



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2015

No. 130

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 10, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID YOUNG to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

IN MEMORY OF THOSE LOST ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of those lost in the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

It is hard to believe that so many years have passed since the tragic events of 9/11, since the sadness and loss are so fresh for many throughout this Nation.

The attacks on the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and my home State of Pennsylvania stand as the most cowardly and senseless acts of terrorism ever perpetrated against the United States and its citizens.

My family and I continue to solemnly offer our thoughts and prayers for those who were impacted that day. We also salute those who came to aid, those who rushed into the World Trade Center before the towers fell, the first responders at the Pentagon, and the passengers who made the ultimate sacrifice, downing United Flight 93 in Somerset County before it could reach its intended destination.

Among those who lost their lives in the attack on the World Trade Center in New York City was Mary Ellen Tiesi. Mary Ellen was a native of Irvona, Clearfield County, and was working in the South Tower on that morning 14 years ago.

Family members have said that, after the attack, Mary Ellen was exiting the stairs of the tower with a friend.

She stopped to wait for her boss, who she knew had a heart condition. Her boss eventually took the elevator, but Mary Ellen continued down the stairs.

She did not make it out of the building and was the only Clearfield County native to lose her life in the attacks in New York. Three years ago the Pennsylvania Route 53 bridge in Irvona was renamed in her memory.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of the kindness Mary Ellen Tiesi showed for her coworker on one of the worst days our Nation has ever known. Let us never forget the thousands like Mary Ellen who truly embody the undying resolve of the American people.

WILDFIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I concluded my summer tour of Oregon at the fire control center on the Warm Springs Indian reservation.

Summer was an amazing time in my State. Smoke enveloped downtown Portland and drifted all the way for 270 miles to the south in Medford. As I drove past, into central Oregon, the Crater Lake National Park consumed 25 square miles.

Throughout the West, 8.5 million acres have already been burned this year. And like we hear almost every year, the 2015 fire season is one of the worst on record.

We should acknowledge the amazing men and women who are on the front lines and the tremendous strain they bear.

We need so many people that we have actually had active military personnel brought online for the first time in a decade. Even firefighters from Australia, New Zealand, and Canada have come to assist in these efforts.

One cannot say enough about the tremendous bravery and sheer hard work involved on so many levels with the men and women who are literally putting their lives on the line for this heroic fight.

But it is important to note that we are not just decimating our forests. We are decimating the Forest Service budget. The portion of the overall budget spent on fighting wildfires has grown in the last 20 years from 16 percent to over one-half, 52 percent.

Because Congress refuses to treat wildfires like other natural disasters, the Forest Service budget is being consumed, squeezing out other critical areas, not just maintaining these special places and trails and recreational opportunities, but even the efforts that

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5869

would deal with forest health and reduce the danger and the cost of future firefighting.

The trend is that two-thirds of the budget in the next 10 years will be firefighting. Absolutely, totally unacceptable.

These fires ought to be treated like any other natural disaster, not decimate our ability to manage our national forests.

The people dealing with these megafires know that part of the problem is climate change making itself felt. Less than 2 percent of these megafires consume almost one-third of the total fire suppression costs because our forests are drier.

There is less snow and rainfall, one more graphic reminder of the devastating impact of climate change, with higher temperatures and less water.

It is past time that Congress steps up to reduce carbon emissions. Perhaps the Pope in 2 weeks will inspire us to do something about climate change.

But, in the meantime, we should at least pass H.R. 167, the Wildfire Disaster Act—bipartisan legislation introduced on the very first day of this Congress, but languishing in committee—that would treat megafires like other natural disasters, not discriminate against the Forest Service.

One final point is that we should stop making the problem worse by allowing more and more people to move into the fire zone in the wildland-urban interface and give these people the illusion that somehow they are going to be provided with urban-level fire protection. Sixty percent of the new homes since 1990 have been built in the flame zone.

We should stop this madness because we are putting more people at risk not just to their properties and their families, but also the men and women who fight forest fires to protect structures.

Remember the 19 hotshots who were killed in Arizona a couple years ago who lost their lives trying to save homes that probably shouldn't have been there in the first place?

Commonsense budgeting, fighting climate change, and reasonable land use will reduce costs, protect lives, and allow us to begin spending money on prevention, which will, in turn, reduce further costs. It more than pays for itself.

Sensible budgeting, prevention, sound land use planning, will protect people and our forests, along with our budgets, while we start our long overdue actions to reduce carbon pollution.

It is time that Congress steps up to start addressing these problems now. This is not rocket science.

MINNESOTA'S BEST BAGGER GOES TO THE SIXTH DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate

Lauren Gillson of St. Cloud for her first place win in the Minnesota Grocers Association 2015 Best Bagger Contest, which took place at the Mall of America last month.

I would also like to commend the Minnesota Grocers Association for hosting this competition. It demonstrates how much value they place on providing excellent customer service.

Anyone who visits a grocery store will understand just how crucial a bagger's role is to the industry. They are, by far, one of the most memorable employees in the store, as they are the last person to be in contact with the customer. A bagger can often make or break the customer's overall experience.

Lauren competed against nine others before winning first place. Her win is truly impressive, as she has only worked at Lunds & Byerlys in St. Cloud for less than a month.

I wish Lauren good luck as she competes in the 2016 National Grocers Association Best Bagger Championship this February.

LIVE UNTIL THE DAY YOU DIE

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jim Davis for all that he has done to help those affected by cancer.

Over the past 4 months, Jim has flown throughout the continental United States and given free plane rides to cancer survivors and patients. By sharing his passion for flying, Jim has brought comfort and everlasting memories to these individuals in their time of need.

What truly is amazing about Jim's story is that he is going through a similar situation as the people he is helping.

After being diagnosed with liver cancer and given just 9 months to live, Jim decided that he wasn't going to give up. Instead, he made it his mission to help others affected by this terrible disease.

Jim has said, "Some people get a cancer diagnosis and just sit and wait to die. Not me. I want to live. Cancer patients, live until the day you die."

Jim, I want to thank you for your amazing acts of kindness. I am in awe of your positive attitude and capacity for helping others.

MINNESOTA IS PROUD OF HER VETERANS

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the individuals from my district who were recently recognized for Veterans' Voices Awards.

I am proud to recognize State Representative Bob Dettmer of Forest Lake, Minnesota; Ralph Donais of Elk River; Jim Tuorila of St. Cloud; Megan Allen of Ramsey; Scott Glew of Elk River; and Shelby Marie Hadley of Rice.

These awards are given to individuals who have nobly served their country in the Armed Forces and gone on to volunteer in their communities after returning home.

Each one of these incredible men and women, chosen by the Minnesota Humanities Center, has positively impacted the United States and Minnesota's Sixth District in a major way.

There is so much to thank these individuals for. Thank you for defending our country and for realizing that there was still so much to be accomplished once you returned home. Your work has not gone unnoticed, and we are forever grateful.

THREE AMERICAN HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the three young men from Sacramento County who have deep roots in my district and whose quick thinking onboard a train to Paris saved lives and inspired our country.

Alek Skarlatos, Anthony Sadler, and Spencer Stone sprang into action to stop a man wielding a gun and a box cutter onboard their train. The childhood friends were on vacation when the gunman burst into their cabin.

As an Oregon Army National Guardsman, Army Specialist Alek Skarlatos had recently returned from a tour in Afghanistan. He was the first to sound the alarm, telling his friends, "Let's go," as they moved to subdue the gunman.

Anthony Sadler, a senior at Sacramento State University, and Airman First Class Spencer Stone of the United States Air Force acted without hesitation.

Stone was slashed while trying to disarm the man, but the injury did not stop him. After subduing the gunman, the trained EMT went on to help treat other injured passengers.

These men showed bravery as they put themselves in harm's way to save those around them. Today I commend them and recognize their great service.

A parade in their honor will be held tomorrow in Sacramento. The date September 11 is fitting. They will be welcomed home and honored for their heroism. The story of these three men is a reminder that everyone can be a hero.

Thank you, Alek, Anthony, and Spencer. You have made your hometown proud, and you have made the United States proud.

REFUGEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the tragic humanitarian crisis currently underway with the migration of refugees from Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey making their way into Western Europe.

With the unfolding of the horrific conflict in Syria and the continuing grotesque violence of ISIS, we can only

expect that hundreds of thousands more will attempt to flee hostile regions for the safety of Europe and beyond.

Since 2011, at least 4 million Syrians have fled their country, uprooting their families to escape brutal violence and miserable living conditions.

□ 1015

However, the refugees' plight for a safe environment since leaving Syria and escaping to Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey has been bleak.

In just the last few days, we have seen heartbreaking images of refugees making the difficult journey to enter European countries, sometimes paying with their lives. These migrants and refugees will do anything for a better future.

I was proud to see the leadership of Angela Merkel in Germany accepting so many of these people in need. I strongly encourage all European Union countries to follow Chancellor Merkel's lead in welcoming these migrants and refugees and also supporting Germany's efforts in ensuring this undertaking is spread across the continent.

Most importantly, the United States must also offer any humanitarian assistance we can to ensure these vulnerable refugees have all available resources to return to a sense of normalcy. The world must step up, and I hope this Congress will play a role in the process of assisting these refugees.

Mr. Speaker, the conflict in Syria is one of the great blemishes on human history. Approximately 250,000 people have been killed. This administration said early on that Bashar al-Assad had to go. Nothing happened. The administration then said that, if Mr. Al-Assad used chemical weapons, then he really had to go. The dictator did, gassing innocent people, including children, and the world did nothing.

This is a heavy burden we carry now, and that is why it is essential that we do everything we can to assist these refugees. My parents were refugees; my grandparents were refugees, and the United States took us in and gave us an opportunity. The world must also now account for our failure in Syria and do everything we can to help these innocent people.

WORLD SUICIDE PREVENTION DAY

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize today, September 10, as World Suicide Prevention Day. Anyone who has been impacted by the horrible tragedy of a suicide, whether it be a family member, friend, or colleague, is well aware of the devastating impact when one person they love takes their own life.

It is critical that we continue the conversation about not only suicide, but mental health issues as well. People of all ages, races, and socioeconomic status can be plagued with mental health problems, and we must ensure those who are suffering receive the proper diagnosis and treatment.

In addition, communities must work together to foster understanding rather

than judgment. If you or a loved one is experiencing difficulties, I encourage you: Please, take the time to seek counseling from a professional.

Every life is worth living, and every life is precious. Let's come together to support our friends and neighbors and work to address mental illness and prevent suicide.

MADURO BORDER CLOSING

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was recently announced by Venezuela's de facto dictator, Nicolas Maduro, that the single remaining border crossing with Colombia will be completely bolted.

This action is only the latest example of Maduro's weak attempts to search for phantom scapegoats of his regime's failed economic policies. The figment of Maduro's imagination is Colombians are the cause of food shortages, the collapse of the Venezuelan currency, and his country's rampant crime. As a result, the Venezuelan dictator has ordered the border between Colombia and Venezuela closed.

Colombians living in Venezuela have been unlawfully arrested and have had their homes bulldozed, leaving them with no other option but to flee; but with the latest and final border closure, Colombians are forced to return to their home country using very dangerous routes. This has been dubbed a humanitarian crisis by the United Nations.

Make no mistake, this crackdown by Maduro is a sick and twisted attempt to distract the Venezuelan electorate from Caracas' failed socialist and anti-democratic policies ahead of the December elections.

Unfortunately, the horrible suffering these policies have caused for both Colombian refugees and the Venezuelan people are all too real.

WATER AND DROUGHT IN CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, as we come back from the August recess, I would like to speak on an issue that hits very close to home and to the Southwestern States—yes, the Southwestern States—and this is the drought.

The drought in particular that is facing California is the worst one recorded in history in our State, and I believe it will define this era.

My home State is entering its fourth year of consecutive drought, with nearly 93 percent of residents experiencing severe droughts, and there is no foreseeable end in the future.

The lack of water in California is so serious that our Governor Jerry Brown declared a state of emergency and asked that all residents cut back on water 25 percent. Even with us hitting that, a recent study estimates that it will take at least 11 million gallons of water to replenish our drought losses.

Water conservation and infrastructure is a life or death issue, not just for the residents of my district, but for all of California. Without water infrastructure, farmers in the Central Valley cannot adequately grow and sell their crops; the price of foodstuff skyrockets; wildfires rage and destroy acres of property; State energy production is crippled; the economy slows; and the list goes on and on.

While other areas of California are just now setting the initial framework for water conservation and recycling projects, my home district recycles almost 70 percent of the water that we use both in business and at home.

How are we able to do that? Well, when I came here 19 years ago, I championed a project called the Groundwater Replenishment System, and it is located in Orange County. It is the water table underneath our homes.

This system recycles treated waste water into clean drinking water, which exceeds Federal and State standards; and it has produced over 160 trillion gallons of new water and serviced millions of Orange County residents since its creation.

This system has become the largest reclamation project in the world. In fact, people from around the world and from across our great States come to take a look at how we replenish our water supply.

Legislation to fund projects like our groundwater replenishment system—well, it should be commonsense to fund those. However, the drought has continued in the past 4 years, and there has been no meaningful action on infrastructure improvements to move water, to reclaim water, to save water.

While residents of California are feeling the effects of our historic drought, this Chamber continues to stall on meaningful drought relief and water infrastructure legislation. Back in my home district, I have held numerous briefings about the drought and recognized community members who are cutting back and being more efficient with their water.

I recently spent part of this August recess meeting with community members of the Central Valley to discuss water storage and recycling projects.

In this Congress, I have cosponsored the Drought Recovery and Resilience Act of 2015. It is commonsense legislation which addresses innovative water financing, it improves water infrastructure and water management, and it assists in planning for future droughts.

The residents of my State have been doing their part to conserve the water; so now, it is time for Washington, D.C., to help us to do what is right for California and to do what is right for the other Southwestern States.

While the House Republicans are bickering amongst themselves to avoid another embarrassing government shutdown, I will continue to fight for meaningful water infrastructure to secure the water independence of future

generations because with water comes growth and California will grow.

HONORING TYRELL CAMERON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Tyrell Cameron, a young man from northeast Louisiana whose life was cut tragically short in an accident on the football field last Friday night.

Tyrell was a bright student at Franklin Parish High School with a promising future, surrounded by a supportive and loving community.

I live about 20 miles from the high school. I consider Winnsboro an extension of my home. I know their people well. I know that this is a strong community that supports each other, helps each other, and loves each other.

As Tyrell's family and friends come to grips with this tragedy, we will mourn; we will grieve, and then we will start the healing process.

While we pray for Tyrell, his family, his teammates, and Franklin Parish, I also ask that you keep the Sterlington community in your prayers. They were on the other sideline during the game, and I know this has been a difficult experience for them as well.

Louisiana is a special place. We love our high school football. Our young men play with heart for their schools every Friday night. As competitive as it can get, we know what is most important. I have been so impressed with the outpouring of support for Tyrell and Franklin Parish that has come from high schools throughout the entire State of Louisiana.

Many local teams will wear Tyrell's number, number 48, on their helmets for the remainder of the season. That says a lot to me about the strong character of our young men back home.

Others like me are wearing blue today, his team color, to honor Tyrell, just as his teammates are doing this week also.

My thoughts and prayers are both with Franklin Parish and Sterlington communities, and I encourage them to keep playing for Tyrell.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, time and time again, I have come to this floor to urge my colleagues to stand with me against the rampant plague of gun violence spreading across our Nation, and I stand here again heartbroken.

I recently had the difficult and tragic duty of speaking at Tamara Sword's funeral. Tamara was the mother of five and the daughter of Chicago gun violence prevention advocate Andrew Holmes, a personal hero of mine.

Andrew is a man who has dedicated his life to preventing gun violence and supporting families of gun violence victims. For decades, he has traveled to hundreds of crime scenes to console those who lost friends and family members. In a cruel twist of fate, he was the one who needed consoling when Tamara was caught in the crossfire while at a gas station.

I wish Tamara's story was an exception, but we know it is not. It is a tragic reminder that only in America does an everyday trip to the gas station, the movie theater, or church end in gun violence or maybe you are a reporter and a photographer just doing your job or a sheriff filling your car with gas.

All across America, gun violence is surging. More than 30 cities are reeling from a summer of senseless shootings, with death tolls reaching historic levels. In Chicago last week, we marked the highest number of gun homicides in a single day in more than a decade.

After each mass shooting, Congress launches into its ritual that is used as an end run around real reform. We give our speeches; we hold our moments of silence, and then we wait for the national buzz to fade.

My colleagues seem to forget that our actions may fade, but the violence remains. Violence—gun violence—is a major public health problem in the United States. Every moment that we don't act, we risk losing even more lives to senseless gun violence, which might be homicides, suicides, or accidents.

Last week, I hosted a dinner for a group of parents who lost their children to senseless gun violence. They think we simply do not care. They wonder. There has been Newtown; there is Hadiya Pendleton; there is the church shooting, movie theaters, the mall, but still, we do nothing.

Today, I rise again on behalf of victims of gun violence. I rise to say that we can no longer dismiss the mass shootings as isolated incidents and ignore everyday shootings altogether because the fact is, when our Nation is averaging one mass shooting a day, they aren't so isolated. When shootings are so commonplace that they are called everyday shootings, they cannot be ignored.

□ 1030

Over the Labor Day weekend, 9 people were killed and 34 were wounded by gun violence in Chicago. It is time that we own up to the gun violence problem that is gripping our Nation and robbing us of a generation of young people one shooting at a time.

This year, for the first time in history, gun deaths are on pace to be the leading cause of death of Americans aged 15 through 24, and the suicide rate is climbing, also. The future of our Nation is hanging in the balance here.

It is time for Congress to act. There are a number of gun violence reform bills that truly make sense and that are truly bipartisan.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the American people and to take action, because the American people are on the side of gun violence reform that makes sense.

The other thing you can do is to try attending a funeral of an innocent person—of a mom of five kids, who cling onto her coffin, or of a young teen who lost his life to senseless gun violence. I wonder how you would feel then.

IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, as we have heard so far during debate on the Iran Joint Plan of Action, there are dozens of shortcomings and concerns when it comes to this administration's nuclear deal—the so-called P5+1. No doubt, we will hear dozens more before all is said and done.

The more we study this agreement—Republican or Democrat—the clearer it is to see that it does not measure up to its ultimate goal: to prevent a nuclear Iran.

The essential restrictions on Iran's key bomb-making technology sunset in as soon as 10 years, leaving an internationally recognized, industrial-scale nuclear program with breakout times shrinking down to nearly zero—and that is if Iran doesn't cheat—but we will have a tough time knowing because what was "anytime, anywhere" inspections of Iranian nuclear sites has now become "managed access," leaving Iran as long as 24 days to scrub sites, enough time to nearly completely remove incriminating evidence of wrongdoing or the option of self-reporting compliance in places like their military base at Parchin.

However, what this deal does accomplish is to precipitate a nuclear arms race in the Middle East—a reality we are already seeing as nations like Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia have already begun building up their nuclear infrastructure in response.

Any of those details should be enough to reject this deal, but that would not even mention the most objectionable portion: that this good-faith agreement with the world's largest state sponsor of terror frees up hundreds of billions of dollars in economic sanctions and frozen assets seemingly without any regard for what that money will be used for.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 6 months, I have had the opportunity to chair the Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, which is a bipartisan group that was established by both parties of the Financial Services Committee, to look into the increasing ability for terror groups to fund and finance their actions and to evaluate the United States' response to these challenges.

Specifically, the task force examined the impact of this nuclear agreement on Tehran's state sponsorship of terror proxies across the region.

What became abundantly clear was that the influx of hundreds of billions of dollars to Iran that have been authorized in this deal will increase that nation's ability to continue regional destabilization through the support of groups like Hamas, Hezbollah, Iraqi Shiite militias, the Houthis in Yemen, and Syrian President Bashar al-Assad's regime in Damascus.

This deal goes about rolling back sanctions while expert witnesses have testified before our task force, even as recently as yesterday, advocating for increased sanctions. There is a real disconnect here between what the experts tell us and what the administration is doing.

Iran's budget already features a nine-figure line item to support terrorism, and there is no doubt that the activities it funds will expand Iran's radical efforts—a fact even acknowledged by the administration following negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, what we have today is a bad deal, one that clears the way for a nuclear Iran, that gravely endangers allies like Israel, and, with our blessing, that makes an already volatile, unstable Middle East less safe by giving Tehran more power to fund its terror syndicates.

What is so troubling to me is that a number of my colleagues, after 2 years of negotiations that have been predicated on no deal being better than a bad deal, have begrudgingly accepted a self-admitted bad deal solely because it is better than no deal.

A better deal would include, truly, "anytime, anywhere" inspections of Iran's entire nuclear program, a plan of action to oversee and manage any funds returning to Iran through sanctions relief or a return to the international banking community, the release of American prisoners improperly held by the regime, and a payment of the \$22 billion in compensation owed by Iran to families of September 11 victims, including Bucks County residents. The court judgments should be paid before Iran receives any funds under this agreement.

I urge them to reconsider what the reality of this bad deal means for the safety of the world and the future of our Nation's foreign policy.

I urge my colleagues to reject this deal because it is one that will have decades-long consequences to our national security.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING DEPUTY DARREN GOFORTH, HARRIS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Deputy Darren H. Goforth, 47 years old, who lost his life more than 10 days ago in Houston, Texas, in an execution-style killing, doing his job and serving his community.

Deputy Goforth was a Harris County Sheriff's Deputy and a man who loved his job. He loved his family, his daughter and his son, and he loved his beautiful wife. Might I share with you her words, Kathleen Goforth's:

"My husband was an incredibly intricate blend of toughness and gentility," she said in a statement following his tragic death.

He was fueling his vehicle at about 8:30 on a Friday night, and someone came behind him—the individual now in custody—and, in execution style, killed him.

"There are no words for this," his wife said. "He was always loyal—fiercely so. He was ethical. The right thing to do is what guided his internal compass."

Of course, she wanted us to know, "If people want to know what kind of man he was, this is it. He was who you wanted for a friend, a colleague, and a neighbor," Goforth said in a statement.

She went on to say, "However, I am who was blessed so richly that I had the privilege of calling him my husband and my best friend."

To Kathleen and her family, Deputy Goforth was the best friends of all of us. He was the best friend of the community. He was the best friend of children whom he stopped and talked to or of young people whom he sought to inspire.

He was the best friend of his friends and neighbors, as was evidenced by the 11,000 people who attended his funeral. He was the best friend of law enforcement officers. He was the best friend of the integrity of what law enforcement and first responders are all about.

He was a young man, as we came to know during the eulogy and the various statements of friends and officers, who desired to be just a helper to anyone.

We were told that, even as he worked, his father had a business and, when he had his time off, he would go to that business and help his father.

We have come to understand that it was his mode of law enforcement to, again, protect and serve but to reach out even to talk to those who weren't even looking his way. It was our understanding that he was gentle and kind and had a great sense of humor and, yes, looked like he did a little baby-sitting as well.

So I rise today to speak to this Nation about this officer and to claim the time for ending senseless violence and to recognize that his life—Deputy Goforth's life—is a testament to the goodness of the American people and our citizens in Houston and Harris County. Certainly, all of our State and local and congressional officials were there to acknowledge our deepest sense of loss.

I want to thank the people of Harris County, when we see officers, for distributing 30,000 wristbands to pray for police. I went out to the gas pump where he was so heinously and tragically shot, and all of the flowers and

notes and people raising money touched all of our hearts. Everyone stopped to pray and talk and hug.

I remember someone saying, "I am a conservative male, but I am so glad to see you here."

And I said, "My brother, I am glad to see you here. Can I hug you?" And we hugged because tragedy brings us together, but purpose should have us going forward. There should be a purpose as we lost this wonderful father and husband and law enforcement officer.

As the ranking member on the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee, that is the very purpose that I am so excited about: this opportunity to talk about walking together, finding ways for solutions, and making sure that the life of a gentle, strong law enforcement person continues to have a presence in our lives through the way we handle our legislation and our coming together.

Foremost among these dangers, of course, are those who come upon officers in the line of duty. Just a week ago, an officer in Illinois faced an enormous tragedy and lost his life, but we realize that they understand that as they go to serve their communities.

We must all work together—law enforcement, community residents, public officials, the Nation—to make our communities places where we trust one another and cooperate to achieve our mutual goal of safety and security for all persons. It reminds us how much work we have to do and how much we are interwoven with our first responders and our law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago, I was at the 9/11 commemoration, the memorial, and it reminded me of the strength of Deputy Goforth. So I would simply say we honor them.

At this time, I will ask for a moment of silence in honor of Deputy Goforth.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow but an abiding admiration that I rise today to acknowledge the life and service of Deputy Darren Goforth of Houston, Texas.

Deputy Darren Goforth, a ten year veteran of the Harris County Sheriff's office, died on Friday, August 28, 2015, while refueling his patrol car.

He was shot fifteen times by a man who, by all accounts, never knew Darren Goforth and the light he brought into this world.

In a senseless act of violence, the love and care Darren Goforth gave to his wife, Kathleen and two young children, and the community he served, ended entirely too soon.

According to Kathleen Goforth her husband was an "intricate blend of toughness and gentility," a man who was fiercely loyal and always strived to do the right thing; a person "who you wanted for a friend, a colleague, and a neighbor."

May I add, Mr. Speaker, Darren Goforth was what we want in an American.

Mr. Speaker, Darren Goforth's life is a testament to the goodness in the American people, but his death is a reminder of many difficult and painful truths.

Foremost among these are the dangers the men and women of our nation's law enforcement departments face every time they walk their beats and patrol their communities.

Their families, the persons who know them best and love them most, deserve to welcome them home at the end of each shift, safe and sound.

Mr. Speaker, we must confront the reality that police departments and the communities they protect are all too often adversarial.

We must all work together—law enforcement, community residents, public officials—to make our communities places where we trust one another and cooperate to achieve our mutual goal of safety and security of for all persons.

The murder of Deputy Goforth also reminds us that we must do more to stem the tide of gun violence that tears through this country.

Neither our country nor our hearts can afford to lose people of such quality as Darren Goforth to gun violence in the staggering quantities that we do.

Mr. Speaker, over 32,000 Americans die from gun violence each year.

So, while Darren Goforth's death is most certainly a tragedy, death by gun violence happens all too often in our country.

This normalcy of gun violence is inexcusable.

Mr. Speaker, according to media reports, the person who ended Deputy Goforth's wonderful life, struggled with mental illness for quite some time.

We absolutely have to do more to ensure that society's most dangerous weapons stay out of the hands of the most mentally or emotionally unstable persons.

It is important that we do this because it is estimated that 61.5 million Americans experience mental illness in a given year.

This is why we must, as a nation, attach as much importance and provide the same level of resources for mental health as we do for physical health.

We can no longer afford to ignore the struggles of nearly 20 percent of the population and fail to provide adequate treatment and services that could alleviate some of that struggle and prevent horrific events like the one that claimed the life of Deputy Darren Goforth.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today mourning the loss of Deputy Darren Goforth but I have hope.

I have hope that out of this tragedy we will be moved to act to make this country safer for the men and women who risk their lives to keep their communities safe.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in honor of Deputy Darren Goforth, an extraordinary human being and a shining example of what is meant when we remember him and say: "he was one of Houston's finest."

IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as this President comes closer to his final year in office, it is no secret that he only cares about shaping and molding his legacy.

When discussing the Iran deal last year, his Deputy National Security Ad-

visor said to reporters: "This is probably the biggest thing President Obama will do in his second term on foreign policy. This is health care for us."

Four years earlier, that health care—ObamaCare—was described by our Vice President as a "big—explicative—deal," but only time will shape this President's legacy.

Seventy-five years ago, Winston Churchill proclaimed that Neville Chamberlain had a "precision of mind and an aptitude for business which raised him far above the ordinary levels of our generation."

Although this description is far too generous to describe our current President, who has no aptitude for business, Mr. Chamberlain was portrayed in a very different light than he is today. If he could be characterized in one word today, it would be "appeaser."

Regardless of his intellect, Mr. Chamberlain's incorrect decision to concede to Adolf Hitler's demands for the purpose of avoiding a conflict in Europe overshadowed anything else he ever accomplished as Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, the Iran deal, I believe, is President Obama's Chamberlain moment.

As the Associated Press reported 2 weeks ago, under this deal, Iran "will be allowed to use its own inspectors to investigate a site it has been accused of using to develop nuclear arms."

These reported "secret deals" acknowledge what many of us have known to be true and confirm what President Obama and his administration still deny—that this deal is based on trust.

This deal is based on trusting the Iranians in that they will not break their promise to build a nuclear bomb. How can we trust Iran's Supreme Leader, who chants "death to America" and "death to Israel"? How can we trust a Supreme Leader who said this week that Israel will not exist in 25 years?

As the former Democratic chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee appropriately said, this deal would be "the equivalent of having an athlete accused of using performance enhancing drugs submit an unsupervised urine sample."

Any deal with Iran must protect America's interests at home and abroad, and this deal does not.

As Israel's Prime Minister warned in his speech before this very Chamber only a few months ago, Iran's regime poses a grave threat not only to Israel, but to the peace of the entire world.

The President and his deal supporters have ignored these warnings. This deal will shift the balance of power in the Middle East. This deal goes against the wishes of Israel, our greatest ally in the region.

I challenge all of my Democratic colleagues who support this deal to come to the floor and look into the camera—and, quite frankly, look in the mirror—so, when history comes full circle, the American people will know who in this

body let our Neville Chamberlain give Iran the bomb.

□ 1045

Despite the warnings from those within his own party and leaders of ally nations, this President has made it clear he is not concerned about the safety of Americans.

This President and his administration have made it clear they are not concerned about Israel. This President and his administration have made it well known that they are not concerned about the fate of the world. And this President and his administration are only concerned with the legacy they have in the future.

For that reason, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this President prepared to suffer the same legacy as Neville Chamberlain?

I urge President Obama and his administration to simply let their conscience be their guide.

In God we trust.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, I will look the camera in the eye and say why I am supporting this agreement. I think there is only one common thing that is agreed upon here in the House and in the Senate: that we don't want Iran to have nuclear weapons.

If the U.S. were to walk away from this deal and say we want to go back to the table, they will be sitting in an empty room, and the only people at the table will be U.S. representatives. There will not be any other nations from Europe, Russia, or China; and Iran won't be at the table either.

This is a deal that is not perfect. Sure, it is far from perfect. They say: Well, Iran could become a nuclear threshold state again in 10 or 12 years because of the way this agreement is written. If we walk away today, they are a nuclear threshold state; and they will build a bomb, and they will have it within 3 or 4 months. Then what?

Well, we do have options, of course. They are being recommended by Dick Cheney, John Bolton, and Benjamin Netanyahu, all who were cheerleaders for the Iraq war and who were oh so wrong about the greatest foreign policy mistake in the history of the United States of America. But they learned nothing from that, and they think yet another war in the Mideast is a better solution than this.

Now what does Iran give up? Two-thirds of its centrifuges. They are allowed to keep the oldest, most primitive centrifuges. Ninety-seven percent of its enriched uranium stockpile will be gone. Their mine sites will be monitored 24/7. Their mill sites for uranium will be monitored 24/7. There will be an intrusive inspection regime. They have to fill in the core of the nearly finished Iran reactor—which can take them on

the plutonium path to a bomb—with concrete and convert that to peaceful use.

Natanz, underneath the mountain that some would have us bomb—unfortunately, it is underneath the mountain—that will become a medical facility monitored 24/7. No. That is Fordow, excuse me, not Natanz. Yet we hear the drumbeat for war over here. They don't want to say they want to have a war, but that is the ultimate conclusion.

If you don't want Iran to have nuclear weapons, this is the best deal we can get, and we amazingly got this deal with the support of Russia, China, and four nations in Europe.

Now, they are already flooding into Iran in anticipation of this deal going forward. They have no intention of going back to the table. The Chinese want the oil. Russians want to sell them weapons. The planes have been totally full coming out of Europe with high-level corporate executives wanting to go into Iran and do business.

No. This is the only alternative before the United States Congress and the only one that can prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon in the short term. Yes, 12, 15 years down the road, we may have to deal with this again. Yet again, 12 or 15 years from now, under this regime, perhaps Iran will have changed. We will see.

So I am proud of this vote, and I think it is the best path. I am also incredibly proud of my vote against popular opinion and such sagacious people as Dick Cheney, John Bolton, and Benjamin Netanyahu about invading Iraq, which has turned the Middle East into an unbelievable mess that will not be undone in my lifetime. ISIS is basically a product of the Iraq war, an invasion by the U.S.

So let's not create even worse problems. Let's take this imperfect agreement, but let's take it because it prevents Iran from having a nuclear weapon and having a weapons race in this incredibly unstable part of the world.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of the Third District of Kansas and on behalf of American people who are counting on us to put their security before the obvious partisan politics of Washington, D.C. I also join a bipartisan majority, leaders of each party in each Chamber, to stand up and be counted as one of the many voices in this country in opposition to the President's deal with Iran.

Like others who plan to oppose the ratification of this deal, I am not opposed to the idea of diplomacy, but I am opposed to the idea of surrender diplomacy. This administration asked us to trust Iran; but as Iran continues to be the largest world state sponsor of terror, as they continue to shout

“death to America” and call for our destruction and the obliteration of Israel, our greatest ally, how can we trust Iran?

With secret deals, side deals, and self-verification, this President's capitulation will lead to a nuclear Iran for the first time in history and an American endorsement of their efforts to get there.

Well, the Ayatollah has convinced the President that it only needs nuclear capacity for peaceful purposes. But why does Iran need nuclear capacity at all? Iran has the world's fourth largest proven oil reserves, totalling 157 billion barrels of crude oil, and the world's second largest proven natural gas reserves, totalling 1.193 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

With such a robust energy sector, why should Iran, a nation that has consistently defied the international community on this issue, be granted the ability to proceed with a nuclear energy program? Why should we trust Iran? Have they earned the right to be trusted?

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, this is a gift to the ayatollahs of Iran. For starters, it releases hundreds of billions of dollars in assets to the regime in Iran, giving them a gift basket full of cash to flood terrorist organizations which seek to harm Americans and our allies.

The deal gives the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism a stamp of legitimacy and the means to expand its destabilizing influence through massive amounts of sanctions relief, even before Iran has demonstrated full adherence to the deal's term. It does, however, bring home the four Americans being imprisoned in Iran.

When questioned as to why, this administration claims that it did not demand the release of American prisoners because it wanted to limit negotiations to just Iran's nuclear program.

On the contrary, Iran won key non-nuclear concessions through the process. The deal grants amnesty to Qasem Soleimani, the head of the Quds force in Iran's Revolutionary Guard, who is one of the world's most leading terrorist masterminds and the man thought responsible for the death of at least 500 United States troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

It also lifts the conventional arms embargo on Iran in spite of public testimony from Secretary of Defense Ash Carter and Joint Chiefs Chairman Martin Dempsey that we should do so “under no circumstances.”

Lifting this embargo means Iran can begin to stockpile conventional weapons, and Russia and China can begin to legally profit off major weapons exports to Tehran.

Yet perhaps the most troubling aspect of this deal is its inspections regime. Gone are the anytime, anywhere inspections that were required by Congress and outlined by the administration. In its place, a 24-day notice period for Iran, combined with secret side

deals that this Congress has no knowledge of and in which the proponents of the plan are happy to be blissfully ignorant.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents of this deal know that it does not make us safer or more secure. They know that we cannot trust Iran. They know that the verification process is weak and is built upon secret deals, they know we shouldn't lift the arms embargo, and they know that the hundreds of billions of dollars being released to the Ayatollah will end up on the battlefield in the hands of terrorists who will use it to kill Americans and our allies. Mr. Speaker, they know this is a bad deal.

I'm proud to have my name listed along with Democrats and Republicans in a bipartisan majority opposing this deal.

Mr. Speaker, those who ignore history are doomed to repeat it. In 1994, we heard President Clinton sell his nuclear agreement with North Korea on many of the same talking points President Obama used in his speech to sell this deal with Iran. Yet in 2006, we watched as the North Koreans detonated a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Speaker, there is still time to stop this, and I urge—I beg—my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against this deal so we aren't watching Iranians detonate their own bomb just a few years from now.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 250

In the Senate of the United States, September 9, 2015.

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker served in the United States Navy during World War II from 1944 to 1946;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker faithfully served the people of Pennsylvania with distinction in the United States Congress;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1960 and served 4 terms as a Representative from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

Whereas as a Representative, Richard Schultz Schweiker served on—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was elected to the United States Senate in 1968 and served 2 terms as a Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

Whereas as a Senator, Richard Schultz Schweiker served on—

(1) the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate;

(2) the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Human Services of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(3) the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities of the Senate; and

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was appointed as the Secretary of Health and Human Services by President Ronald Wilson Reagan in 1981 and served as Secretary of Health and Human Services until 1983: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Richard Schultz Schweiker, former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, the Senate stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Richard Schultz Schweiker.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 349. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts.

S. 1603. An act to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep disappointment in the decision by the House leadership to back off from a direct vote on a resolution of disapproval of the Iran nuclear accord as provided under the Corker Act.

Clearly, the President has not complied with the requirements of Corker to provide Congress with the full text of its agreement with Iran, most specifically, the side deals referenced in the agreement between Iran and the IAEA.

H. Res. 411, which declares the administration out of compliance with the Corker Act, is well-founded, but there is no reason to cancel the vote on the resolution disapproving the agreement as specified in the Corker Act and as promised by the House leadership for the last 6 weeks.

H. Res. 411 rightly disputes September 17 as the deadline for congressional action to stop this treaty from taking effect, and I support that resolution, but it cannot authoritatively settle this dispute. That leaves the deadline as an open question, and this House must not let that deadline pass without definite action as provided by Corker.

I oppose the act because it guts the Treaty Clause of the Constitution that requires treaties to be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the U.S. Senate. Despite the President's contention that this is an agreement and not a treaty, the fact that it explicitly modifies the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty makes it obvious that it requires Senate ratification.

Unfortunately, the Congress overwhelmingly approved the Corker Act, establishing a very different framework with respect to this particular treaty. Instead of a two-thirds vote of the Senate to ratify it, Corker, in es-

sence, requires two-thirds of both Houses to reject it through a resolution of disapproval, an almost impossible threshold.

Under Corker, the resolution of disapproval is the specific legal act required to reject this treaty. This is what the leadership had promised the House would vote on this week, until yesterday. Now we are to vote on a legally meaningless bill to approve the treaty that is expected to be voted down. It is specifically designed to have no legal effect but merely to give Members political cover.

Thus, the House will fail to take action on a resolution of disapproval called for under the Corker Act by the disputed September 17 deadline. On that deadline, the President will declare victory, implement the treaty, and the Congress will be left sputtering. The world will correctly interpret this dereliction as a capitulation by the House to this treaty. And years from now, maybe, possibly, the courts will intervene to declare the President's action illegal or maybe not.

Mr. Speaker, the House is right to dispute the September 17 deadline because clearly the President did not comply with provisions of Corker and provide the full text of the side agreements to the Congress; but the House is dead wrong to refuse to take action on the resolution of disapproval prior to the disputed deadline to assure that the House has spoken clearly, unambiguously, and indisputably according to the provisions of the Corker Act that the Congress, itself, enacted in May. Once it has acted, the House can still dispute whether the President's submission meets the requirements of Corker, but it will not have this momentous question dangling unresolved and in dispute.

The argument we hear for this course is that the Senate is unlikely to take up a resolution of disapproval; therefore, we should hold the President to the letter of Corker. Well, what the Senate does is up to the Senate; but for our part, the House has a moral obligation to act within the undisputed timeframe to legally reject this dangerous action by the President.

There is little doubt that this treaty will trigger a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. The leaders of Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia have already made that abundantly clear. There is little doubt it is unverifiable.

There is no doubt it will release \$150 billion of frozen assets to Iran with which it can finance its terrorist operations and continue its nuclear research.

□ 1100

I fear the Iran nuclear agreement may be just as significant to the fate of the 21st century as the Munich Agreement was to the 20th century. The American people and the world deserve a clear, unambiguous, and indisputable act of the House to repudiate this act. What the House leadership is now pur-

suing falls far short of this moral imperative.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, last month, I traveled to Israel with more than 35 of my colleagues to meet with key leaders in that country, including Prime Minister Netanyahu, and learned firsthand what our closest ally in the Middle East thinks about the proposed Iran nuclear agreement, also known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action between the P5+1 countries and Iran.

The consensus view from the Israelis across the political spectrum, from the Prime Minister to the opposition leader in the Knesset, Isaac Herzog, from the President of the State of Israel, Reuven Rivlin, to the military leaders in the Israeli Defense Forces, they all agree that the deal negotiated by Secretary Kerry and championed by President Obama is a dangerous and historic mistake.

This confirms what we have learned in briefings and hearings in Congress. This deal will not deliver the safety and security the American people deserve. Instead, it will transform Iran from the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism with an illicit nuclear program into the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism awash in billions of dollars in sanctions relief with an internationally sanctioned nuclear program on an industrial scale.

This is not just a bad deal for Israel. This is not just a bad deal for America. A nuclear Iran is a global threat to everyone everywhere. Consider the counterparty to this deal. Since the seizure of the U.S. Embassy and the taking of 52 American hostages during the 1979 revolution, the Islamic Republic of Iran has taken the long view on its global ambitions of exporting its revolution, supporting terrorist proxies like Hamas, Hezbollah, Houthis, and Boko Haram.

The Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and the leader of its elite Quds Force, Qasem Soleimani, is responsible for the killing of over 500 U.S. soldiers in Iraq.

The Iranian regime has covered up and lied about its nuclear program for decades, deceiving international inspectors, agreeing to intrusive inspections, and then allowing those inspections to be implemented only provisionally and selectively. Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, regularly chants "death to America" and openly calls for the annihilation of the Jewish people and the destruction of Israel.

In Jerusalem, we visited the Yad Vashem Holocaust memorial museum. There, we saw exhibits recounting the horrifying images of the Holocaust. During our visit with Prime Minister

Netanyahu, he made a profound observation. He said they compare this to the 1930s.

This is not like the 1930s. In the 1930s, the Nazis concealed their intentions for the Jewish people in the Holocaust. Here, they are actually telling us. They are telling us what they want to do to the Jewish people and death to the Great Satan. Let's not give them the tools to actually carry it out.

The President's promise of anytime, anywhere inspections has been replaced with managed access to suspect nuclear sites in which international inspectors must appeal to Iran, Russia, and China. This bureaucratic process could take up to 24 days at least, during which Iran would remove anything covert or in violation of the agreement.

The Associated Press now reports that at least one of two secret deals between the IAEA and Iran—secret deals neither Congress nor even the Secretary of State has been allowed to see—allows Iran to use its own inspectors at the military complex long suspected as the headquarters of Iran's nuclear weapons and ballistic missile program.

Given the Iranian regime's past behavior and contempt for U.S. negotiators it knows are weak, there is little doubt Iran will cheat and dare the Obama administration to find violations which prove the very deficiencies of the deal it negotiated.

Even if Iran does not cheat, even if Iran actually complies with the deal, three bad outcomes are guaranteed. First, Iran will be allowed an arsenal—not a bomb—an arsenal of nuclear weapons in as little as 10 years.

Under the agreement, Iran is not required to dismantle key bomb-making technology, is permitted to retain vast enrichment capacity, may continue research and development on advanced centrifuges, and will be allowed to acquire intercontinental ballistic missiles in as little as 8 years. Intercontinental ballistic missiles—those are not for Tel Aviv; those are for Washington, D.C., and New York.

Second, Iran gets sanctions relief, at least \$56 billion almost immediately, and that is according to the Obama administration itself. Independent analysis projects the relief could be as much as \$150 billion. As a member of the Task Force to Investigate Terrorist Financing, I have heard extensive testimony that, when these funds are released, a significant percentage will go to Iran's terrorist proxies in Gaza, Lebanon, Iraq, Yemen, Nigeria, and elsewhere. Experts warn it will be impossible to snap back effective sanctions.

Third, because Iran's neighbors know this deal reverses a decades-long bipartisan U.S. policy blocking Iran's nuclear program, this agreement will spark a nuclear arms race in the broader Middle East. Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt have already signaled their intent to acquire nuclear retaliatory capability if this deal is finalized. The people who know Iran the best trust them the least.

This President says it is this deal or war, but that is a false choice. Rejecting this deal will keep most sanctions in place and allow Congress and our allies to turn up the pressure on Iran to get a better deal. In fact, I signed a letter with 366 colleagues outlining the conditions we would consider to be part of a better deal, none of which were included in the one before us.

On the last night we were in Israel, one of the last nights, as we finished dinner at a restaurant on the Sea of Galilee, the owner of the restaurant took the microphone and announced that Members of the American Congress were here to stop this bad Iran deal. The whole restaurant stood up and sang "God Bless America."

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, on the Iran deal, I proudly stand with our allies in Israel, not with the mullahs in Tehran.

WHY THE IRAN AGREEMENT MUST BE OPPOSED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I want to just associate myself with the comments of my good friend from Kentucky, who was just up here and I think eloquently was giving a case as to why this deal with Iran is such a bad deal.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that the national security consequences of the nuclear agreement with Iran will haunt America for generations if Congress does not step in to stop it. This shouldn't be about party. It should not be about loyalty to the President because, if one thinks about this current President, whether you like him or don't like him, whether you agree with him or don't agree with him, this administration ends in 15 months, but the national security consequences of this deal will go on and haunt America for generations to come.

This deal, this agreement, needs to be evaluated on the substance and how it will impact America and will it make America safer.

Mr. Speaker, an overwhelming bipartisan majority of Americans and a bipartisan majority of this Congress are against this agreement. It makes America less safe. If it survives, it is only because the President was able to ram it through on a wholly partisan basis. That is not something to celebrate, Mr. Speaker. The fact that there is zero bipartisan support for this pact in the United States Congress further demonstrates just how dangerous this is for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in my very first speech on the floor of this House in 2011, I stated my belief that Iran was the greatest national security threat that we had. Today, I am even more committed that Iran is the greatest threat that we have to our own national security.

By proving that aggression and defiance will be rewarded, this agreement

makes the world less safe and, tragically, war more likely. What are we saying to our neighbors? If Iran gets a nuclear weapon, surely its neighbors will go on a nuclear arms race as well and will make this dangerous part of the world even less safe than it already is, far more volatile.

These concerns have been bipartisan. According to Democratic Senator BOB MENENDEZ, this agreement doesn't end Iran's nuclear program, it preserves it. According to Democratic Senator CHUCK SCHUMER: "If Iran's true intent is to get a nuclear weapon, under this agreement, it must simply exercise patience."

Simply put, this agreement won't block Iran's path to a nuclear weapon. Instead, it leaves Iran's nuclear infrastructure intact and amounts to a containment strategy. Settling for only containing a nuclear Iran is a grave mistake that leaves the long-term safety of the United States and our allies vulnerable to nuclear blackmail by Iran.

We are all familiar with the basic reasons for why this reckless agreement should be opposed. The agreement relies on a sure-to-fail inspections regime that falls well short of anytime, anywhere inspections that are so critically needed. It fails to deliver on the commitment to dismantle Iran's nuclear infrastructure.

Iran actually receives a signing bonus that trades permanent sanctions relief for temporary limitations on its nuclear program. This will provide Iran, the world's greatest state sponsor of terror—and that is not up for debate; that is not disputed—with \$150 billion, which they will no doubt use to fund terror through their proxies in Hezbollah and Hamas, through Assad in Syria, and through cells in South and Central America—sunset provisions, which simply gives Iran a patient path to a nuclear weapon.

This agreement lifts conventional arms embargo in 5 years and ballistic missile embargo in 8 years. Why were these even on the table, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, I ask you: What do you use an intercontinental ballistic missile for? It is not to drop leaflets; it is not for humanitarian needs. It is to deliver a nuclear warhead to Washington, to New York, to Chicago.

I am perplexed because, Mr. Speaker, like many here in this body, I have three children, and they have children. We have constituents that are out there. I have a 13-year-old, an 11-year-old, and an 8-year-old. By the time my 8-year-old goes to college, she will not know a world without Iran having a nuclear weapon. The chants of "death to America" in the streets, at some point in time, we have to take their word that that is exactly what they want to do.

When we look at this agreement, this legitimizes Iran's nuclear program and provides Iran's illicit nuclear pursuit with international stamps of approval. This is what Iran has been desperately

seeking; yet we have just handed it to them on a platter.

Let's remember, when the negotiations began, Iran was an isolated nation. Their economy was in ruins; they were under heavy sanctions and were outside the international community, but this process has ended with the administration isolating and hammering Israel and the administration coercing Congress to accept a deal by asserting that the United States would otherwise be blamed for it falling apart.

On August 5, the President gave a speech to promote the Iran agreement, and he delivered the following line, which had its intended effect of isolating Israel and minimizing her concerns. Because this is such a strong deal, he said, every other nation in the world has commented publicly, with the exception of the Israeli Government, that they have expressed their support.

I understand my time has expired, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to just note again that a nuclear-armed Iran is the greatest threat we have to our own national security going forward, and giving the international stamp of approval to them will make the world a less safe place and jeopardize the United States of America, our citizens, and our allies abroad.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 13 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Andrew Walton, Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

As vacations and recesses draw to a close, we give thanks for the gift of rest and recreation afforded us while so many in our country and world have spent those same days in fear and suffering.

May we leave business as usual in the shadows of yesterday, seeking to shine with renewed purpose, inspired wisdom, and transformative action.

May every person associated with these Halls of power remember their calling as public servants to humbly hold the hopes, dreams, and trust of people from every walk of life in every State, city, town, village, and neighborhood of our country and world.

As numerous streams of opinion, interest, and need flow into the procedures, process, and decisions of this

day and days ahead, may there be wisdom and patience to allow them to find their way to pools and ponds of peace, rivers of mercy, and eventually oceans of compassion and common good for all people.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IRAN DEAL: NOT VERIFIABLE, ENFORCEABLE, OR ACCOUNTABLE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there is a clear fact that these are dangerous times and that the regime in Iran is a dangerous threat to world peace. The President's legacy of failed policies of weakness has led to the Middle East in chaos, with refugee families fleeing for their lives and many drowning at sea.

It is not too late to stop a bad situation from getting even worse. A nuclear-armed Iran is a threat to every country everywhere. We need a deal that is verifiable, enforceable, and accountable.

Is it verifiable? No. Because of secret deals, it will be the Iranians who get to certify whether or not they are complying.

Is it enforceable? No, because the sanctions that have been effective in forcing them to the bargaining table will be lifted. Iran will then have the money it needs to complete its nuclear programs, missile development, and expand their funding of terror. With future terrorist attacks, media should trace the funding to determine if the source is from this deal.

Is it accountable? No, because the deal permits Iran to keep thousands of nuclear centrifuges to enrich uranium.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions

never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

KEO 50TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION ON FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2015

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the Kauai Economic Opportunity, a non-profit multiagency known as KEO.

For half a century, this agency has been providing services to thousands of Kauai residents in need, to ease the pain of poverty, and to help them achieve self-sufficiency. As the only human services organization on that island, they have been a lifeline for low-income families and individuals who are looking for a second chance. In the past year alone, KEO has assisted over 5,000 individuals with housing, education, food, medical services, legal services, child care, transportation, disaster preparedness, employment opportunities, and so much more.

I would like to say mahalo nui loa to CEO MaBel Ferreiro-Fujiuchi, Chair Brenda Viado, the board members, staff, volunteers, and everyone else who selflessly dedicated their time, attention, and aloha to ensure the people of Kauai always have a friend to help them in their time of need.

STOP THE BARRIERS OF OUR FOREST SERVICE

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, well, once again, with the end of a summer vacation that still has, in California and the West, the onset of fire season, California has seen twice the number of acres of trees burned so far this year, and fire season is far from over.

While we are working to pass reforms to return responsible management to our national forests, the work doesn't stop when the fires are put out.

Every single day that a tree lies dead on the floor of the forest means it loses more and more of its salvage value and then becomes a cost of the taxpayers to remove later, and it is also more dangerous fuel for the next fire.

It is imperative that the Forest Service act rapidly to salvage these downed trees and conduct replanting and forest recovery or we will simply end up with more fuel on the ground the next time an area burns.

While the Forest Service estimates there are 12 million dead trees already in the Sierra Nevada, virtually no work is being done to remove these dead trees from these forests. We must stop the barriers to getting the work done that is needed for our forests to be healthy and safe.

JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to ask a simple question of those who oppose the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Can you show me a viable alternative to this agreement that will lead to tougher international sanctions on Iran and prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon?

Scholars and diplomats, including President Bush's Iran negotiator, Ambassador Nicholas Burns, have stated before Members of this very body that there is no way we will be able to keep Russia, China, and India in the sanctions regime if we reject this agreement. We tried secondary sanctions in 1996, and they failed. Our European allies have made it clear that, should the United States reject this agreement, we are on our own.

Despite these facts, it baffles me that some of my colleagues have concluded that, by rejecting this agreement, we can somehow get a better deal with less leverage.

No deal is perfect, especially one negotiated among adversaries, but the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is the best option we have on the table today. This agreement puts the United States in a better position to confront the Iranian regime's threat to world peace.

OPPOSITION TO THE PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the President's proposed agreement with Iran.

Iran is the world's number one state sponsor of terrorism. They support the murderous Assad regime in Syria, they support Hezbollah terrorists in Lebanon, and they support the Houthi rebels in Yemen. Iran-backed militias have killed American troops in Iraq.

Negotiation is founded upon trust, and there can be no trust for the mullahs who run Iran. To quote Nobel Peace Prize winner Elie Wiesel: "Regimes rooted in brutality must never be trusted. And the words and actions of the leadership of Iran leave no doubt as to their intentions."

In March, I joined with 366 of my fellow Members of Congress, including 130 Democrats, in a letter to President Obama. We agreed that any deal with Iran must last for multiple decades and include full disclosure of Iran's past nuclear pursuits with anytime, anywhere inspections for verification. This agreement does not meet these standards.

For these and many other reasons, we must not support it.

POPE FRANCIS

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, Pope Francis will address this body in a joint session this month, and I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say I am eager to receive the Holy Father's message of peace as a reminder of where our priorities should be in our work here in the House.

As the Pope explained earlier this year in an encyclical, becoming a better steward of our environment should be a priority for all of us.

The leader of the Catholic Church accurately points out that it is a moral imperative to care for others and the gifts we have been given by addressing climate change, and addressing it now. It is time to work together to better protect our environment and build a culture of stewardship.

I thank Pope Francis for his focus on this issue, and I hope the words he will share in 2 weeks ring true with all of us, including those who continue to deny climate change, both in this body and around the world. For having the wisdom to change one's mind and evolve in thought is a blessing.

I hope the Pope's encyclical will encourage deniers to work with us to find creative ways to clean up our environment, help create jobs, and make our world just a little bit better and more peaceful for our kids and our grandkids.

RECOGNIZING DR. VICKI RUIZ

(Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Dr. Vicki Ruiz, a distinguished professor of history and Chicano/Latino studies at the University of California, Irvine.

Dr. Ruiz is also the president of the American Historical Association, and was most recently named a recipient of the 2014 National Humanities Medal. The National Humanities Medal is awarded to those who have deepened the country's understanding of humanities and broadened citizens' engagement with history, literature, languages, and philosophy.

This afternoon, Dr. Ruiz will be one of only 10 honorees from top universities to receive this prestigious award from President Obama. In fact, Dr. Ruiz is the first faculty member of UCI to receive the National Humanities Medal.

As the first in her family to earn an advanced degree, Dr. Ruiz began her work at UCI in 2001. In 2008, she was named Dean of Humanities, and currently chairs the Department of Chi-

cano/Latino Studies in the School of Social Sciences.

Please join me in recognizing Dr. Ruiz as she receives this prestigious award today at the White House.

RESTORE HONOR TO SERVICE MEMBERS ACT

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell 4 years ago, we noted that gay and lesbian Americans have fought with distinction in every war in our Nation's history, which is true. But while they fought to protect us, we failed to protect them.

Over 100,000 Americans were discharged from the military between 1945 and 2011 solely because of their sexual orientation. These discharges were often less than honorable, which impacted their veterans benefits and served as a rebuke to their service and sacrifice.

We can and must do better.

The Department of Defense allows veterans who were discharged solely for their sexual orientation to petition for an upgrade to an honorable discharge. I encourage all of my colleagues to conduct research in their districts to inform veterans of this opportunity and to assist them in their applications.

Congress should pass the Restore Honor to Service Members Act, introduced by Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND and Congressman MARK POCAN, to codify this opportunity for veterans to remove this insult from their records.

A good and grateful Nation owes these brave Americans nothing less.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Iranian agreement's completion, its proponents have insisted that the deal is based on verification, not on trust. That is because Iran is not a country that can be trusted, evidenced by their funding of terror, detention of American citizens, and past attempts of secretive nuclear armament.

However, as details are continuing to be revealed, it is clear that negotiations were, in fact, based on trust. The verification this agreement hinges upon has been entrusted to the Iranians themselves, while objective inspections of their facilities can be delayed for weeks and weeks at a time. To top it all off, Congress still doesn't have access to the agreement in its entirety.

It is entirely naive for supporters of this agreement to trust an unstable, hostile theocracy to self-certify on nuclear weapons when the Federal Government doesn't even trust our own American citizens, farmers and ranchers, to self-certify on farm fuel storage.

I strongly encourage all attempts to disarm Iran, but the Ayatollah's aggressive actions and statements against the U.S. and our allies, particularly Israel, have shattered their credibility in the international community. And the President's threat to veto alterations to his deal confirms his personal commitment to his own legacy rather than the concerns of the American people and our closest allies.

Congress cannot accept the terms of this agreement which empower an untrustworthy and hostile nation in an already dangerously unstable region.

□ 1215

DIEZ Y SEIS PARADE

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 50th celebration of the Diez y Seis parade in my hometown of Fort Worth, Texas.

In 1965, Juanita Salinas and Pauline Valenciano both recognized that Fort Worth did not have a public celebration for Mexico's Independence Day. Together, the organization that they worked with began organizing the parade as a way to celebrate this important event for the Latin American community.

For the last five decades, their work has grown—and the celebration has, too—into one of the largest in the country for Hispanic heritage events. The hard work by the committee will be seen during this year's parade on September 12, which also will serve as the kickoff for National Hispanic Heritage Month.

I want to personally thank Juanita and her committee for their continued commitment to the Hispanic community in Fort Worth. I wish them their best on this 50th year.

RULE FOR IRAN DEAL

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the Iranian nuclear deal unacceptably lifts certain sanctions on individuals like:

Qasem Soleimani—in the middle—the current commander of Iran's Quds Force, who was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American servicemen and -women in Iraq and that is right now leading Iran's efforts against the U.S.' interests in the Middle East;

Ahmad Vahidi, the former Quds Force commander and defense minister, who is still wanted by Interpol for his role in the 1994 AMLA Jewish community center bombing in Buenos Aires, which claimed the lives of 85 people;

The former head of Iran's atomic energy agency who was sanctioned by the U.N. for his nuclear and ballistic missile activities;

Gerhard Wisser—right here—the German engineer who facilitated the sale of nuclear equipment to North Korea, Iran, and Libya;

Also, the former head of Iran's nuclear weapons program, who has been described as Iran's Dr. AQ Khan.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a brief sample of the many people who will have additional resources, access, and freedom to continue their terror and nuclear weapons activity as part of this unacceptable program. We can and must get a better nuclear deal.

REPUBLICAN DYSFUNCTION

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I am disgusted and ashamed.

Instead of working to address our most pressing issues like jobs, the economy, long-term highway transportation funding, and a responsible budget, my Republican colleagues are meeting behind closed doors, scheming up plans that delay our work here—putting our economy and our constituents' jobs at risk. It is past time that Republicans put the needs of the Americans before partisan politics.

American businesses that have what it takes to compete globally are being left behind because of the Republicans' refusal to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

The uncertainty placed on State and local governments by the Republicans' refusal to put forth a long-term highway funding bill is unconscionable. Let's not forget that we have yet to produce and pass a responsible budget. We cannot have a repeat of 2013 with our people out of work.

I urge my colleagues to put partisan politics aside, and let's do what we have been called here to do. Based on the latest antics, I can't tell if I am a freshman in high school or a freshman in Congress.

IRAN

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reject President Obama's Iranian nuclear deal, which would lift sanctions on the regime before delivering any proof that it is acting in good faith to curb its nuclear program.

I continue to have concerns that this deal is dangerous and will simply delay Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. We should seek a strong deal to ensure that the current regime is never able to obtain a nuclear weapon.

This is not what we have been delivered by the negotiators. Sanctions against the regime are the reason they came to the negotiating table. We

should negotiate from a position of strength and not surrender to removing sanctions before there is proof of compliance.

The President is attempting to sell the American public on a deal that provides billions of dollars that can be used to support Iran's clandestine activities, which will further destabilize the region. Any agreement must first advance our national security and the security of our allies.

A clear indicator of future performance is always past performance. Unfortunately, Iran has a decades-long history of misrepresentation when it comes to its nuclear program.

JAMES ZADROGA 9/11 HEALTH AND COMPENSATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we mark the 14th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks on America.

This day will forever remain as one of the most somber in American history; but out of all of the horrific and heartbreaking stories, there are also stories of heroism and honor.

In the minutes, hours, and days after the attacks, thousands of firefighters, paramedics, police, and other first responders ran into the Twin Towers, toward the Pentagon, and to the Pennsylvania crash site. They risked their lives for all of us.

Now we need to make sure we are still there to support them, which is why I am proud to cosponsor the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Reauthorization Act.

This legislation provides medical treatment and financial compensation to the first responders who were harmed in the 9/11 attacks. We owe them this with their medical bills and so much more. Our Nation will forever be grateful for their sacrifice.

A BAD DEAL FOR AMERICA AND THE WORLD

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

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, successful diplomacy requires statesmanship, a mutual benefit, and a commitment to peace. None of these elements are a part of the administration's deal with Iran.

On statesmanship, this administration's acquiescence has been met with Iranian hostility. Just this week, the Ayatollah said Israel would be destroyed within 25 years. Words matter, and we cannot discount Iran's dangerous rhetoric.

Where is the mutual benefit?

Short of immediate access to a nuclear bomb, Iran has been given all it wants. It will receive billions of dollars it can use to fund terrorism against

our country and our allies. It will be allowed to reject “anytime, anywhere” inspections that are vital to verifying compliance and ensuring our national security. In less than 15 years, Iran will be allowed to have a nuclear weapons program that is capable of attacking targets anywhere in the world.

The fundamental question is: Are we willing to gamble that Iran’s Government will end its destructive behavior and belligerent rhetoric in the coming days?

I, for one, am not willing to take that chance. I believe this is a bad deal for America and the world, and I oppose it.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, the Iranian deal—I stand in the absolute, strongest possible opposition.

What would make America think that Iran’s having a nuclear capability in 13 years would be a good idea?

What would make any American believe that, in 5 years, relaxing the sanctions on conventional arms—the same 10,000 missiles that struck Israel—and, in 8 years, relaxing the sanctions on ICBMs would be a good idea? There is only one purpose for an ICBM, and that is to attack every city in the United States.

Lastly, because this deal does not dismantle anything, in 13 years, Iran could legally have a path for at least 100 ICBMs.

Those are the facts in voting for this bill when there are secret deals that no Congressman has seen. No Congressman has looked at the deal.

My job is truth. My job is to deliver truth to the American people, to deliver truth to Montana, and this deal is not truthful. We are rewarding Iran with \$50 billion to \$100 billion.

Terrorism—the idea that we take this deal or go to war is patently false. Sanctions work. We need a dismantle for this mantle. I ask my colleagues to be Americans first and vote against this bill.

CORRECTION OF COSPONSOR

(Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on September 9, 2015, one of my staff members mistakenly added Congresswoman MCSALLY from Arizona to H.R. 3443, as a cosponsor, instead of to H.R. 3339.

Both my staff and I acknowledge and take full responsibility for this unintended addition of Ms. MCSALLY’s name, and I apologize for any confusion and inconvenience that this error has caused. This cosponsorship was not authorized by Representative MCSALLY.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3443

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) from H.R. 3443.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, when I got on the plane to return from Texas yesterday, I felt like it was a done deal—the Iran deal was going to happen.

But guess what. Conservatives in the House came together with a better idea, fueled by hundreds of folks out on the lawn when Senator TED CRUZ was speaking.

We have come up with a solution that will at least possibly stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. It is the bill we have got coming up, which points out that the President has not met his requirement.

The entire deal, together with the side agreements, puts the President and the banks and businesses that are doing business with Iran—and who might start to do that—on notice that they are potentially civilly and criminally liable. We are going to use the judicial branch of the government to help keep America safe.

As I read on one of the signs on the lawn yesterday: What part of “death to America” do you not understand?

The Iran deal is a bad deal, and it needs to be stopped, and we are fighting here in the House of Representatives to do that.

PHILIPPI HEROES

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend three local citizens from Philippi, West Virginia.

The first is Twila Smith, a teacher at Philip Barbour High School. On August 25, one of her students brought a gun to school and held her classmates hostage. Twila did a miraculous job in calming the teenager and buying time until the police could arrive.

Philippi Police Chief Jeff Walters and the young man’s pastor, Howard Swick, are our next two heroes. They negotiated the release of the student hostages and then convinced the teenager to surrender voluntarily.

Because of these heroes and their courage in a threatening situation, more than 700 high school students were unharmed, and this man will now

be able to receive the help that he needs.

OPPOSE THE IRAN NUCLEAR WEAPONS DEAL

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this agreement with Iran will bring the world closer to war.

Under this deal, Iran can make its centrifuges used to make nuclear weapons;

Iran is trusted to inspect itself; The U.S. must come to the aid of Iran if there is sabotage against its weapons program, and in the meantime, Iran is buying anti-aircraft weapons and fighter jets from Russia to strengthen their military;

Iran will have the sanctions lifted with no proof required that they are in compliance;

The President himself admits this deal neither denies nor deters Iran from a nuclear bomb—only delays. Meanwhile, Iran continues to chant “death to America” and “death to Israel,” and it continues to imprison four Americans—the same Iran that supplies weapons and help to terrorists throughout the world.

The Iran nuclear deal makes the Middle East and the world far more perilous and war inevitable. It is naive and dangerous to believe otherwise. The American people rightly oppose this deal, and I oppose this deal. For the sake of peace, Congress must oppose this deal.

□ 1230

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about one of the most important national security matters this Chamber will vote on, and that is the President’s dangerous nuclear deal with Iran.

We have heard a lot about this this morning. I heard a lot about it while I was in the district during the August work period. I traveled across Georgia’s 12th District and spoke with my constituents about this terrible agreement.

Today I come to the floor again to voice the concerns I heard from the overwhelming majority and to say to my colleagues in the House and Senate we must stop this deal.

The consequences of the President’s agreement are clear. We have heard it over and over. It will chart a clear path to allow Iran nuclear capability. In the meantime, the Iranian regime will use billions of dollars in sanctions relief to continue promoting terrorism.

I visited Israel last month and met with the nation’s leaders, including

Prime Minister Netanyahu, and learned firsthand about the security threats Israel and the region face every day. We cannot allow this deal to move forward and further empower those who seek the destruction of Israel, the same leaders who shout “death to America.”

I reject the President’s false choice between this bad deal or war.

FIGHTING TERRORISM

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the anniversary of September 11, 2001, when Islamist terrorists attacked our country, killing nearly 3,000 innocent people.

While that day brought terrible destruction, it also sparked a renewed sense of determination and unity that should not be forgotten.

Today, we must recognize that the threat from Islamist extremism is as great as ever. We are in a generational fight against terrorists like ISIS who seek our complete destruction and that of our allies and our way of life. We must remain vigilant and have the courage and will to stand against this evil to protect Americans and ensure our enemies never have a chance to attack us again.

This week, we remember Americans who lost their lives 14 years ago—Americans like Aaron Jeremy Jacobs and Karol Ann Keasler, both born in Tucson, Arizona, and killed in New York City—and we remember the bravery and selfless acts of the first responders and ordinary citizens who put themselves in danger so that others may live.

Our thoughts and our prayers continue to be with the family and friends of those who died.

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 9, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
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 9, 2015 at 9:42 a.m.:

Appointments:
Congressional Award Board.
Congressional-Executive Commission on the People’s Republic of China.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 411, FINDING THAT THE PRESIDENT HAS NOT COMPLIED WITH SECTION 2 OF THE IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3461, APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3460, SUSPENSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE, SUSPEND, REDUCE, PROVIDE RELIEF FROM, OR OTHERWISE LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO AN AGREEMENT RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 412 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 412

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 411) finding that the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Minority Leader or their respective designees.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3461) to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) three hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Minority Leader or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3460) to suspend until January 21, 2017, the authority of the President to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate, with 30 minutes controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee, 30 minutes controlled by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee, and one hour controlled by the Minority Leader or her designee; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the cus-

tomary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman and my friend from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Texas delegation, I want to say to the Speaker pro tempore, “Happy birthday.” We were celebrating your birthday at the Texas lunch. We are sorry you were unable to attend.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, this rule would empower the U.S. House of Representatives with the opportunity to block this administration’s devastating nuclear deal with the country of Iran. It is my belief that this deal needs to be ripped up word by word, line by line, and it is this body that needs to help do that. The process is going on today and tomorrow, and it needs to continue until we kill this deal.

This rule includes three legislative items and is designed to give the U.S. House of Representatives multiple opportunities to block this disastrous Iran deal.

I want to make one thing perfectly clear from the beginning: There is nothing unprecedented about this rule. What is unprecedented is that the administration, an administration of the United States, has negotiated a deal that pardons a state that supports terrorism and turns it into a legitimate nuclear state in a matter of time.

There is nothing to hide in this rule; whereas, a significant part of this so-called deal with Iran is still hidden, not just by side agreements, but in facts of the case that it was up to the United States Congress to openly understand, to debate, and then to make decisions on.

First, H. Res. 411 would find that the President has not complied with the requirements of section 2 of the Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, which passed Congress and became law of the United States of America in May of 2015. This resolution simply says that the President should follow the law—the law he signed only 4 months ago—and give Congress access to all parts of the deal as they pertain to this nuclear opportunity and deal that is being cut, including the IAEA and Iran.

Second, H.R. 3460 would stop the administration from lifting sanctions placed currently on Iran.

Third, H.R. 3461 would allow for a vote to approve the deal that the administration made with Iran regarding its nuclear program. While previous legislation would have allowed Congress to disapprove this deal, this legislation would not allow the deal to go

forward without congressional approval.

So, Mr. Speaker, what does the administration deal do? Well, first, the deal guarantees permanent sanctions relief, but only temporarily blocks Iran from building a nuclear bomb. In other words, this deal would inject—I assume really as a signing bonus—\$150 billion into the Iranian economy with almost completely no rules or regulations related to the use of the money, and it would allow Iran to build and possess a nuclear bomb in just a matter of a few, short, 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, we should not encourage the leading funder of terrorism in the world to have immediate access to billions of dollars now and billions of dollars later. Let there be no doubt, this money will go to Hezbollah, Hamas and the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, groups that are dedicated to wiping out not only the United States but our friends and allies around the world, including their number one target, Israel.

Mr. Speaker, when I visited the Middle East in May of this year, we met with our partners all around the region, and they were furious that this administration was negotiating with Iran. Presidents from both parties have spent decades in the United States persuading countries around the region not to build a nuclear bomb, yet now this administration wants to allow Iran to have access to that, that which we have been protecting and holding away from even our closest of friends. We will give that to this country that calls us the “evil empire.”

Under this administration, for 6 years, America has led from behind. We have led from behind when it should have been chosen to lead from the front. Now this administration has decided to engage with a nation that jails Americans and where “death to America” and “death to Israel” is chanted every single day all over the streets of Iran and by its chosen leaders. Even worse, when the administration chose to engage with Iran, it chose to negotiate from a position of weakness. This negotiation ended with a deal that gives Iran literally everything it wants and, as I see it, delivers nothing for the American people.

So what does this deal exactly do? Instead of allowing international inspectors into sites within 24 hours, the administration agreed to give Iran 24 days’ notice. The plan also ends restrictions on the Iranian intercontinental ballistic missile, ICBM, program in just over 8 years, which means, within a decade, Iran can go back to developing warheads that could reach the United States.

Mr. Speaker, they cheat on every single deal they make. Why would you negotiate with someone you don’t trust? Why would you give someone you don’t trust and who had a track record, give them everything they wanted?

Well, even worse, reports have indicated that there is also a side deal, a

side deal between Iran and the IAEA, that allows Iranians to inspect their own nuclear sites. Mr. Speaker, this will be like a person in college or any school being allowed to grade their own test. That is not the right way you handle international affairs. When the Republicans say you negotiate with weakness, this is exactly what we are talking about.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is not clear what the American people would get from this deal. What is clear is that this deal will empower a stronger Iran to be the strongest country in that region, to be competitive against the United States, and to have everything they want to pursue nuclear weapons in their future.

So what is at stake here? Congress is being asked to join in this deal. They are being asked to endorse a plan that would eventually legitimize the Iranian nuclear state and fund its terrorism activities and to support our President in doing this.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here today. We are going to debate it. We are going to pass this legislation, and we are going to put this House on record of where we would be.

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

□ 1245

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the vote on the Iran nuclear agreement has been touted by the majority as the most consequential of our careers, maybe even our lifetimes. We have had months of consideration, hearings, questions, open debate following rules and customs of the House, more or less, surrounding the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran, an agreement carefully negotiated by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia, China, and Germany to curb Iran’s nuclear activities.

As you listen this morning, you would think this was a negotiation between Barack Obama and the Ayatollah. Apparently, that is all that they want to think. The other countries played major roles here, and they are the most important economies in the world. This agreement is the best available option for peacefully and verifiably cutting off Iran’s pathways to a nuclear weapon.

On Tuesday evening, the Committee on Rules had a hearing on the third floor of the Capitol that lasted over 3 hours, and there was testimony from chairs and the ranking members of the relevant committees. We had a robust discussion and a healthy back-and-forth. We prepared for the rule debate.

We had our statements written, but 12 hours later, the dissident wing of the majority’s party emerged from a neighborhood bar, the Tortilla Coast, with a different path in mind. They rendered all our work moot, and the House was forced into a holding pattern all day

yesterday while Republican dissidents brought their party to its knees.

Once again, instead of regular order, in a perversion of our legislative process, we are thrown into chaos by a majority chasing its tail in a last-minute ploy, throwing together three bills that might as well have been scribbled on the back of a cocktail napkin.

These bills trivialize our institution. They have been whipped up in an afternoon to mollify the disgruntled wing of the majority’s party that shows no interest in governing. Their only goal with this trio of bills—which are contradictory, let me add, and I will say more about that later—is to feed the monster seething within their own ranks.

There has been no committee action on these bills. There has been no debate. There has been no time even to consider them.

Now, why didn’t we do them in our regularly scheduled Tuesday night meeting? It is because we didn’t even know they existed. Instead of addressing an issue of international global importance, we are occupied with the Republican Conference’s internal politics, and it is an embarrassment to this country.

This dog-and-pony show has turned Congress into a stage to play out the internal drama that diminishes our constitutional role. If the majority cannot devise a process for a measure on which they agree, on which they have their vote unanimously, if they can’t devise a process for a measure like that, I shudder to think what is coming with act two, which we are hurtling toward, because we are days away from a government shutdown.

We have no budget; our troops would not get paid; flights would be canceled, and what is more, the last time we had a Republican-inflicted shutdown, \$24 billion was lost to our economy at a time when we were struggling even more than now to regain it.

Even so, here we are, forced to join in yet another pointless exercise, and the Senate has said they will not take up these bills, and so this nuclear agreement will be implemented, which leaves the Republican Party with the majority in both houses, which they control, with no consensus.

What is more, keeping Iran from building a nuclear weapon is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to silence the drumbeats of war. There is no opportunity to renegotiate this. With all you have heard this morning about “this won’t do” and “we can’t have it” and “it is awful,” have you heard a single alternative? There is not one. The possibility of peace in a powder keg region of the world should be considered carefully.

Mr. Speaker, in May of 1946, shortly after World War II ended, when the horrors of global violence were fresh in our collective memory, Albert Einstein asserted that: “The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything save our modes of thinking, and thus, we drift toward unparalleled catastrophe.”

Very rarely do we have an opportunity to stop that so-called drift toward catastrophe, but we do with this measure, and all of our allies have agreed to it. Only we are trying to hold it up.

The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action provides for unparalleled access to Iran's nuclear facilities. The agreement blocks all four possible pathways to a bomb. Contrary to falsehoods reported by the media, Iran will not be self-monitoring.

The inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency have unprecedented and continuous daily monitoring authority, and it is so easy, they tell me, to detect the radioactive material if they were to break this agreement.

Only certain sanctions will be lifted. Many will be kept in place, for example, what they do with terrorist organizations and supplying arms to other people. We are continuing those sanctions. If Iran fails to comply, all the nations involved in the negotiation have said they will be reinstated by using a snapback provision which is in the bill.

Let me repeat that. We have heard from ambassadors of almost all those nations yesterday saying that their countries would absolutely comply with reintroducing the sanctions.

Now, let me remind people that should the Iranians attempt to conceal their work, even a nanogram—a billionth of a gram—of dust of nuclear work is detected.

Retired American military leaders, former Secretaries of State from both parties, the Israeli security professionals, and even faith leaders have come out in full support of this accord. The former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and former Secretary of State under President George W. Bush, retired four-star General Colin Powell, called this agreement “remarkable.”

The former head of Israel's intelligence and special operations agency, the Mossad, Efraim Halevy, supports the agreement as well. He said recently to PBS' Judy Woodruff: “I believe this agreement closes the roads and blocks the road to Iranian nuclear military capabilities for at least a decade.” That is not a trivial thing.

Domestic faith leaders have implored this Congress to follow the Old Testament creed to “seek peace and pursue it.”

The agreement was painstakingly negotiated by Secretary of State John Kerry, Deputy Secretary of State Wendy Sherman, and Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz representing the United States. When hailing this agreement, Brent Scowcroft, the national security adviser to both Presidents Gerald Ford and George H.W. Bush, said of this team: “There is no more credible expert on nuclear weapons than Energy Secretary Moniz . . . when he asserts that the JCPOA blocks each of Iran's pathways to a fissile material . . . responsible people listen.”

It is now clear, based on the declared supporters in the Senate, that the effort to kill this agreement will end in the upper Chamber, and the accord will survive and be implemented.

Regardless of that certainty, the House majority has nonetheless thrown us into disarray. We will vote today on two bills, another one tomorrow. It was decided that, first, there will be a bill to say that the President cannot lift the sanctions and a bill on side agreements that they think are out there that nobody else knows about, and then the most interesting one is the bill tomorrow will be to approve it.

You have already had all this discussion on “we won't have it, we can't have it, the bill will not survive.” They are going to approve it; but just in case, because the Senate won't take up an approval message, they kept another rule last night.

First, they did away with it, then they put it back so that, next week, we can come up with a disapproval rule; but by next Thursday, it is all over, the 60 days are up, and the President may go ahead with the agreement.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule and support this agreement.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Harding Township, New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule before us and in strong opposition to the Iranian nuclear agreement.

While there may be many reasons to stand against this deal, it comes down to a fundamental reality. The Iranian nuclear agreement fails to achieve its critical objective, blocking all of Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon. In fact, this deal provides Iran with an international endorsement of an industrial scale nuclear weapons program.

My colleagues, we must not forget where it started, with the President declaring Iran must never be allowed to achieve a nuclear weapons capability, but to get from that point to where we are today, our negotiators have made some inexcusable and dangerous concessions on inspections and verification and on Iran's missile defense program and their access to conventional weapons.

Worse than that, Iran will economically be strengthened by early relief from sanctions, providing the Ayatollah with fresh resources with which to fund the Quds Force and its global terrorism network.

Supporters of this agreement have proclaimed loudly that the only alternative to this agreement is war. I reject that notion and predict this deal will lead to more Iranian aggression in the Middle East.

For our own part, the agreement talks about the normalization of eco-

nomics relations with Iran and states that the parties shall implement the agreement in good faith based on mutual respect; but how can there be respect for a regime that actively promotes regional instability, publicly and constantly advocates for the destruction of the State of Israel, and uses the phrase “death to America” as a mission statement?

Mr. Speaker, our first responsibility as Members of Congress is to provide for our national defense. This deal is bad for our national defense. I sincerely regret that this vote has been characterized as a partisan measure. It is not.

It is a vote of conscience far and above politics, and that is why I will vote “no” on the motion to approve this disastrous agreement and “yes” on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Rule before us and in opposition to the Iran nuclear agreement.

While there are many reasons to stand against this deal, it comes down to a fundamental reality: the Iranian nuclear deal fails to achieve its critical objective: blocking all of Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon. In fact, this deal provides Iran with international endorsement of an industrial-scale nuclear weapons program.

My Colleagues, we must not forget where we started: with the President declaring that Iran must never be allowed to achieve a nuclear weapons capability. But to get from that point to where we are today, our negotiators had to make numerous and serious concessions:

They dropped snap “anywhere, anytime inspections”;

We will not receive credible information about the potential military dimensions of Iran's previous nuclear research efforts;

Existing restrictions on Iran's ballistic missile program will cease;

International sanctions targeting Iran's support for global terrorism and human rights violations have been eased.

Each and every one of these important elements was discarded as the Obama Administration worked to achieve its landmark deal with Iran.

The reality is that this agreement will provide a legal path to a nuclear weapons capability to a country that remains a rogue state and has violated a whole series of international obligations and U.N. Security Council resolutions. Simply put, the Iranians have cheated before. We would be fools to assume they will not cheat again.

While the President insists “this deal is not built on trust,” key verification provisions are buried in confidential side agreements that allow Iran to conduct its own inspections of nuclear weapons research facilities. This brings me to the conclusion that we would be better off with no deal, rather than this deal.

Worse than that, Iran will be economically strengthened by early relief from sanctions—providing the Ayatollah with fresh resources with which to fund the Quds Forces and its global terrorism network. If Iran violates the agreement, building international support for new sanctions would take too long to be effective. And furthermore, our allies appear to be more interested in their own trade and commercial interests than in halting Iran's nuclear aspirations.

Supporters of this agreement have proclaimed loudly that the only alternative to this agreement is war. I reject that notion and predict that this deal will lead to even more Iranian aggression in the Middle East.

For our part, the agreement talks about normalization of economic relations with Iran and states that the parties shall implement the agreement "in good faith . . . based on mutual respect."

But how can there be respect for a regime that actively instigates regional instability, publicly and constantly advocates for the destruction of the State of Israel, and uses the phrase "Death to America" as a mission statement?

Mr. Speaker, the first responsibility of each Member of this House is to provide for our national defense—and that includes confronting the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism everywhere. If we fail to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon this year, next year or in the next decade, we will have allowed the weakening of that defense. And we will have failed our children and future generations.

I sincerely regret that this vote has been characterized as a partisan measure. It is not. It is a vote of conscience far above and beyond politics. And that's why I will vote "yes" on the resolution of disapproval.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman, and I want to thank my colleagues. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, I agree with many of the points that you made. This is a vote of conscience for all of us.

The question is not whether we trust Iran. We don't. The question is not whether we want Iran to have any pathway to a nuclear weapon. Proponents of this agreement—I am one—and opponents of this agreement—there are many, my friend, Mr. STEWART—don't want Iran to have a nuclear weapon. This question about trust, we have got to step back a minute.

One of the fundamental challenges that a strong and confident country faces is to secure its national security. That requires the Commander in Chief, whose fundamental responsibility is to exercise his judgment about what will work to increase our security, to enter into negotiations with adversaries; and there may be no greater adversary to the United States, to our allies, particularly Israel, than Iran.

Keep in mind, President Kennedy negotiated with the Soviet Union after one of their leaders said they will bury this country, and he did that, and it turned out that he was right to limit nuclear proliferation. President Nixon went to China when it was Red China, an absolute adversary of this country and our way of life, and it has worked to the benefit of the national security of this country, and President Reagan did the same.

The fundamental question here is not at all about whether we trust Iran. We don't trust Iran. It is not about whether you negotiate with people you trust. You have to negotiate with people that are your adversaries.

The question is whether the terms and conditions of this agreement that the President is recommending, along with our very close allies—Germany, France, Great Britain, and Russia and China—will improve our national security and that of our allies, particularly Israel. My judgment is it will.

Number one, there is no pathway for Iran to have a nuclear weapon under this agreement.

Number two, this is not based on trust. It is based on distrust and strong verification provisions that will give us a heads-up if there is any effort of Iran not to comply.

Third, we have the opportunity to snap back the sanctions all of us supported that brought Iran to the table. We don't have to get a majority vote; we can do that unilaterally.

□ 1300

Then, finally, we do have to ask the question of not whether this is the perfect agreement—undoubtedly, there could be a better agreement that might give more satisfaction and security and peace of mind to all of us—it is a question of this agreement or no agreement. That is the question that we face.

The weight of the opinion and judgment is that, if we repudiate this agreement, the sanction regime that we constructed on the leadership of President George Bush and President Barack Obama would dissolve. What happens then? Iran gets the money and they have no restraint on their ability to get the bomb.

I urge us to support this agreement in the national security interest of the United States of America, Israel, and our allies.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Butler, Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today not to speak for Republicans, but to speak for America.

When 80 percent of the American people say "no" to this deal, how can America's House, how can we who have been elected by the American people, come here and say, "You are wrong, and we are right"?

A vote for this deal is a vote against the American people. History tells us that in 1938, Chamberlain came home from meeting with Hitler and said, "Peace in our time." Judas went to the Last Supper, pointed to the Lord, and they gave him 30 pieces of silver. We are not even getting 30 pieces of silver.

President Obama says this is the best deal we could get. In my lifetime, anytime anybody comes back from a negotiation and says, "This is the best we could do," it means they lost. They did not get what they wanted. They got the best they could. In this case, it is the losing hand.

This deal endangers the safety, security, and stability of not only America,

but the entire world. This deal comes with absolutely no accountability, no verification, and no enforceability.

I ask you, how can you sit in America's House, when the President's number one responsibility is to protect the American people, and say, "This is the best we could get." This gives the American people nothing. This gives Iran everything.

Now, in just 24 hours, we are going to commemorate the 14th anniversary of a terrorist attack on the United States, and we are going to grant the biggest state sponsor of terrorism in the world \$150 billion to show how much we have turned a deaf ear to the cries of the dead and a blind eye to the destruction of America that day.

To sit here and even begin to think that somehow this is good for America is false. To try and sell this to the American people is a lie. We are sacrificing the safety of 330 million Americans for the legacy of one man. That is not what America wants. That is not who America is. That is not who America should ever allow itself to be.

And to sit here and listen to somehow we have not done our job; ladies and gentlemen, our main job is to protect the American people. It always was. It always is. This has morphed into something greater than that; I understand that. But at the base of the day, it is to protect the American people.

And let me tell you, as tomorrow we have dawn and the sun comes up, all you have to do is turn your ears to the east and our enemies will be shouting, "death to the Great Satan," "death to America," "death to Israel." And the Supreme Leader, himself, says that, within 25 years, there will be no Israel.

The hypocrisy to stand before this House today, America's House, and sell the American people down the river because of one man's legacy is a travesty of who we are. And it is more than that. It flies in the face of the 1.4 million Americans in uniform who have given their life to give us this opportunity to defend this great Nation.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Almost every observer, even the host of candidates seeking the Republican Presidential nomination, recognize that President Bush's invasion of Iraq was a foreign policy disaster for which so many military families are continuing to pay a high price. And American taxpayers will ultimately pay over a trillion dollars for that failure, spurred on by some of the speeches like the one we just heard.

So we look next door to Baghdad, at Tehran, and we see a despicable government there, just as there was one in Baghdad. We have ample intelligence evidence that that despicable government was pursuing a nuclear weapon program that is unacceptable to us. And we try to learn: Is there a way for America to use its other power, its diplomatic power, to stop that? Because

we know our use of military power did not accomplish positive foreign policy objectives by itself in a go-it-alone invasion of Iraq.

We found an approach that, in fact, had strong bipartisan support—imposing strong economic sanctions on the Iranians. It didn't work so well originally, the first time that I and almost everyone else in this House voted for it, because America couldn't go-it-alone any more than it could be successful in a go-it-alone invasion of Iraq.

But when we brought the rest of the world along, including some people that have been our adversaries, like Russia and China, to join in this sanctions regime, it finally forced Iran to the table to begin to deal with the critical elements of this nuclear weapon program.

Step by step, through very hard negotiations, by bringing the rest of the world along to force those economic sanctions on Iran—all of which I supported—they began to move forward on trying to resolve this issue through diplomacy, through acting that way, rather than bombing first and asking questions later, as some of these folks have advocated. At every step in that process, as we approached an interim agreement, we had an “object first, read later” approach from those who are pushing this rule.

The interim agreement was announced. They rejected it that night before they had even read it. It proved that their objections were totally unfounded: We gained more in terms of intelligence; we came to understand better the Iranian program; and we put a stop to it in that interim agreement. Our families are safer today because that agreement was adopted.

And we come along to about March of this year, and the same folks that are advocating this rule were out here telling us there was one thing this Congress had to do: It had to have the power to disapprove this agreement if it did not feel the final agreement met the objectives.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. That is how we began this week with the resolution of disapproval. But yesterday, they brought their self-styled foreign policy experts to Washington—Sarah Palin, Glenn Beck, Donald Trump—and they said a resolution of disapproval is not enough.

So today, Republicans have abandoned the only tool they had to stop this agreement—a resolution of disapproval; that is not even in this resolution—and they are off on a three-pronged approach to satisfy the most extreme views that prefer to use war as the first instrument instead of the last instrument.

We have a choice in this Congress, and it is the choice of using the strong power of America, with verification, to prevent this program rather than call-

ing on more military families to sacrifice for an unnecessary endeavor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we will do everything in our power to try and stop this bad deal; you are darn right we will.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Farmington, Utah (Mr. STEWART), a member of the Intelligence Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and a member of the United States Air Force for years and years, a veteran of this great Nation.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for that gracious introduction.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement is deeply, deeply flawed; and when you talk to our friends across the aisle, in moments of honesty, they will admit that it is deeply flawed.

This is the most important national security question of our generation. We have got to get this right, and we simply haven't done that yet.

If I could elaborate on my background that leads me to this conclusion, as the chairman said, I sit on the House Intelligence Committee. For 14 years, I was an Air Force pilot. I flew aircraft that carried nuclear weapons. I worked for the implementation of various nuclear treaties. I understand that for any treaty to work, there has to be a modicum of trust. There has to be a kernel of trust between the two parties.

Let me ask you this: Do you think we can trust the Iranians?

I asked Secretary Kerry on two occasions to give me a single example of where the Iranians have worked with us or our allies in any positive fashion, and he could not do that. But I can give you a long list of where they have worked against us, where they have created death and chaos: Hezbollah, Hamas, assassinations in Central America. Hundreds of Americans have been killed and maimed because of the Iranian-backed Shia militia. This is what they do. And we are supposed to trust them?

And by the way, I believe they are going to cheat, because they are cheating even now. In the last few months, they tried to buy prohibited equipment from Germany. They refuse to answer questions from the IAEA even now.

Which brings me to my second question: Do you think we can trust this President?

I would ask you to give me a single example of what you consider a foreign policy success of this administration—give me a single example—and then let me give you a long list of foreign policy failures, beginning with China claiming much of the South China Sea; with Russia, after the reset, going into Crimea, controlling much of eastern Ukraine now, even now building military posts in Syria.

We went into Libya and created chaos and walked away. We snatched defeat from the jaws of victory in Iraq. We are doing the same thing in Yemen, the same thing in Afghanistan. Why should we trust this President?

I believe that most people think this agreement is doomed to fail; and I believe that when it does, we now have to turn towards the question of: What do we do when we have an entirely nuclearized Middle East? When we have four or five countries in the next few years that have nuclear weapons there, how are we going to deal with that, coming from a President who declared it was his goal to see the elimination of all nuclear weapons across the globe? It is a terrible irony that he is going to preside over the greatest and most dramatic expansion of nuclear capabilities in the most chaotic part of the world, that he will preside over that, and that will be his foreign policy legacy.

We need to defeat this agreement while we still can.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this extremely convoluted rule as well as the underlying legislation.

When I was a child in the 1980s, I remember my mother taking me to Mothers Embracing Nuclear Disarmament rallies. I recall wondering why America possesses enough nuclear weapons to blow up the entire world at least seven times over. As an adult, I have never succeeded in finding a satisfactory answer to why we want to be able to blow up the world seven times.

Now, we are all here because the potential for nuclear war is one of the greatest threats to the future of humanity and perhaps to the future of life on the planet itself. That is why this agreement to make sure that Iran, a country that supports terrorism, does not acquire nuclear weapons is so important.

Let's be clear about what this deal is and what it isn't.

It is not a peace deal. It is not a deal that calls on us to trust Iran or like Iran. In fact, the very reason we want to make sure that Iran doesn't develop nuclear weapons is we see how much damage they caused through their mischief-making through support of Hezbollah and others on the conventional front. If that were compounded by nuclear capabilities, it would significantly increase the chance of global destruction.

This agreement is based on verification and enforceability. It is built on extensive electronic monitoring and unprecedented access for international investigators at known or suspected Iranian nuclear sites.

Of course, there are things in this deal that I would change or you would change. No deal is perfect. But perfection can't be our standard or we would never be able to support anything around here. Our job is to consider if this deal is better than the alternatives.

□ 1315

If Congress rejects this agreement and it leads to a nuclear Iran, what then?

It was multilateral sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table, not American sanctions alone; and it is clear that Russia and China will likely grant Iran sanctions relief, regardless of what the U.S. decides to do. We also worry about the dedication of our European allies in this regard.

With sanctions disappearing and Iran's money being unfrozen, the deal is moving forward. Shouldn't we want this agreement to proceed with the oversight of the United States of America, to make sure that Iran abides by the very letter of this agreement not to develop nuclear weapons?

Instead of standing in its way, we, in Congress, should play a leading role in the implementation and rigid enforcement of this deal to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

This agreement is an unprecedented opportunity to stop Iran's nuclear weapons program cold and make the world a safer place. Of all our options, it is the one most likely to succeed in preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

I urge my colleagues not to stand in the way of this important deal, to make sure that Iran, a country that supports terrorism, has a terrible record of human rights violations at home, and even just 2 days ago said that the State of Israel wouldn't last 25 years.

It is important that we ensure that they don't have access to the nuclear weapons that will allow them to carry through with their terrorist goals.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Windsor, Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, President Obama negotiated with a band of villains. The President believed Iran would change their ways because of his kind and forgiving nature, but we have seen Iranian hypocrisy far too long to believe they can change. It is time to face reality and prevent them, at all costs, from acquiring nuclear capability.

Iran's leaders promised to wipe Israel off the map. They deny the Holocaust and refer to our country as the Great Satan. The Ayatollah even takes to Twitter to call for Israel's annihilation.

Iran's actions are as dishonorable as their rhetoric. The administration has negotiated with Iran on nuclear non-proliferation as if they were an honorable country with honorable intentions, but it is certainly not honorable when our Department of State lists Iran as a state sponsor of terrorism, and no honorable country would occupy that unworthy distinction for the past 30 years, nor would an honorable country supply terrorists around the world with weapons to kill Americans and Israeli. In fact, Iran supplied IEDs that killed and maimed American soldiers and marines in the Iraq war.

On the day we remember the worst terrorist attack on U.S. soil, we are going to vote on whether or not to allow billions of dollars of funding to the world's largest state sponsor of terror. This deal is, at best, delusional and, at worst, despicable.

Iran is in pursuit of a nuclear weapon, and their intention for the United States is death.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote in favor of this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the agreement reached by Secretary Kerry and the international community because I believe there is no better alternative for preventing Iran from immediately developing a nuclear weapon.

Since the first sanctions were imposed on Iran a decade ago, I have supported tough economic measures as a means to bring Iran to the negotiating table. In that respect, the sanctions worked, but sanctions alone will not stop Iran from moving toward nuclear weapons.

After strenuous review of the July 14 agreement and all its annexes, I have reached the conclusion that the agreement is the best option available today for keeping nuclear weapons out of Iranian hands. Under the agreement, Iran is bound "under no circumstances ever to seek, develop or acquire nuclear weapons."

Among other things, Iran must reduce its active centrifuges by two-thirds, give up 97 percent of its uranium stockpile, and reconfigure the Arak reactor so it cannot produce weapons-grade plutonium.

The number of inspectors in Iran will triple. They will gain full access to nuclear facilities, including the entire uranium supply chain, at any time. This is indeed the most intrusive inspection regime of any nonproliferation agreement in U.S. history.

That is important because it will give the United States and the international community far greater insight into the regime's behavior and enable us to monitor them closely.

It is true that Iran may try to cheat, but that is exactly why we need this agreement. With severe restrictions and an aggressive inspections regime in place, we will be much more likely to discover any violations.

In that event, the United States will be authorized to reimpose sanctions on Iran immediately, and that applies not just to the U.S. sanctions, but to U.N. sanctions as well.

In summary, this agreement comprises harsh restrictions on Iran's nuclear activities, a strong monitoring system, and tough penalties for violation.

A group of 29 leading American scientists, including Nobel laureates, has called it "a technically sound, stringent, and innovative deal that will pro-

vide the necessary assurance in the coming decades and more that Iran is not developing nuclear weapons."

If we walk away from this agreement, the only remaining alternative is military action. We have been down that path for 15 years, and we have seen the grave consequences of not allowing diplomatic efforts to move forward.

Ronald Reagan said of the Soviet Union: "Trust, but verify."

This agreement is not rooted in trust but in our ability to verify compliance and to deal with enforcement. I believe it meets the goals of our negotiations to deny a dangerous Iranian regime access to a nuclear weapon.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Sugar Land, Texas (Mr. OLSON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. OLSON. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, one of the worst parts of President Obama's agreement with Iran is that it opens the door to nuclear bombs blowing up right here in America.

This man is a terrorist from Iran. His name is Manssor Arbabsiar. He comes from a family of hate.

In 2011, he approached the notorious Los Zetas drug cartel with a scheme to kill the Ambassador from Saudi Arabia right here in this city. He offered them \$1.5 million for that hit. Luckily, we caught him.

President Obama's agreement gives Iran at least \$100 billion to hire Los Zetas and others to unleash nuclear material and death on innocent Americans. We caught them once. Will we catch them again?

I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule today and tomorrow. Vote to reject President Obama's agreement with Iran.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Let me thank our ranking member for yielding me time and also for your leadership on this vital global peace and national security issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 412, the rule providing for consideration of three bills surrounding the nuclear agreement negotiated by this administration and the P5+1.

Make no mistake, these bills are nothing more than yet another attempt to purposefully and deliberately thwart the Iran deal.

Mr. Speaker, all of us have the same goal, to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. Now, as one who has been involved in many nuclear non-proliferation efforts since the 1970s, I am convinced that this deal brings us much closer to a nuclear-weapons-free Iran.

I believe that the President negotiated with our P5+1 partners—while not perfect, this deal achieves that goal. The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action cuts off all pathways to a bomb and ensures robust oversight and inspection. It is the best way to promote

regional security and global peace, and the majority of Americans agreed.

According to a recent University of Maryland poll, 55 percent said that Congress should get behind this agreement. That is why we need to be clear on the ramifications of rejecting the deal.

If the United States walks away, we will be walking away alone. As United Nations Ambassador Samantha Power stated in her recent Politico op-ed: “If we walk away, there is no diplomatic door number two. No do over. No rewrite of the deal on the table.”

Rejecting the Iran deal will isolate the United States from our international partners and will not make us any safer, and it certainly won't result in a better deal with Iran.

Instead, it would allow Iran to accelerate their weapons programs with no oversight, and it will significantly undermine our ability to engage with our partners on critical issues like addressing international terrorism.

Simply put, rejecting this deal would isolate the United States and would put us back on the path to war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. The Scriptures do say let us study war no more, so that is why it is critical for us to support the President and our diplomats and give this deal a chance to succeed.

This is a defining moment for our country and for the world. Let us continue to work for peace because the military option, that is always there. Let us work for a world worthy of our children and future generations.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Fairhope, Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BYRNE. Thank you, Chairman SESSIONS.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and in strong opposition to the Iran nuclear agreement.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama has created a false choice by claiming the only alternative to this deal is war.

First of all, this deal itself can most definitely lead to war. By giving one of our biggest enemies access to nuclear weapons, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and billions of dollars in sanctions relief, we are effectively giving Iran the tools they need to live out their dream of bringing “death to America.”

The other flaw in the President's logic is that there are actually other alternatives than war. What about a better deal that includes anytime, anywhere inspections? What about increasing the sanctions which were clearly working to begin with? What about requiring the release of Americans held as political prisoners in Iran? These are clear alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, this is the people's House, so I think it is critically important that we actually listen to the people. Last month, I held over 15 town-hall meetings all across my district. At each and every stop, someone asked me what Congress is going to do to stop the Iran nuclear deal.

Just look at the public opinion polls. Only 21 percent of those surveyed in a recent poll said they approve of this agreement. That is less than one in four Americans who believe this is a good deal.

I implore my colleagues to put the opinion of the American people over loyalty to some political party. I ask my colleagues to listen to our Nation's military leaders, who have made clear the serious consequences of giving Iran access to ICBMs, instead of party bosses.

I plead with my colleagues to look past the short-term legacy of our President and, instead, look at the long-term ramifications this deal will have on the safety and security of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater responsibility of this House than to do everything we can to keep the American people safe.

With that in mind, I strongly urge my colleagues to stand strong and oppose this deal.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Iran nuclear agreement and in strong opposition to this convoluted rule and process.

Today, the House should have already completed several hours of debate on the Iran deal. Instead, we have before us a convoluted process with three measures that won't go anywhere in the Senate and will never reach the President's desk.

The fact is that the President has the votes to move this historic agreement forward. We should be having a serious debate and moving toward a vote in a timely fashion.

□ 1330

Instead, House Republicans have cooked up a series of votes to needlessly drag this process out and appeal to their extremist base.

We all know how serious the Iran nuclear agreement is for the security of the Middle East, the United States, and the world.

After reading and listening to many diverse views, I believe it is the strongest available option to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon and prevent yet another war.

These negotiations were never meant to solve all of the problems that we have with Iran. Their purpose was clear from the beginning: to shut down the pathways available to Iran to develop and produce a nuclear bomb, period.

Quite simply, is it better to have an Iran capable of producing a nuclear weapon by early next year or is it better to shut down that capability for the next 10 to 15 years and even longer?

And let me be clear. The agreement is set up to ensure that Iran remains a nuclear weapon-free state with mechanisms for inspections and verifications that remain permanently in place.

Now I know that some hoped that a “better deal” might somehow be renegotiated if we just keep increasing sanctions and threaten—or even use—military force against Iran.

But we already know that 10 years of sanctions and military threats only gave us a significant increase in Iran's nuclear capacity and that the number of centrifuges needed to produce weapons-grade enriched uranium also increased.

Only when serious negotiations began 2 years ago did we see Iran's program stopped and then rolled back. The final agreement degrades even further Iran's ability to develop a nuclear weapon, blocks all pathways for Iran to acquire the materials needed to develop a bomb, and imposes the most comprehensive inspections regime of any nuclear arms control agreement to date.

In return, Iran will receive sanctions relief that is phased in over the next decade, dependent on Iran's compliance.

Do I trust Iran? Certainly not. Iran doesn't trust us either. But, again, that is the whole point of negotiations: for nations that don't trust one another to sit down and to hammer out a deal that all parties can live with and abide by.

Nelson Mandela is credited with saying, “The best weapon is to sit down and talk.” This means compromise, for all parties to get something out of the final agreement.

For Iran, that is sanctions relief. For the world, that means an Iran without a nuclear weapon. It is not based on trust. It is based on tough inspections and verification.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an accord between just the U.S. and Iran. Six of the world's major powers—Russia, China, France, Germany, the U.K., and the U.S.—hammered out this deal with Iran.

If the U.S. walks away now, we will never be able to put the pieces back together or get these nations to take a risk with us again. Without this agreement, Iran could simply return to developing a nuclear weapon.

After 2 years of arduous negotiations, why would the U.S. insult the very nations whose cooperation and commitment we need to ensure Iran's compliance?

Why would we undermine our international standing as a good-faith negotiating partner not just on this agreement, but on every other negotiation we are engaged in now and in the future?

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the IAEA inquiry into Iran's past nuclear

activities is a side deal. It is its own separate bilateral agreement. It neither affects nor delays the P5+1 agreement's rigorous inspections and verification process or Iran's obligation to significantly degrade and dismantle its nuclear infrastructure before getting any sanctions relief.

But, quite frankly, the U.S. long ago reached its own conclusions about Iran's nuclear activities. We believe that, if left unchecked, Iran would soon acquire enough weapons-grade plutonium and highly enriched uranium to make a nuclear bomb.

It is why we approved U.S. nuclear-related sanctions and supported similar international sanctions, and it is why the White House began serious multilateral negotiations with Iran to cut off every pathway Iran might have to make a nuclear weapon. And we were successful. We were successful.

Mr. Speaker, my support for the comprehensive agreement is not something I give reluctantly or grudgingly. I am proud to support this deal and to cast my vote in support of the resolution of approval.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in opposing this rule, in supporting the resolution approving this historic agreement, and in rejecting both the Roskam and the Pompeo bills that seek to delay its implementation.

This is a good deal. It deserves our support.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), who serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, when I was home during the August break, I talked to a lot of folks. Many of them were fearful. They were fearful about national security. And it focused on the on deal, the Iranian deal that we are here for today.

The Iranian deal, Mr. Speaker, is bad for America. It is bad for Israel. It is bad for the Middle East. But, oh, what a deal for Iran.

If we approve this deal, there will be singing and dancing in the streets in Iran, especially with the High Ayatollah leading the dancing. Why? Because it is wonderful for Iran.

The deal certifies a nuclear Iran, eventually. We can argue over when, but they are going to get nuclear weapons. How lovely is that. Is the world going to be safer because of that? No.

We need to see the world for what it is. Iran is a wolf in wolf's clothing. They make absolutely no secret about they want us dead.

They want Israel dead first. They were preaching this while we are working on this peace, peace, peace at any price deal, talking about how they want to destroy us.

So why don't we just look at the law right now. We have heard a little bit

about a side deal. Secretary Kerry was before our Foreign Affairs Committee.

I asked him about a side deal that came up about the IAEA deal with Iran. He said he hadn't read it, he has been briefed on it.

Congress needs to read the side deals before we ever vote to approve this deal. We have to read the fine print, like all of us are supposed to do when we sign a contract.

Now let's read what the law says. The Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act is quite clear, Mr. Speaker. The President is obligated by law—the law he signed—to provide Congress “the agreement itself and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements.”

That is in the law. I haven't seen the side deal. I haven't seen anybody in Congress that has seen the side deal.

The law the President signed says we are to see all these side deals, agreements, before we even vote on whether or not to approve this deal; otherwise, the clock doesn't start ticking for the 60-day approval requirement.

So show us the side deal. Let us read it. I think Congress maybe has had enough embarrassment over the years voting on laws where we haven't seen all of the information before we voted on it. Show us the side agreement. Let us go from there.

Of course the deal in itself is a bad deal for all of us. I don't understand why we are giving \$150 billion to Iran while we have got \$47 billion in claims by Americans against Iran for terrorist activities. Why don't we give them the money first?

And I know I am out of time. But let's not approve the deal. Let's vote for the rule and make sure, before we ever see any vote on the agreement, we see the side deal.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the Members that the gentleman from Texas has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my colleague if he has further speakers? If not, I am prepared to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentlewoman, I have three or four more speakers.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss what I believe will be one of the most consequential votes in the history of this body.

A fundamental duty of the Federal Government—so much that it is enshrined in the preamble to our Constitution—is to provide for the common defense.

We must ask ourselves: Will this deal enhance the safety and security of the American people? The answer is clearly no. On the contrary, it imperils the United States and our allies around the world.

Look only to those who know Iran best, its neighbors, who universally oppose the deal. Why? Because it is built on trusting a regime that has cheated on international agreements time and again and because it will launch a nuclear arms race in the most unstable region in the world.

So today we have a choice. To me, the choice is clear. We can support this deal and stand with a regime that spreads terror around the world, leads its people in chants of “Death to America,” and whose leaders refer to our country as the “Great Satan,” or we reject the deal and stand strong as a country, resolute in our pursuit of freedom and justice, stand with our allies, like Israel, and stand with the American people, who overwhelmingly opposed this deal.

I know where I stand. I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this deal and sending a clear signal to the world that we will not accept a nuclear Iran.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a gentleman with compassion and healing, a gentleman who is a physician, a gentleman on from the Education and the Workforce and Veterans' Affairs Committees.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation expressing disapproval of this proposed nuclear deal with Iran.

Forty years ago I was a young soldier just south of the militarized zone in Korea when they did not have a nuclear weapon. Now that they have joined the nuclear community, does the world feel safer with a rogue nation having a nuclear weapon?

I pose the question: What is in this agreement for America? Does it make us safer?

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Republican or a Democrat issue. This is an American issue. This affects all of us. It affects the Middle East, where our closest ally feels endangered, and I agree that they are.

And I pose the narrative question: What is it about “death to America” this administration does not understand?

The President presents a false narrative: war or this agreement. I could not disagree more. The sanctions brought the Iranians to the negotiating table.

What kind of an agreement did we negotiate? What happened to “anytime, anyplace” inspections? What happened to Americans actually being on the inspection team?

I think everyone, every thoughtful person, realizes this just slows the process down. But, ultimately, the Iranians will develop a nuclear weapon.

I support the rule and the underlying bills.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Miami, Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we need to ask ourselves if this nuclear deal with Iran makes the United States safer. Does it make Israel safer? Does it make the world safer?

As a result of this deal, Iran will be nuclear-capable, and its neighbors will not be complacent knowing that Iran can't produce a nuclear weapon.

The billions of dollars that the regime is set to receive will undoubtedly go towards building its military capabilities, not to mention its support for terror and other illicit activities.

Because this deal jeopardizes Iran's neighbors, the administration is promising Gulf countries military arms sales to defend against the increased Iranian threat.

We then will be the major proliferator of nuclear and conventional arms in the Middle East. Do we really believe that arming an extremely unstable and violent Middle East region to the teeth and having nuclear-capable Iran right there in the middle will make us or the world safer?

The answer is clear, Mr. Speaker. This deal is dangerous. It is bad public policy. We must oppose it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wheaton, Illinois, (Mr. ROSKAM), the distinguished gentleman who spent several hours, 4 or 5 hours, with us in the Rules Committee last night.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank Chairman SESSIONS.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Kerry came and gave a briefing to a closed session of Congress. Part of it was open for discussion. He said something provocative at the end. He said, "Folks, what is the alternative?"

And I said to him in a question and answer session, "You know, Mr. Secretary, for 2 years, the administration has been telling us that no deal is better than a bad deal. And if no deal is better than a bad deal, that means that there was an alternative."

Secretary Kerry, during that same briefing, said that he walked away from the deal three times with the Iranians. And I said, "Secretary, when you walked away from the deal, that means that there was an alternative."

So the administration does not get to argue today, Mr. Speaker, to this Congress or to the American people that there is no alternative. There is an alternative. And this House is prepared to offer alternatives.

I appreciate Chairman SESSIONS. I appreciate the Rules Committee bringing forth this package of bills that we can begin to discuss getting us out from underneath a disastrous deal.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

□ 1345

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and against the Iran nuclear deal.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot in good conscience accept a deal that is laden with secretive side agreements brokered by this administration, nor can we possibly grant \$150 billion to the world's foremost sponsor of terror and, in the process, turn our back on Israel.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of this bad deal that the Supreme Leader of Iran now is publicly emboldened to say that Israel will not exist in 25 years and that terror will continue to plague the Middle East, Israel, and the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach September 11, I would ask my colleagues to please join me in rejecting this bad deal, and let's defeat terrorism rather than advance it.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the deal with Iran. Iran is one of the world's largest state sponsors of terrorism.

It provides military and financial support to groups responsible for the deaths of Americans and our allies. In addition, the regime is working to undermine governments across the Middle East, including Iran, Syria, Yemen, and Lebanon.

As Iranians rally behind "death to America," I am left to wonder what other options we have but stopping them from obtaining the most dangerous weapons on Earth. Unfortunately, I believe this deal falls way short of that goal.

I pledge and will be working with my colleagues to make sure that we oppose this deal and that we find other alternatives.

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

In closing, the weight of this decision falls heavily on this Chamber. Instead of following regular order, the majority's insistence on governing by crisis has once more taken over, and we are thrown into disarray.

The Iran agreement is the best option that we have to curbing Iran's nuclear ambitions. People who know—nuclear scientists, ambassadors, people of the military—have all said, including Colin Powell, I may add, that this is a good bill, this is a good negotiation that will help to keep us safe.

The work ahead will be arduous, and it is going to take coordination with our international partners who also negotiated this agreement with us, but peace is always preferable to war.

I urge my colleagues to support the agreement and vote "no" on this rule.

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

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

I want to thank my distinguished colleagues, my friends on the Rules

Committee, both Mr. MCGOVERN, Judge HASTINGS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER, for their participation today. I thank you very much, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for your professional attributes in this very, very difficult debate in the last few days that have taken many, many hours.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me that the deal that the administration negotiated is a disaster. We have talked about that all morning. Speaker after speaker after speaker after speaker spoke about the lack of benefit to the American people. It undermines American leadership abroad; it empowers the Iranian regime, and ignores what has been decades of policy where Americans would not deal with terrorists.

By overturning the decades of this bipartisan national defense policy, the administration is telling the world the United States is willing to negotiate with rogue states, those people that say "death to America," and give them exactly what they want. This will embolden future actors. It will limit the United States' ability to aggressively pursue sanctions against other countries.

The rest of the world will take note of our weakness. This is not leading; this is weakness. If the United States is willing to lift sanctions against Iran, we will unilaterally limit our ability to resolve issues through democracy, diplomacy, and through peace.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to stop this deal, which is why Republicans are on the floor today. We invite all of our colleagues to vote with us because it is the right thing, the adoption of this rule. Obviously, the lengthy debate we are going to have today is going to lead us to the conclusion that the underlying piece of legislation must be properly voted on.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, President Obama has sold our nation's security for some magic beans. This Iran deal is a bad deal for our national security. It is a bad deal for our allies—particularly Israel.

Removing sanctions against ballistic missiles and conventional arms, would happen before Iran halts its nuclear activity. If we try to re-impose sanctions, Iran gets to walk away from the deal free of sanctions all together and keep its money and nuclear weapons.

The way I see it, Iran is the only one benefiting from this deal. President Obama wants people to believe this is the best deal possible. I say, if this is the best deal, then I don't want any deal at all.

I am voting NO on this deal because I made a promise to my children and grandchildren that I would fight to make this nation safer and stronger for the next generation. I cannot break that promise to my grandchildren. This is a bad deal.

I urge my colleagues to vote YES on the rule and NO on passage of this agreement.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 186, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

YEAS—243

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

NAYS—186

Adams	Gabbard	Norcross
Aguilar	Gallego	O'Rourke
Ashford	Garamendi	Pallone
Bass	Graham	Pascrell
Beatty	Grayson	Payne
Becerra	Green, Al	Pelosi
Bera	Green, Gene	Perlmutter
Beyer	Grijalva	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Peterson
Blumenauer	Hahn	Pingree
Bonamici	Hastings	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan	Heck (WA)	Polis
F.	Higgins	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Himes	Quigley
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Rangel
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Rice (NY)
	Hoyer	Richmond
	Butterfield	Roybal-Allard
	Capps	Ruiz
	Capuano	Jackson Lee
	Cárdenas	Jeffries
	Carney	Johnson (GA)
	Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.
	Cartwright	Kaptur
	Castor (FL)	Keating
	Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)
	Chu, Judy	Kennedy
	Chu, Judy	Kildee
	Cicilline	Kilmer
	Hice, Jody B.	Kind
	Clarke (MA)	Kirkpatrick
	Clarke (NY)	Kuster
	Clay	Langevin
	Cleaver	Larsen (WA)
	Clyburn	Larson (CT)
	Cohen	Lawrence
	Connelly	Lee
	Conyers	Levin
	Cooper	Lewis
	Costa	Lieu, Ted
	Courtney	Lipinski
	Crowley	Cummings
	Crowley	Lipinski
	Cummings	Loebsack
	Davis (CA)	Lofgren
	Davis, Danny	Lowenthal
	Rothfus	Lowey
	DeFazio	Lujan Grisham
	DeGette	(NM)
	DeLaney	Luján, Ben Ray
	DeLauro	(NM)
	DeBene	Lynch
	DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean
	Deutch	Matsui
	Dingell	McCollum
	Doggett	McDermott
	Doyle, Michael	McGovern
	F.	McNerney
	Duckworth	Meeks
	Edwards	Meng
	Ellison	Moore
	Engel	Moulton
	Eshoo	Murphy (FL)
	Esty	Nadler
	Farr	Napoli
	Fattah	Napolitano
	Foster	Neal
	Frankel (FL)	Nolan
	Fudge	

NOT VOTING—4

Cuellar	Maloney, Carolyn	Neugebauer
		Walberg

□ 1416

Messrs. FATTAH, NOLAN, BRADY of Pennsylvania, JEFFRIES, and CARSON of Indiana changed their votes from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TERRORIST ATTACKS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-58)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and,

together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared in Proclamation 7463 with respect to the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001, is to continue in effect for an additional year.

The terrorist threat that led to the declaration on September 14, 2001, of a national emergency continues. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect after September 14, 2015, the national emergency with respect to the terrorist threat.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, September 10, 2015.

FINDING THAT THE PRESIDENT HAS NOT COMPLIED WITH SECTION 2 OF THE IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 412, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 411) finding that the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 411

Whereas section 135(h)(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as enacted by section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, defined the term “agreement” as meaning “an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding or not, including any joint comprehensive plan of action entered into or made between Iran and any other parties, and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future.”;

Whereas section C(14) of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action requires Iran to implement the “Roadmap for Clarification of Past and Present Outstanding Issues regarding Iran’s Nuclear Program” (referred to as

the “Roadmap”) which was agreed to with the IAEA;

Whereas the Roadmap identifies two separate, confidential agreements between the IAEA and Iran, one to address remaining outstanding issues related to “Possible Military Dimensions” of Iran’s nuclear program, and another “regarding the issue of Parchin”;

Whereas both of those agreements constitute side agreements within the meaning of section 135(h)(1);

Whereas section 135(a)(1)(A) requires the President to transmit the agreement, including any side agreements, as defined by section 135(h)(1) to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership;

Whereas the Executive Communication numbered 2307 and captioned “A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter and attachments satisfying all requirements of Sec. 135(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (Pub. L. 114–17), as received July 19, 2015”, did not include the text of either side agreement with the IAEA; and

Whereas the President has not subsequently transmitted to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership the text of the separate agreements identified in the Roadmap; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 because the communication from the President did not constitute the agreement as defined by section 135(h)(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; and

(2) the period for review by Congress of nuclear agreements with Iran under section 135(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 has not commenced because the agreement has not yet been transmitted to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 2 hours, equally divided and controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the minority leader or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) will control 1 hour. The gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to revise and extend and submit extraneous materials on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think we all know why we are here to debate this resolution today. The bottom line is that, for those of us that were involved in this agreement, we always thought that international inspections were going to be done by international inspectors, not by the Iranians, not by those in the Iranian regime.

Whether you like the Iran agreement or not, one thing I think all Members

can agree on is that sound verification must be the bedrock of any viable agreement.

Iran cannot cheat and get away with it. And the reason this is an issue for us is because Iran has cheated on every past agreement. That is why the verification was so important.

The problem is key aspects of this verification agreement have not been presented to Congress to review. Indeed, there are two separate arrangements agreed to between Iran and an arm of the U.N. here, the International Atomic Energy Agency.

One is regarding the regime’s past bomb work, of which there are a thousand pages of evidence that the IAEA tell us about, and the other involves access to the Iranian military base at Parchin, where that evidence shows that that testing took place.

In order to fully assess the agreement, Members of Congress should have access to these documents. This is especially important since Iran will almost certainly treat these arrangements as setting a standard for future IAEA requests to access any suspicious sites, especially military sites, since they have made it clear nobody is going to their military sites.

Physical access by the IAEA to Parchin is critical to understanding Iran’s past bomb work. This is where “Iran constructed a large explosives containment vessel,” to quote the IAEA.

Why did they do it? To conduct experiments related to the development, say the international inspectors, of nuclear weapons. Iran has blocked the international inspectors’ access to Parchin for years.

In the meantime, we are told by those inspectors that they watch on spy satellite as Iran bulldozes and paves over this site and then paves over the site again.

If the international inspectors cannot attain a clear understanding of the experimentation that took place, then the United States will have great difficulty figuring out how long it would take Iran to rush toward a nuclear weapon.

In recent congressional testimony, administration officials expressed confidence in their access to suspicious sites that the agreement provides the IAEA.

Yet, these separate arrangements have the potential to seriously weaken our ability to verify the agreement as a whole even is true, that Iran is going to do self-inspections here, which is what Iran asserts.

Mr. Speaker, the history of Iranian negotiating behavior, as we know, is to pocket past concessions. And then what do they do? They push for more and more and more.

The separate arrangement agreed to between the IAEA and Iran regarding inspection of the facilities at Parchin will almost certainly be regarded by that government in Iran as a precedent for their IAEA access to future suspicious sites in Iran.

In other words, if you don’t get access to this site, you are not going to get access to other military sites where there is evidence that the same type of thing has occurred.

So if Iran won’t let international inspectors do the international inspecting today, what makes us think that the Iranians will allow intrusive terms to these agreements in the future after sanctions have been lifted when we find evidence of the next site?

I have little doubt that the side deals of today will become central to the agreement’s verification provisions tomorrow. This makes it imperative that these agreements are made available to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, 350 Members of this House, Democrats and Republicans—I think we had the majority of the Democrats, and I think we had every Republican—wrote to Secretary Kerry last fall.

Iran’s willingness to resolve concerns over its bomb work, as we said in that letter, is a fundamental test of Iran’s intention to uphold a comprehensive agreement. That is why we all wrote that letter together, in order to make that point.

The administration once took the same position that we are taking right now on the House floor as well, but it gave that position away in negotiations. It gave away that position.

Reviewing these side agreements is critical to understanding whether Iran intends to pass that test. We need access to those agreements.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, after several years of difficult negotiations with a dangerous and malevolent regime, the administration and representatives of the other P5+1 nations reached an agreement with Iran over its nuclear program.

The primary objective of the United States in the negotiations was to prevent Iran from ever obtaining a nuclear weapon. Given the unthinkable consequences of Iran, the world’s foremost sponsor of terrorism, obtaining the bomb, this has been an overriding national security imperative of the United States for decades.

As an American and as a Jew who is deeply concerned about the security of Israel, it is also intensely personal.

I believe our vital interests have been advanced under the agreement, since it would be extremely difficult for Iran to amass enough fissionable material to make a nuclear weapon without giving the United States ample notice and time to stop it.

We will still need to guard against any Iranian effort to obtain nuclear material or technology from proliferators abroad, a reality even if Iran had given up all enrichment.

But the agreement likely gives the world at least a decade and a half without the prospect of an Iranian nuclear weapon and without going to war to

make that so. That is a major achievement.

The United States realized this objective by securing a number of important provisions in the agreement, including the power to snap back sanctions, in whole or in part, and not subject to a veto in the United Nations.

The United States and its allies also procured an extensive and intrusive inspections regime that lasts for 25 years or more. By applying to the whole chain of the enrichment process, from the ground to the centrifuge, it realistically precludes Iran from developing a hidden and parallel enrichment process.

With respect to those inspections, I think it is very important to clarify something which I often hear the opponents obscure, and that is there are inspections with respect to Iran's prior military work, inspections of known nuclear sites and inspections of other sites which we may suspect Iran may conduct work in the future. And the mechanisms with respect to each are different.

With respect to the known nuclear sites, there are 24/7 eyes on Iran's enrichment activities that would be the most extensive and intrusive inspections any nation has seen of its nuclear program.

□ 1430

With respect to its potential sites—that is sites we don't know, where we suspect in the future they may do work—we will have a mechanism to obtain inspections in a timely way and certainly in a timely enough way that, if they were to ever utilize radioactive material, they would be detected.

Finally, we have the inspections into their prior military work. I will say this with respect to the prior military work, those of us that have reviewed the intelligence know that we have an extensive bank of information about what Iran had been doing in the past. To the degree that we need a baseline for what Iran's work has been, we have that baseline, and I think that is a pivotal consideration going forward.

As recently as yesterday, the Director of National Intelligence stated that he has great confidence that we can determine if Iran fails to comply with the agreement.

For me, it is the size and sophistication of Iran's nuclear enrichment capability after 15 years that is the key challenge. At that point, it is the work necessary to produce the mechanism for the bomb that becomes the real obstacle to a breakout, and that work is the most challenging to detect. Nevertheless, I have searched for a better, credible alternative and concluded that there is none.

When it comes to predicting the future, we are all looking through the glass darkly, but if Congress rejects the deal agreed to by the administration and much of the world, the sanctions regime will, if not collapse, almost certainly erode.

This does not mean that Iran necessarily dashes madly for a bomb, but it will almost certainly move forward with its enrichment program, unconstrained by inspections, limits on research, and development of new centrifuges, metallurgy, or other protections in the deal.

In short, Iran will have many of the advantages of the deal in access to money and trade with none of its disadvantages. Instead of rejecting the deal, therefore, Congress should focus on making it stronger.

First, we should make it clear that, if Iran cheats, the repercussions will be severe.

Second, we should continue to strengthen our intelligence capabilities to detect any form of Iranian non-compliance.

Third, we should establish the expectation that, while Iran will be permitted to have an enrichment capability for civilian use, it will never, never be permitted to produce highly enriched uranium, and if it attempts to do so, it will be stopped with force.

Fourth, we will share with Israel all the technologies necessary to maintain its regional military superiority and, if necessary, to destroy Iran's nuclear facilities no matter how deep the bunker.

Finally, we are prepared to work with Israel and our Gulf allies to make sure that every action Iran takes to use its newfound wealth for destructive activities in the region will prompt an equal and opposite reaction, and we will combat Iran's malignant influence.

The Iranian people will one day throw off the shackles of their repressive regime, and I hope that this deal will empower those who wish to reform Iranian governance and behavior. The 15 years or more this agreement provides will give us the time to test that proposition.

Then, as now, if Iran is determined to develop the bomb, there is only one way to stop it, and that is by the use of force; but the American people and others around the world will recognize that we did everything possible to avoid war.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, although the Obama administration has pitched the Iran nuclear accord as a way to prevent the Ayatollahs from developing nuclear weapons, the agreement lifts the key restrictions on Iran's nuclear activities after 10 to 15 years. Many of my fellow Members wonder how the administration can be so naive as to pave the way for an Iranian bomb in the course of trying to prevent an Iranian bomb.

Well, the answer is clear to me. The President is gambling. He is betting that the very act of engaging with Iran

will moderate the regime's behavior so that, in a decade or so from now, we won't have to worry about it anymore. He has called his engagement with Iran a calculated risk. Indeed, it is a risk.

As I said, the President is placing a bet; but why would anyone bet on the moderation of the Iranian regime? It has not changed one iota since the Ayatollahs seized power in 1979. Thirty-six years later, Iran is the world's biggest state sponsor of terrorism. It is also responsible for the deaths of thousands of U.S. soldiers in Iraq.

Obama has spoken of the Ayatollah Khamenei as possibly seeking to rejoin the community of nations. This is a thin reed to justify giving Iran a path to the bomb in the near future. With their ritual "death to America" chants, I don't know how the Iranians could make it any more clear that they do not want to rejoin the community of nations. They want to blow up the community of nations.

Soon after the Iranian agreement was signed, Khamenei himself tweeted a silhouette image of President Obama holding a gun to his head. I just don't understand what is more clear that this regime could do to make its intentions clearer to the American people, but our President sees things differently.

As he told The New York Times, if the nuclear agreement is signed, "Who knows? Iran may change."

Well, consider this: if you are rolling the dice at a casino, who knows? You may roll a 7. If you are at the roulette wheel, who knows? It may land on your number. When you are gambling, one thing is for sure; in the long run, the casino always wins.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, this is not about a casino, nor is it about a gambler losing money. This is about gambling on human lives, U.S. lives and our Western allies' lives.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, reasonable people disagree about the merits and shortcomings of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

In the strongest democracy in the world, we have a sacred duty to uphold the high standard of debate and govern responsibly. That is why I am profoundly disappointed by vitriolic personal attacks and character assassinations on both sides of this debate; and I am outraged by the Republicans' attempt to score political points on this critical issue of national and global security.

The threat to pursue wasteful litigation and to tie the hands of our President until the end of his term are particularly outrageous, when the Senate has indicated it will not even consider these measures. I strongly oppose the blatantly irresponsible partisan political measures before the House this week.

As ranking Democratic member of the House Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I have participated in dozens of classified and unclassified Iran briefings with the Obama administration, including members of our negotiating team and colleagues in Congress during the last 2 years.

I have thoroughly evaluated the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action released in July, met with foreign leaders, nuclear experts, and heard from thousands of thoughtful and passionate constituents.

After careful consideration, I will vote against approval of the agreement. Sufficient safeguards simply are not in place to address the risk associated with this agreement, and it will not dismantle Iran's nuclear infrastructure.

First, in 15 years, Iran will become an internationally recognized nuclear threshold state capable of producing highly enriched uranium to develop a nuclear weapon.

Second, relieving U.N. sanctions on conventional arms and ballistic missiles and releasing billions of dollars to the Iranian regime will lead to a dangerous regional weapons race and enable Iran to bolster its funding of Hezbollah, Hamas, the Houthis, and Bashar al-Assad.

Third, the deal does not explicitly require Iran to fully disclose its previous military work before sanctions relief is provided. Inspectors will not have anytime, anywhere access to the most suspicious facilities, particularly the Parchin military complex, with a process that lacks transparency and could delay inspectors access for up to 24 days.

Finally, there are no clear accountability measures regarding punishment for minor violations of the agreement. In recent weeks, the administration has responded to some of my concerns by committing to additional security assistance to Israel and our Gulf partners and to improving international cooperation on countering Iran's non-nuclear destabilizing activities.

I will work in Congress and with the administration to expeditiously implement these commitments to enhance—not just maintain—nonnuclear-related sanctions to establish stronger mechanisms to deter Iran and to ensure Iran never develops a nuclear weapon.

One of my highest priorities will continue to be the protection of Israel's qualitative military edge so that our closest ally in the region can defend itself against all threats from Iran or its proxies.

In the same week, my colleagues, that Congress holds this important vote, Iran's Supreme Leader vowed again to annihilate the Jewish State of Israel and to vilify the Great Satan that he calls the United States of America.

It is my sincere hope that we can work together in a bipartisan way moving forward. The security of the

United States of America and our allies depends on it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa and was the author of some of the Iran sanctions laws that are in force today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed chairman for his leadership on this critical issue. I also want to congratulate Mr. POMPEO, whose resolution we are discussing.

Mr. Speaker, this deal will allow Iran to become nuclear capable in just a short order. It will allow Iran to grow and expand its military. It will allow Iran to continue with its support for terror. These facts are indisputable.

What is also indisputable is that the regime in Tehran detests the United States, the West, and the democratic Jewish State of Israel, our steadfast partner. The Supreme Leader of Iran constantly incites chants of "death to America" and "death to Israel." Are we not listening?

Through its proxies, Hezbollah and Hamas, Iran seeks to make this threat into a reality. Earlier this week, the Supreme Leader threatened that Israel will no longer exist in just 25 years.

Because of this agreement, Mr. Speaker, the regime will now have the weapons; it will now have the capabilities to pose an even greater threat to us, to Israel, and to our interests in the region. Giving a regime that openly calls for and works toward our destruction and the destruction of Israel is insane. We are providing Iran a path to nuclear weapons and increased conventional weapons capability.

This isn't just bad policy. It is dangerous. It is naive to think that this nuclear deal with Iran won't make us and the world less safe, less secure, and less peaceful. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we must reject it.

I thank Chairman ROYCE and Mr. POMPEO for this resolution.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action negotiated between the United States, the permanent 5 members of the United Nations Security Council plus Germany, the European Union, and Iran.

I support this deal because it is the best available option to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, an outcome that all of us agree must be prevented. The opponents of this agreement say that Iran supports terrorism. I don't disagree with that.

This deal, however, is about only one issue—the issue that the entire world agrees is by far the most pressing—preventing Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. It is precisely because Iran is so nefarious that this deal is so important.

□ 1445

As dangerous as Iran is and may remain, Iran would be far more dangerous if they acquired a nuclear weapon. This deal is the best way to prevent that unacceptable outcome.

The opponents of this agreement say that we can't trust the Iranians to abide by the agreement's strict restrictions on their nuclear program. That may be true. And I wouldn't be supporting the agreement if it required us to trust the Iranians, but it doesn't.

This deal is built around the strictest verifications ever devised. If Iran tries to dash toward a bomb, we will be more likely to catch them using the verification procedures under this deal than we would be without it.

With this deal in place, if you do catch Iran dashing toward a nuclear weapon, all options will be on the table to stop them. But military force must always be a last resort. I have not heard any of the opponents of this agreement present any realistic diplomatic alternative that would be anywhere near as likely to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, and if we reject this deal, military action will become more likely.

Whenever we send Americans into harm's way, we must be able to look them and their families in the eye and honestly tell them that we have exhausted every other option. This deal is a diplomatic option we must exhaust. This deal's opponents present no other.

The late Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, said: "You don't make peace with friends. You make it with unsavory enemies."

We are now faced with three choices: this deal, a drastically increased likelihood of military confrontation, or a nuclear Iran. I support this deal, and I ask my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, what was previously unacceptable, an Iranian nuclear state, is now inevitable under the terms and conditions of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Tragically, the deal is riddled with serious flaws, gaps, and huge concessions to Iran. Taken as a whole, the deal poses an existential threat to Israel and other friends in the region—and is a significant risk to the United States.

Not only is Iran now permitted to continue enriching uranium—a previous nonnegotiable red line was no enrichment whatsoever—but under this agreement, Iran will be able to assemble an industrial-scale nuclear program once the agreement begins to sunset in as little as a decade.

And make no mistake about it, Iran's decades-long rabid hatred of Israel

shows no sign of abating anytime soon. Yesterday, the Times of Israel reported that Iran's Supreme Leader said to Israel, "You will not see the next 25 years," adding that the Jewish state will be hounded until it is destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, inspections are anything but anytime or anywhere, the Obama administration's previous pledge to the Nation and the world. We have learned that the IAEA has entered into a secret agreement that precludes unfettered, robust inspection. That also violates the Corker law. We have not gotten that information.

Mr. Speaker, Iran is the world's leading supporter of terrorism. This agreement provides tens of billions of dollars for weapons and war-making material.

The Supreme Leader also criticized any call to end its ballistic missile program, another eleventh hour concession. The Supreme Leader called that stupid and idiotic, and that they should mass produce such weapons and means of delivery.

Countries build ICBMs, Mr. Speaker, to deliver nukes.

The administration was reluctant, but I held two hearings and the chairman held several hearings on the Americans being held hostage. Pastor Saeed Abedini, Amir Hekmati, Jason Rezaian, and Robert Levinson remain in jail—abused, tortured, or missing. Why are they not free?

President Obama continues to tell Congress and the American people that the Iran nuclear agreement is the best deal possible and advances peace. Such boasting collapses under scrutiny. What was previously unacceptable—an Iranian nuclear state—is now inevitable under the terms and conditions of what is officially known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Tragically, the deal is riddled with serious flaws, gaps, and huge concessions to Iran. Taken as a whole, the deal poses an existential threat to Israel, our allies in the region—and even poses significant risks to the United States.

Not only is Iran now permitted to continue enriching uranium—a previous nonnegotiable redline was no enrichment whatsoever—under this agreement, Iran will not be required to dismantle its bomb-making technology and will have an internationally recognized, industrial-scale nuclear program once the agreement begins to "sunset" in as little as a decade.

And make no mistake, Iran's decades-long rabid hatred of Israel shows no sign of abating anytime soon. Yesterday, the Times of Israel reported that Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei said to Israel: "You will not see (the) next 25 years," adding that the Jewish state will be hounded until it is destroyed.

On the inspections front, Supreme Leader Khamenei has stated that he will "never" permit inspectors to inspect Iran's military bases. Even after the agreement was signed, the Iranian Minister of Defense reportedly said that "Tehran will not allow any foreigner to discover Iran's defensive and missile capabilities by inspecting the country's military sites."

Inspections under this agreement are anything but "anytime, anywhere"—the Obama Administration's previous pledge to the nation

and the world. We have learned that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has entered into a secret side agreement to preclude unfettered, robust inspection, and in another bizarre concession by the Administration and our negotiating partners, even allows Iran to self-monitor in certain circumstances.

Yet the agreement itself contains many limits on access by IAEA inspectors to suspected sites, including a 24-day period in which Iran is allowed to continue to refuse the IAEA's request to visit a facility followed by a very long process needed to increase pressure on Iran to permit access if it still blocks access by inspectors. During this period, Iran will have sufficient time to remove, cover up, or destroy any evidence. "Managed access" would be better called "manipulated access" as inspectors will get access to suspected sites only after consultations between the world powers and Iran, over nearly a month.

Given Iran's repeated cover-ups of its clandestine nuclear program, its refusal to give the IAEA access to its Parchin military facility (where Iran is believed to have tested detonators for nuclear warheads), and its stonewalling the IAEA concerning evidence that it had done extensive research and development on a nuclear explosive device, verification is fundamental to ensure that Iran is abiding by the agreement's terms. Secretary of State John Kerry, after an Iranian history of refusal to allow inspections at Parchin, would only assure us of inspections there "as appropriate," whatever that means.

Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman has said that pledges by Obama Administration officials that the agreement would guarantee "anywhere, anytime" inspections of Iran's nuclear facilities were only "rhetorical." Mere words without substance? Why would our allies in the region trust us if our word—and negotiating positions—are indeed only rhetorical flourish?

The key restriction on Iran's nuclear program—the ability to enrich at high levels—begins to expire in as little as 10 years. Once these restrictions expire, Iran could enrich on an industrial scale and the U.S. and its allies will be left with no effective measures to prevent Iran from initiating an accelerated nuclear program to produce the materials needed for a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Speaker, the IAEA has uncovered significant evidence that Iran has engaged in activities related to the development of a nuclear weapon. Despite many agreements with the IAEA in which Iran has pledged to provide satisfactory information, the IAEA has repeatedly said that Iran has given it virtually nothing. Secretary Kerry has said that the U.S. has "absolute knowledge" of Iran's past military activities regarding its nuclear program, but Gen. Michael Hayden, the former Director of the CIA, recently testified to Congress that the U.S. did not have that capability.

Furthermore, as witnesses testified at a joint hearing in July by three Foreign Affairs subcommittees, there is ample evidence that Iran has a longstanding nuclear collaboration with North Korea. In light of the abundant evidence they will present, what gives the Administration certainty that the Iranians won't at some point during this agreement acquire fissile material beyond what they are allowed to produce for themselves or actual warheads from North Korea?

Why was the Iran-North Korea nuclear collaboration not factored into the Iran nuclear

agreement? Surely Secretary Kerry is aware of the Iran-North Korea nuclear linkage. Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs Douglas Frantz, previously a high-ranking Kerry Senate aide, wrote a 2003 article about Iran's ties to the North Korean nuclear program. Are we to believe Frantz and Kerry never discussed this issue? He dodged the question at today's committee hearing.

Mr. Speaker, in March 2007, the UN Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1747 which, *inter alia*, established an embargo on the export from Iran of all arms and related materials, thereby banning all states and groups from purchasing or receiving arms from Iran. The resolution also called on all states to "exercise vigilance and restraint" in their supply of any items covered by the U.N. Register of Conventional Arms to Iran.

However, reports indicate that Russia is eager to sell massive amounts of military hardware to Iran. Major General Qassem Soleimani, Iran's Revolutionary Guard leader, recently visited Russia. How will this shape other regional conflicts in which Iran is currently involved, including Iraq, Syria, and Yemen? After the conventional arms embargo is lifted in just 5 years, what limitations, if any, will there be on Iran's ability to export arms, specifically heavy weapons? Besides Russia, who else will sell weapons to Iran? China?

Moreover, the Administration and its supporters of the Iranian nuclear agreement downplay the possibility of Saudi Arabia, for example, producing a nuclear weapon as part of a Middle East arms race. However, the Saudis are building King Abdullah City for Atomic Renewable Energy to train nuclear scientists and already have greater science and mathematics capacity than Pakistan had when it developed nuclear weapons. Why couldn't and why wouldn't the Saudis join the nuclear arms race when faced with a more nuclear and conventionally armed Iran? Secretary Kerry would have us believe that the Saudis and others in the region would prefer the current agreement to an effort to achieve a more effective one and would agree not to pursue nuclear weapons even though Iran is on the path to develop or acquire its own.

Mr. Speaker, ballistic missiles are a central component of any country's nuclear weapons program as they allow for the quick, accurate delivery of nuclear weapons over long distances. While the agreement calls for Iran to abide by all U.N. Security Council resolutions—including the requirement that "Iran shall not undertake any activity related to ballistic missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons," Iranian Supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei's criticized the call for Iran to end its ballistic missile program, characterizing it as "a stupid, idiotic expectation" and claiming "The Revolutionary Guards should definitely carry out their program and not be satisfied with the present level. They should mass produce."

In an 11th hour concession by the Obama Administration and others, the agreement "sunset" U.N. sanctions on Iran's ballistic missile program after 8 years, and also requires that the European Union do the same. U.S. intelligence estimates Iran to have the largest arsenal of ballistic missiles in the Middle East. Congress has received expert testimony that "no country that has not aspired to possess nuclear weapons has ever opted to sustain" a costly, long-range missile program.

Simply put, countries build ICBMs to deliver nukes.

Under this agreement, the Iranians have stated they are under no obligation to stop developing ballistic missiles. In fact, this agreement would allow them the two things they need to advance their program: money and foreign assistance.

Iran dared to insert ballistic missiles and conventional weapons into the nuclear negotiations without fear of disturbing the talks. Meanwhile, the Administration was reluctant to use its leverage during the negotiations to free the four Americans held hostage in Iran today. Pastor Saeed Abedini, Amir Hekmati, Jason Rezaian, and Robert Levinson remain in jail—abused, tortured or missing.

Mr. Speaker, the agreement requires “full implementation” by October 15 of the commitments in the “roadmap” made by Iran to the IAEA in their 2011 agreement, following which the IAEA is to provide its “final assessment on the resolution of all past and present outstanding issues.” However, there is no stated penalty if Iran continues to refuse to provide sufficient information to fully answer the IAEA’s questions, which Iran cannot do without admitting it had a secret nuclear weapons program.

Iran has repeatedly agreed to answer the IAEA’s questions regarding extensive evidence that it had a secret research and development program regarding a nuclear device, including fitting it onto a ballistic missile. All that resulted was the Iranians stonewalling the inspectors.

Is the failure to resolve the possible military dimensions as required by the IAEA a violation of the agreement? Why would Iran provide any information now when there is nothing in the agreement to compel it to do so?

Iran currently is the world’s leading supporter of terrorism, and this agreement provides funding that will drastically expand Iran’s regional destabilization efforts—from Israel to Iraq to Yemen to Lebanon and elsewhere. The Administration disputes the figure of \$150 billion to be released to Iran, but even a portion of that amount would provide significant resources to fund Iran’s terrorism in the region—threatening our allies in the region and global security.

Moreover, the Administration underestimates the revenue from both rising oil prices at some point and the tax revenues from increased commercial investment and activity.

Congress should oppose in any way possible the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, reinstate comprehensive, robust sanctions and direct the executive branch to resume the struggle to craft an enforceable accord to ensure no nuclear weapons capability for Iran—ever.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee’s Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the Iran nuclear agreement.

As the ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, I am acutely aware of the harmful influence Iran

and its proxies have on the security situation in the greater Middle East. However, despite my clear and deep distrust of Iran, I firmly support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, given the improvement it works.

This hard-fought multilateral agreement will severely limit Iran’s nuclear ambitions, establish a verifiable and robust inspection regime, allow for the timely reinstatement of sanctions for violations of this agreement, and in no way limit U.S. military options.

I cannot argue that the agreement is perfect, and I am frustrated at its limited scope. However, in any negotiation, especially one among sovereign nations, each having their own economic and security considerations, some compromise is necessary. Critically, I believe the agreement reached accomplishes the goal of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

I concur with the sentiments of my esteemed friend and former Senator Richard Lugar, who recently wrote that congressional rejection of the Iran deal would “kill the last chance for Washington to reach a verifiable Iranian commitment not to build a nuclear weapon” and “destroy the effective coalition that brought Iran to the negotiating table.”

I believe it is vital for the duration of the agreement that the U.S. leads the international community to maintain focus on Iran’s compliance and ensure that Iran does not undermine regional stability through other pathways. To accomplish this, we must remain steadfast in our commitments to Israel and all our regional partners.

I ask all to constructively work to improve the security situation in the Middle East, rather than using all of their energy to undermine the agreement. We cannot rely on force of arms alone to bring lasting stability to any region of the world.

In conclusion, I do hope that the exhaustive multilateral negotiation that led to this agreement will serve as a template for future U.S. and international engagement on other outstanding issues that have led to instability and violence in the region.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the chairman, the gentleman from California, for his leadership on this critical national security issue.

Mr. Speaker, this Iranian deal promises peace—peace in our time—by guaranteeing a nuclear weaponized Iran in our children’s time.

Anyone who has read the Iran Nuclear Agreement Act should support this legislation before us. The Iran Nuclear Agreement Act, known as the Corker bill, is to allow representatives of the American people—us—to read what is in the deal before we vote on the deal. The nuclear deal with Iran may be the most important international agreement in our lifetime.

The Corker bill is crystal clear when it comes to defining exactly what the President needs to provide Congress before the review period of 60 days begins. The President is obligated under the law—and let me read a portion of the law that the President signed. Here is what it says:

Congress is allowed to have the agreement itself and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements.

The logic behind this requirement is simple and essential: Congress cannot review an agreement without having access to everything, including the fine print. We need to see all the secret side deals, Mr. Chairman.

Testifying before the Foreign Affairs Committee, Secretary Kerry, who was making the deal for us, said that even he had not seen the secret side deals. And these secret deals are not just technical formalities. The deals I am talking about are the IAEA agreement to let Iran inspect itself at the Parchin military facility. The Parchin facility is known as the place where Iran has worked to build nuclear warheads.

There is absolutely nothing normal about allowing Iran to inspect itself. That is what this side agreement apparently does, if we ever get to see the whole thing.

I was a judge in Texas for a long time. It is like having a burglar coming to trial and saying: “Judge, I want 12 burglars on my jury.” We would never let that happen, but we will let Iran inspect itself? We want to see these side secret deals.

And these revelations may be only the tip of the iceberg. What else is included in these secret deals, these side deals? Well, we really don’t know because we haven’t been furnished—by law—these deals.

It is the legal right of Congress to know all of those details before voting to approve or disapprove this nuclear agreement. We in Congress are the representatives of the people. Isn’t it about time we start reading all the information before we vote? I don’t know that Congress has learned that lesson.

The citizens of this country have a right to know absolutely about these side deals. The President signed the Corker bill. It is the law. He has to live by it, whether he likes it or not.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. In 2002, the President of the United States and this Congress voted to address the perceived threat of a mushroom cloud coming from Iraq by going to war, a war that unleashed massive violence in the Middle East and threatens the world even today.

The Obama administration, faced with the actual threat of a nuclear weaponized Iran, has chosen, instead,

the path of diplomacy, the path of peace, and I am proud to support this historic agreement.

As the President said: "This deal demonstrates that American diplomacy can bring about real and meaningful change—change that makes our country, and the world, safer and more secure."

Voices inside and outside the Congress are calling for a rejection of this historic agreement, among them the same neocons who stampeded the United States into war with Iraq. They were wrong then, and they are wrong now. Iran is now 2 to 3 months from being able to produce a nuclear weapon, and yet the critics have offered no credible alternative to a deal that blocks all the paths to a nuclear weapon.

Now, we know this deal is not perfect. Iran is a bad actor. The President and all of us would have much preferred a deal that prohibits Iran from enriching any uranium forever and maintains sanctions until Iran changes its behavior and becomes a responsible member of the world community. But that deal didn't happen—because it never could have happened.

This deal greatly improves the outlook for peace by blocking all of Iran's paths to a nuclear weapon, and this is carefully spelled out in the agreement itself, often in very technical language: Iran's stockpiles of rich uranium will be reduced from enough for 10 bombs to less than 1; the number of Iran's installed centrifuges is reduced by over two-thirds; and far from trusting Iran, the deal demands the most robust, intrusive inspections regime ever in an international agreement.

We heard yesterday, many of us, from the ambassadors from five of our allies in the P5+1. These ambassadors said if the United States walks away, the deal collapses. Iran would be without any constraints to move ahead with its nuclear weapons program. All paths would be open. There would be no inspections whatsoever, no insight into Iran's activities. The ability of the United States to build meaningful international coalitions would be eroded for the foreseeable future.

I view this upcoming vote on Iran as one of the most important of my career, and, my colleagues, I would say that is true for everyone. It is one of the most important of my life. For me, the choice is clear: diplomacy over war.

Colleagues, let's remember, nothing is off the table. But why wouldn't we choose peace and give peace a chance?

□ 1500

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Part of diplomacy is making certain that you have verification, and our problem here is that the Iranians are boasting right now that the U.S. is not going to have access—or any other international inspectors are going to have access—to their military sites

where they do this work. The problem is that inspectors don't get 24 hours' notice; they get 24 days' notice, and then they go through a process in which Iran and China and Russia can block.

The former head of the CIA Michael Hayden testified in front of the Foreign Affairs Committee that we never believed that the uranium at Iran's declared facilities would ever make its way into a weapon. We always believed that that work would be done somewhere else, in secret.

So again, if you cannot get international inspectors into Parchin where they did that work, what makes you think, what makes us believe, that in the future we are going to have international inspectors, once that is the established premise, go anywhere else, go anywhere else?

As Hayden said, requiring consultations between the world powers in Iran takes inspections from the technical level and puts it at the political level, which he calls a formula for chaos, obfuscation, ambiguity, and doubt.

And we do not even know how bad the capitulation was in the site agreements, a capitulation that will undermine the ability to catch Iranian cheating. That is why we are concerned about the way this was negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO), the author of H. Res. 411.

Mr. POMPEO. Thank you, Chairman ROYCE. A great deal about what we have learned has come out of your committee, about what we have learned about this deal and what the Iranians' objectives are. So thank you for all the hard work that the Foreign Affairs Committee has done related to this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, there are lots of things to say about the Iranian deal that this President has set up, but this bill is very narrow and very simple and very straightforward. It is aimed to establish a simple precedent, which says, if the President signs something into law, he is going to fulfill the obligation which he has made for himself.

I have listened to the debate so far today. I can tell you that we have not had any Member of this House stand up and tell you that they have read the entire agreement. I suspect that we will not. That is because there is no American who has read the entire agreement. That is right—not the President of the United States, not the Secretary of State, not Undersecretary Sherman. No Member of Congress, no member of the public, no American citizen has read this entire agreement. And yet we have got Members who say: This a great deal, and I am excited to vote for it.

I don't know how one can feel that way about an agreement that one has not read.

We have Members of Congress stand up and demand that they see the text of bills that rename post offices, and yet this is a historic agreement, and

many of my colleagues are saying they are going to vote for it without even knowing what the details are about important components of how we are going to verify whether the Iranian regime has complied with this agreement. I think that is deeply troubling.

I think, as Representatives, we have a moral obligation to understand what it is we are voting on. I think we have a constitutional duty to require that the President comply with his obligations, and I know there is a legal obligation for the President to turn over every element of this deal.

Mr. Speaker, in July, Senator COTTON and I traveled to Vienna, where we were informed by the Deputy Director of the IAEA of these two secret side deals. He looked us straight in the eye and said he had read them but I wasn't going to get to.

I think that is wrong. I think that makes it impossible for a Member of Congress to support this agreement.

He informed me—that is, the Deputy Director of the IAEA informed me—that Iranians had read these two secret side deals, but Senator COTTON and I weren't going to get to reading them.

I have spent the intervening 50 days asking, cajoling, demanding, praying that this President would do what he is required to do under Corker-Cardin and what every Member of Congress is entitled to have—that is, provide us with the deal. Well, we don't have that.

H. Res. 411 simply says we, as Members of Congress, are going to demand that this President comply with what Corker-Cardin sets out. Show us the terms of the deal. Allow us the opportunity to read the agreement so that we can form judgments and the American people can form judgments about its scope.

In the absence of that, H. Res. 411 makes clear that the President can't lift sanctions. That was the deal. In exchange for not demanding that this be a treaty, Corker-Cardin said what we want is simple transparency; just show us the simple terms of the deal. And this President couldn't do it.

I ask all of my colleagues to vote for H. Res. 411 and demand that the President show us the secret side deals.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the chairman of the House Democratic Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the ranking member, Mr. SCHIFF, for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, the goal of America and the international community in our negotiations with Iran is and has been to prevent Iran from producing and possessing nuclear weapons. By all accounts, Iran had already reached a point where it was perhaps just months away from crossing that nuclear threshold—I repeat, months away; not years, not decades—months away.

So few votes can be taken more seriously than one intended to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. That is why

this Congress and the American people should support the agreement negotiated to prevent Iran from producing and possessing nuclear weapons, and we should vote here in this Congress against any of these congressional measures attempting to thwart its implementation.

The negotiated agreement provides for inspection and verification, a regime which Iran had to consent to and it must now submit to. That regime for inspection and verification is not just credible, it is enforceable, and those who have conducted nuclear inspections will tell you that. Ask those who deal with nuclear materials, and they will tell you that. And ask those who have butted heads with and had to negotiate with Iran, and they will tell you that.

Our ability to respond as well, should Iran decide to regress from its obligations, is real and it is robust. Nothing in this negotiated agreement is based on trust. The inspections, the penalties, they all are mandatory and unambiguous in their terms.

No deal is perfect. We can all think of ways of making a deal better. But thinking is not doing, and speculation won't stop Iran from reaching a nuclear weapons capability.

It should escape no one's notice that every measure, every economic sanction in place today against Iran has failed to stop Iran's lurch towards a nuclear weapon—remember, perhaps only months away from that nuclear threshold.

It was time for America and our international partners to take this to another level before the only alternative available to all of us was the use of military force. This is why the U.S., Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, and China joined together to force and drive Iran to the negotiated agreement.

How often, these days, can we utter the names of those six countries together working for the same cause?

This agreement constitutes a meaningful and enforceable check on Iran's nuclear ambitions and any intentions it might have to cheat.

Back in July when this agreement was reached, I stated that it "must constitute measurable progress in halting nuclear proliferation, driving the region and the world further away from nuclear Armageddon."

The negotiated agreement meets that test, and with the support of Great Britain, Germany, France, yes, even Russia, and, yes, even China, we will hold Iran to that test. And that is why we should support the negotiated agreement.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in firm opposition to the Iran nuclear deal. This deal represents a direct threat to the United States, Israel, and the world.

Recently, I visited Israel and met with Prime Minister Netanyahu. Prime

Minister Netanyahu was firm in his warning—this is a very bad deal, and it could result in grave consequences for the world.

First, this deal allows Iran to continue to enrich uranium that can be used to develop a nuclear weapon.

Second, this deal abandons the President's promise of anytime, anywhere inspections to a process that allows Iran to delay up to 24 days.

Third, this agreement would result in the comprehensive lifting of the economic sanctions that have stifled Iran's quest for a nuclear weapon.

Bottom line, this deal presents far too many risks for the U.S. and far too many rewards for Iran. When the Ayatollah chants "death to America," he means it, and that should cause serious concern in every American citizen.

It is time for America to wake up and understand the danger and threat this deal presents to our national security.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

First, I want to address briefly the very strained interpretation I think my friends are giving the Corker legislation. To accept the arguments of the opposition to the deal, you would have to accept the proposition that the Corker legislation requires the administration to provide an agreement between the IAEA and Iran to which the United States is not a party, to which the United States has no obligation, and of which the IAEA is precluded from providing to the administration. That seems to me a very farfetched interpretation of the Corker legislation.

What's more, if you accept the argument that we can't have a vote on the agreement until we have this document between the IAEA and Iran, then why has the majority scheduled a vote on the agreement for tomorrow? So it is inconsistent with what their own majority has scheduled.

But finally, I don't think anyone is fooled by the nature of this procedural motion or bill. No one expects, in the least, that anyone who has voiced their opposition to the agreement is somehow going to change their opinion if they have access to this private document between the IAEA and Iran. What's more, as we know, the IAEA enters into these agreements with individual nations around the world, so this is not at all unique to the situation with Iran.

One final point I would like to make: We are now well into the debate on the agreement, and for all the arguments that have been advanced as to why we should have concerns about provisions in the agreement or concerns about Iranian behavior, many of which I share, there is one thing we have heard precious little about from the opposition to the deal, and that is, what is the credible alternative?

So, I ask the question: What is the credible alternative?

And the answer, from what I am able to divine from the scarce attention that the opposition pays to this—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield myself an additional minute.

The answer, as far as I can discern from the opposition to the deal, is this: This is how the alternative would work.

Congress rejects the deal. Congress, the administration, then, somehow goes out and persuades the rest of the world to maintain sanctions, even when we rejected an agreement adopted by the other major powers, and even when those other powers tell us explicitly that there will be no new negotiations. But somehow we maintain the sanctions regime under this theoretical alternative.

And what? Iran gives up all enrichment and comes back to the table prepared to capitulate everything?

That seems so fanciful, so far removed from the reality of the situation, that it is no surprise that the opposition devotes very little, if any, time to discussing a credible alternative, because, indeed, there is no credible alternative.

So, again, this is why I think it is so important for us to focus on how we can strengthen the constraints in the agreement, mitigate the risks that we will face, and that is a much more constructive path forward than rejection of this, seeing Iran going back to spinning up its centrifuges, picking up where they left off at 20 percent enrichment and going beyond, picking up where they left off with 19,000 more centrifuges and thousands of kilos of uranium.

Is that really the path we want to go down? I think not.

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

□ 1515

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

There was a credible alternative. There was a credible alternative that this body passed by a vote of 400–20, bipartisan legislation which the administration blocked in the Senate, legislation which would have put that additional pressure on the regime in Iran.

Knowing that the United States is the 800-pound gorilla, knowing that countries do not have the option and companies around the world do not have the option of making a choice when they have to make that choice between doing business with the United States or doing business with Iran, they have to do business with the United States.

We have put that bill into the Senate. The administration blocked it. That legislation would have ensured the type of pressure on Iran that would have forced the Ayatollah to make a choice between real compromise—real compromise—on his plan to construct a weapon or economic collapse for that regime.

We would have had that leverage in this negotiation. That leverage was

given up by this administration by blocking that bill in the Senate in the last Congress. And, frankly, that option is still available to us.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is September 11, a solemn day in our history when thousands of Americans lost their lives in the worst terror attack in our history.

It is disturbing that we happen to be debating whether a state sponsor of terror should have a glide path to nuclear weapons at this time. But we are.

I have been a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for a long time, almost 20 years now. I chaired the Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

I can tell you without any reservation that this deal with Iran is a disaster. It will weaken the security of our allies in the region, and it will make Americans less safe here at home.

If this deal goes through, Iran will receive up to \$150 billion. That is 25 times what Iran currently spends on its entire military. Does that seem like a good idea?

We are talking about the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism here. This money will fund more and more terror across the globe and here.

My district is the greater Cincinnati area. GE aircraft engines is headquartered there. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is just up the road. They have been top potential targets for ICBMs, intercontinental ballistic missiles, since the cold war.

This deal allows Iran to get more sophisticated ICBM technology from Russia, which will allow them to target not only Tel Aviv, but Washington and New York and Cincinnati. This is just nuts.

What happened to the "anytime, anywhere" inspections? Gone. It will take months to get the inspectors in. And, by that time, they will have moved the incriminating evidence elsewhere.

The bottom line is the Obama administration wanted a deal, any deal, more than the Iranian mullahs did. This administration was willing to sell out Israel and our allies in the region and make us less safe here at home.

This is a lousy, lousy deal, and it ought to be rejected.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to take a brief moment to respond to my colleague from California.

I wish it were so simple that a credible alternative was the passage of a bill in Congress that had not passed before that we could pass now and, through the mere act of our legislation, compel the rest of the world to join us in a new negotiation and a stronger round of sanctions. We simply don't have that power to coerce the rest of the world with a bill we pass here in Congress.

What is more, to imagine that a new sanctions bill will somehow force Iran to come back to the table ready to concede its entire enrichment program is simply not credible. If that is what we are left with, we are really left with no really good alternative.

Again, I think that is precisely why we need to move forward with the agreement that has been reached between the world powers and Iran.

At this point, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the Iran nuclear agreement is fundamental to the national security of the United States.

I applaud the tremendous efforts of Secretary Kerry and Secretary Moniz, who worked in concert with the world's most powerful military and economic nations to reach a verifiable agreement that will deny the ability of Iran to develop a nuclear weapon.

In a past era, when politics was civil and foreign policy was bipartisan, this diplomatic agreement would have been championed by Republicans and Democrats as a nonproliferation triumph, as it is today in Great Britain, our greatest ally. This agreement will prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

As an Israeli intelligence analyst has said, "This is not about trust and goodwill between sides. It is the strict inspection and verification regimes that will ensure the success of the agreement."

And if Iran violates the agreement, sanctions will "snap back" and the international community together will take action.

I strongly support this agreement, and I am grateful for President Obama's unwavering leadership in the face of hostile and unprecedented attacks from Republicans and Israel's Prime Minister.

The New York Times calls the Republican efforts a "vicious battle against Mr. Obama" and an "unseemly spectacle of lawmakers siding with a foreign leader against their own Commander in Chief."

I want to be crystal clear: I support our Commander in Chief.

The Republicans and Israeli opponents of this agreement are the same neocons who sold the war in Iraq to America based on lies, distortions, and misinformation.

And now what do the Republicans offer as an alternative? Nothing. They have no plan, no plan other than to kill this agreement, which means that Iran will either obtain a nuclear weapon or the U.S. goes to war to stop them. Well, let me tell you: I am not interested in another Republican war in the Middle East.

Now is the time to put the national security of the American people first. Let's reject this Republican game playing and support a tough diplomatic agreement that will stop Iran from gaining a nuclear weapon.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice strong opposition to this fatally flawed Iran deal.

By signing the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, the President agreed to allow all documents, secret annexes, and side deals to be reviewed by the U.S. Congress.

But, once again, President Obama has not complied with the law of the land and, therefore, does not have the authority to waive sanctions on Iran.

By lifting sanctions on the Iranian regime, a nation that finances the likes of Hezbollah, Hamas, and other terrorist groups will receive over \$100 billion in assets and no doubt will continue to fund terrorist organizations at probably greater levels than they are able to do today, those terrorist organizations with the motto "death to America."

Have we learned nothing from our past mistakes? The same person that negotiated the deal with North Korea also led the discussions with Iran.

We must ask ourselves, Is the world a safer place when unstable nations like North Korea are testing nuclear weapons?

The number one responsibility of the United States Congress charged to us in the Constitution is national security.

This agreement jeopardizes our security because I believe, as the Prime Minister of Israel believes, that this will ensure that Iran will get a nuclear weapon.

For the security of America and our friends and allies around the world, we must oppose this agreement.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend him for his extraordinary leadership as the ranking member on the Intelligence Committee, which has served us so well.

His leadership has served us so well in this debate today and in our deliberations leading up to this debate. It has served us well in the ongoing as we use intelligence to protect the American people. So I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

I did not go to the well as usual for the leader, but I wanted to be here because I have some materials that I want to share with you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think today and tomorrow, the next 24 hours, is a very, very special time in the Congress of the United States. Members will be called upon to make a decision that affects our oath of office, to protect and support the Constitution and, of course, the American people.

This is a moment that we are prepared for. That is what I have this

binder here for, to say I commend my colleagues because they have spent thousands of hours reviewing the agreement, reviewing the annexes and the classified materials, speaking with experts, gaining information, acquiring validation from outside sources other than the administration and the agreement itself, conversations with each other, conversations with their constituents, all to have, again, a sense of humility that we all don't know everything about this subject.

And we have to get our assurances from those whose judgment we respect, as well as to support this agreement on the merits. It is a very fine agreement.

I will take a moment just to talk about my own credentials because I see that people are doing that in their statements. I read with interest Senator MENENDEZ' statement where he talks about his service in the Senate, and I will talk about mine in the House.

For over 20 years, I have served as a member of the Intelligence Committee both as a member of the committee, as the top Democrat on the committee, and as the Speaker and leader ex officio over the years, longer than anyone in the history of the Congress.

I went to the Intelligence Committee because I had a major concern which sprang from my district, which was a very big interest there in stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Plowshares, an organization dedicated to that purpose, was founded there. They saluted President Reagan and the actions that he took when he was President. And they are very actively supporting this agreement now.

But I mentioned my credentials because I brought that experience to make a judgment on the agreement after it was negotiated.

Of course we were briefed, as members of the committee and members of the leadership, on the ongoing as to the progress that was being made in negotiations.

Again, having been briefed all along the way, I still was pleasantly pleased to see what the final product was. What the President negotiated was remarkable. It was remarkable in several respects.

One was that the P5, the permanent members of the Security Council, plus one—that would be Germany—the P5 nations negotiated this agreement with Iran: China, Russia, France, the U.K., the United States.

This is quite remarkable, that all of those countries could come to agreement. And an important part of that leadership was the leadership of President Obama to have that engagement sustained over a couple-year period.

Now, President Bush took us a bit down this path, and that is referenced in an op-ed that was put forth by Brent Scowcroft.

When he supported this legislation, he says that "The deal ensures that this will be the case for at least 15 years and likely longer."

But he talks about the fact that this has been a goal, as what Ronald Reagan did with the Soviet Union arms control and what President Nixon did with China. It was a negotiation.

And he talked about the fact that this particular agreement was one that was worked on under the presidency of President Bush. Actually, he places it in time.

So let me read his comment:

"Congress again faces a momentous decision regarding U.S. policy toward the Middle East. The forthcoming vote on the nuclear deal between the P5+1 and Iran (known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or JCPOA) will show the world whether the United States has the will and sense of responsibility to help stabilize the Middle East, or whether it will contribute to further turmoil, including the possible spread of nuclear weapons. Strong words perhaps, but clear language is helpful in the cacophony of today's media.

"In my view, the JCPOA"—as it is known—"meets the key objective, shared by recent administrations of both parties, that Iran limit itself to a strictly civilian nuclear program with unprecedented verification and monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency and the U.N. Security Council."

He goes on for a couple of pages.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit for the RECORD Brent Scowcroft's statement.

[From the Washington Post, August 23, 2015]

THE IRAN DEAL: AN EPOCHAL MOMENT THAT CONGRESS SHOULDN'T SQUANDER

(By Brent Scowcroft)

Congress again faces a momentous decision regarding U.S. policy toward the Middle East. The forthcoming vote on the nuclear deal between the P5+1 and Iran (known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or JCPOA) will show the world whether the United States has the will and sense of responsibility to help stabilize the Middle East, or whether it will contribute to further turmoil, including the possible spread of nuclear weapons. (Strong words perhaps, but clear language is helpful in the cacophony of today's media)

In my view, the JCPOA meets the key objective, shared by recent administrations of both parties, that Iran limit itself to a strictly civilian nuclear program with unprecedented verification and monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency and the U.N. Security Council. Iran has committed to never developing or acquiring a nuclear weapon; the deal ensures that this will be the case for at least 15 years and likely longer, unless Iran repudiates the inspection regime and its commitments under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and Additional Protocol.

There is no more credible expert on nuclear weapons than Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz, who led the technical negotiating team. When he asserts that the JCPOA blocks each of Iran's pathways to the fissile material necessary to make a nuclear weapon, responsible people listen. Twenty-nine eminent U.S. nuclear scientists have endorsed Moniz's assertions.

If the United States could have handed Iran a "take it or leave it" agreement, the terms doubtless would have been more onerous on Iran. But negotiated agreements, the

only ones that get signed in times of peace, are compromises by definition. It is what President Reagan did with the Soviet Union on arms control; it is what President Nixon did with China.

And as was the case with specific agreements with the Soviet Union and China, we will continue to have significant differences with Iran on important issues, including human rights, support for terrorist groups and meddling in the internal affairs of neighbors. We must never tire of working to persuade Iran to change its behavior on these issues, and countering it where necessary. And while I believe the JCPOA, if implemented scrupulously by Iran, will help engage Tehran constructively on regional issues, we must always remember that its sole purpose is to halt the country's nuclear weapons activities.

Israel's security, an abiding U.S. concern, will be enhanced by the full implementation of the nuclear deal. Iran is fully implementing the interim agreement that has placed strict limits on its nuclear program since January 2014 while the final agreement was being negotiated. If Iran demonstrates the same resolve under the JCPOA, the world will be a much safer place. And if it does not, we will know in time to react appropriately.

Let us not forget that Israel is the only country in the Middle East with overwhelming retaliatory capability. I have no doubt that Iran's leaders are well aware of Israel's military capabilities. Similarly, the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) members have impressive conventional militaries, and the United States is committed to enhancing their capabilities.

Congress rightfully is conducting a full review and hearing from proponents and opponents of the nuclear deal. However, the seeming effort to make the JCPOA the ultimate test of Congress's commitment to Israel is probably unprecedented in the annals of relations between two vibrant democracies. Let us be clear: There is no credible alternative were Congress to prevent U.S. participation in the nuclear deal. If we walk away, we walk away alone. The world's leading powers worked together effectively because of U.S. leadership. To turn our back on this accomplishment would be an abdication of the United States' unique role and responsibility, incurring justified dismay among our allies and friends. We would lose all leverage over Iran's nuclear activities. The international sanctions regime would dissolve. And no member of Congress should be under the illusion that another U.S. invasion of the Middle East would be helpful.

So I urge strongly that Congress support this agreement. But there is more that Congress should do. Implementation and verification will be the key to success, and Congress has an important role. It should ensure that the International Atomic Energy Agency, other relevant bodies and U.S. intelligence agencies have all the resources necessary to facilitate inspection and monitor compliance. Congress should ensure that military assistance, ballistic missile defense and training commitments that the United States made to GCC leaders at Camp David in May are fully funded and implemented without delay. And it should ensure that the United States works closely with the GCC and other allies to moderate Iranian behavior in the region, countering it where necessary.

My generation is on the sidelines of policymaking now; this is a natural development. But decades of experience strongly suggest that there are epochal moments that should not be squandered. President Nixon realized it with China. Presidents Reagan and George H.W. Bush realized it with the Soviet Union. And I believe we face it with Iran today.

□ 1530

Ms. PELOSI. I also want to quote another Republican—Brent Scowcroft served in the administration of President George Herbert Walker Bush—Senator John Warner joined Senator Carl Levin. These are two chairmen of the Senate Armed Services Committee—one a Democrat, but before him, a Republican, John Warner. They talk about they support this. They say:

The deal on the table is a strong agreement on many counts, and it leaves in place the robust deterrence and credibility of a military option. We urge our former colleagues not to take any action which would undermine the deterrent value of a coalition that participates in and could support the use of a military option. The failure of the United States to join the agreement would have that effect.

Mr. Speaker, I submit Carl Levin and John Warner's statement for the RECORD.

WHY HAWKS SHOULD ALSO BACK THE IRAN DEAL

(By Carl Levin and John Warner)

We both were elected to the Senate in 1978 and privileged to have served together on the Senate Armed Services Committee for 30 years, during which we each held committee leadership positions of chairman or ranking minority member. We support the Iran Agreement negotiated by the United States and other leading world powers for many reasons, including its limitations on Iran's nuclear activities, its strong inspections regime, and the ability to quickly re-impose sanctions should Iran violate its provisions.

But we also see a compelling reason to support the agreement that has gotten little attention: Rejecting it would weaken the deterrent value of America's military option.

As former chairmen of the Senate Armed Services Committee, we have always believed that the U.S. should keep a strong military option on the table. If Iran pursues a nuclear weapon, some believe that military action is inevitable if we're to prevent it from reaching its goal. We don't subscribe to that notion, but we are skeptical that, should Iran attempt to consider moving to a nuclear weapon, we could deter them from pursuing it through economic sanctions alone.

How does rejecting the agreement give America a weaker military hand to play? Let's imagine a world in which the United States rejects the nuclear accord that all other parties have embraced. The sanctions now in place would likely not be maintained and enforced by all the parties to the agreement, so those would lose their strong deterrent value. Iran would effectively argue to the world that it had been willing to negotiate an agreement, only to have that agreement rejected by a recalcitrant America.

In that world, should we find credible evidence that Iran is starting to move toward a nuclear weapon, the United States would almost certainly consider use of the military option to stop that program. But it's highly unlikely that our traditional European allies, let alone China and Russia, would support the use of the military option since we had undermined the diplomatic path. Iran surely would know this, and so from the start, would have less fear of a military option than if it faced a unified coalition.

While the United States would certainly provide the greatest combat power in any military action, allies and other partners make valuable contributions—not just in direct participation, but also in access rights,

logistics, intelligence, and other critical support. If we reject the agreement, we risk isolating ourselves and damaging our ability to assemble the strongest possible coalition to stop Iran.

In short, then, rejecting the Iran deal would erode the current deterrent value of the military option, making it more likely Iran might choose to pursue a nuclear weapon, and would then make it more costly for the U.S. to mount any subsequent military operation. It would tie the hands of any future president trying to build international participation and support for military force against Iran should that be necessary.

Those who think the use of force against Iran is almost inevitable should want the military option to be as credible and effective as possible, both as a deterrent to Iran's nuclear ambitions and in destroying Iran's nuclear weapons program should that become necessary. For that to be the case, the United States needs to be a party to the agreement rather than being the cause of its collapse.

In our many years on the Armed Services Committee, we saw time and again how America is stronger when we fight alongside allies. Iran must constantly be kept aware that a collective framework of deterrence stands resolute, and that if credible evidence evolves that Iran is taking steps towards a nuclear arsenal, it would face the real possibility of military action by a unified coalition of nations to stop their efforts.

The deal on the table is a strong agreement on many counts, and it leaves in place the robust deterrence and credibility of a military option. We urge our former colleagues not to take any action which would undermine the deterrent value of a coalition that participates in and could support the use of a military option. The failure of the United States to join the agreement would have that effect.

Ms. PELOSI. Again, I refer to the statements of my colleagues. They are thoughtful; they are serious, and they are courageous in support of the agreement.

I would like to thank President Obama and the entire administration for being available as Members sought clarification to respond to their concerns. I want to thank the President, Secretary Kerry, Secretary Moniz, Secretary Lew, and so many others for their leadership and availability to us in a bipartisan way in our Democratic Caucus.

For years, Iran's rapidly accelerating enrichment capability and burgeoning nuclear stockpile has represented one of the greatest threats to peace and security anywhere in the world. We all stipulate to that. That is why we need an agreement.

That is why I am so pleased that we have so many statements of validation from people. The experts say:

This agreement is one of the greatest diplomatic achievements of the 21st century.

It is no wonder that such a diverse and extraordinary constellation of experts have made their voices heard in support of this—again, I use the word—“extraordinary” accord.

On the steps of the Capitol the other day with our veterans and with our Gold Star moms who have lost their sons, we heard the words of diplomats and soldiers, generals and admirals and diplomats by the score—Democrats, Republicans, and nonpartisan.

We heard from our most distinguished nuclear physicists; we heard from those scientists, and we heard from people of faith. I would like to quote some of them. More than 100 Democratic and Republican former diplomats and ambassadors wrote:

In our judgment, the JCPOA deserves congressional support and the opportunity to show that it can work. We firmly believe that the most effective way to protect U.S. national security and that of our allies and friends is to ensure that tough-minded diplomacy has a chance to succeed before considering other more risky alternatives.

That is the diplomats.

The generals and admirals wrote:

There is no better option to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon. If the Iranians cheat, our advanced technology, intelligence, and the inspections will reveal it, and U.S. military options remain on the table. And if the deal is rejected by America, the Iranians could have a nuclear weapon within a year. The choice is that stark.

Twenty-nine of our Nation's most prominent nuclear scientists and engineers wrote:

We consider that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action the United States and its partners negotiated with Iran will advance the cause of peace and security in the Middle East and can serve as a guidepost for future nonproliferation agreements.

I quote “and can serve as a guidepost for future nonproliferation agreements.”

This is an innovative agreement, with much more stringent constraints than any previously negotiated nonproliferation framework.

They went on to say more.

Mr. Speaker, 440 rabbis urged Congress to endorse the statement, writing:

The Obama administration has successfully brought together the major international powers to confront Iran over its nuclear ambitions. The broad international sanctions move Iran to enter this historic agreement.

They urge support.

Mr. Speaker, 4,100 Catholic nuns wrote to Congress stating:

As women of faith, followers of the one who said, “Blessed are the peacemakers,” we urge that you risk on the side of peace and vote to approve the Iran nuclear deal.

Treasury Secretary Jack Lew warned of the hazards of rejecting the agreement, reminding us that foreign governments will not continue to make costly sacrifices at our demand. I say this in response to something that my distinguished colleague from California said:

Indeed, they would be more likely to blame us for walking away from a credible solution to one of the world's greatest security threats and would continue to reengage with Iran.

He went on to say:

Instead of toughening the sanctions, the decision by Congress to unilaterally reject the deal will end a decade of isolation of Iran and put the United States at odds with the rest of the world.

We certainly don't want to do that.

Today, something very interesting happened, Mr. Speaker. It was a statement put forth by U.K. Prime Minister

David Cameron, French President Francois Hollande, and German Chancellor Angela Merkel. They wrote an op-ed for the Washington Post and said:

This is an important moment. It is a crucial opportunity at a time of heightened global uncertainty to show what diplomacy can achieve.

This is not an agreement based on trust or any assumption about how Iran may look in 10 or 15 years. It is based on detailed, tightly written controls that are verifiable and long-lasting.

They went on to say:

We condemn in no uncertain terms that Iran does not recognize the existence of the State of Israel and the unacceptable language that Iran's leaders use about Israel. Israel's security matters are and will remain our key interests, too. We would not have reached the nuclear deal with Iran if we did not think that it removed a threat to the region and the nonproliferation regime as a whole.

We are confident that the agreement provides the foundation for resolving a conflict on Iran's nuclear program permanently. This is why we now want to embark on the full implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, once all national procedures are complete.

Our own President wrote to Congressman JERRY NADLER:

I believe that JCPOA, which cuts off every pathway Iran could have to a nuclear weapon and creates the most robust verification regime ever negotiated to monitor a nuclear program, is a very good deal for the United States, for the State of Israel, and for the region as a whole.

Many of us share the views that had been expressed by those in a position to make a difference on this agreement.

Tuesday night, again after the votes here in this House, dozens of Members supporting the nuclear agreement stood on the steps of the Capitol. We were honored to be joined by military veterans and Gold Star families, men and women whose sacrifices remind us of the significance of putting diplomacy before war. They remind us of the significance of this historic transformational achievement.

Congratulations. These nuclear physicists, they congratulated the President on this agreement. I congratulate him, too.

Our men and women in uniform and our veterans and our Gold Star moms remind us of our first duty, to protect and defend the American people. I am pleased to say we achieve that with this agreement.

I urge my colleagues to support the agreement and to vote "no" on the other items that are being put before us today.

I think we all have to, as we evaluate our decision, ask ourselves: If we were the one deciding vote as to whether this agreement would go forward or that we would fall behind, how would we vote? None of us has the luxury to walk away from that responsibility.

I am proud of the statements that our colleagues have made, the agreement the President has reached; and I

know that tomorrow we will sustain whatever veto the President may have to make.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the deputy chief whip and a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this important matter of national security.

Today, I rise in opposition to this bad nuclear deal the President has negotiated. I don't oppose it because the President negotiated it. I don't oppose it because it was brought forth by this administration.

I oppose it because it is bad for the security of America. It is bad for the security of the world. It is bad for the security of our most sacred ally, Israel. It is bad for the nonproliferation strategies the world has had to mean that we have fewer nuclear weapons on this planet.

Now, you have to ask yourself a few basic questions: Has Iran warranted the trust of the international community to enter into this agreement? The answer is no. It is very clear by their actions over the last 20 and 30 years that they should not be trusted.

Number two, we hear the Supreme Leader of Iran saying, time and again, "death to America and Israel." He has declared his nation is committed to the destruction of Israel. He has called America the Great Satan.

Now, how can we believe a country is fully committed to our destruction yet, at the same time, uphold their end of the bargain? We can't. We must oppose this agreement based off of what is best for international security and what is best for our Nation's security.

We also have to oppose this because it will mean, during my lifetime or during my children's lifetime, we will have more nuclear weapons, not fewer.

This is a bad agreement, and we should reject it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time and the ability to control the time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, since 1998, I have had the privilege of sending a group of high school students each year to Israel where they are paired with Israeli teens to learn about what life is really like in Israel.

When these students return, they have learned life lessons that stay with them forever, but just as important, they have made friendships that will also last a lifetime.

I am a proud and strong friend and ally of Israel, and I have been for a very long time. This is why I believe we must support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and why I am here

to oppose the resolution. The world cannot tolerate a nuclear-armed Iran, and I will not stand by as Iran continues to gain ground towards that objective.

This agreement puts real, concrete steps in place to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons, steps that have already begun to degrade Iran's ability to produce nuclear material.

According to the independent experts, this deal "effectively blocks the plutonium pathway for more than 15 years." These experts also assess that, without the deal, Iran may shrink its breakout time to a few weeks or even days.

The steps outlined in the agreement complement existing prohibitions on the development of a nuclear weapon by Iran.

□ 1545

Under this agreement, the international community will have unprecedented access to ensure that Iran never gets one.

This agreement will not be monitored merely according to the goodwill of Iran. Its enforcement mechanisms are verifiable and transparent.

Under this agreement, there will be more inspectors than ever in Iran. These inspectors will have daily access to Iran's declared nuclear sites and will be able to have access to undeclared sites that they suspect may be involved in nuclear activity. Inspections will be regular, and they will be invasive. They will not be oriented around Iranian convenience but, rather, around compliance, ensuring that the international community remains safe and, indeed, informed.

If at any time Iran is found to be in violation of the agreement, the full brunt of international sanctions will snap back, once again hobbling the Iranian economy.

It is important to note that many sanctions will still be in place. Relief will come only from those sanctions related to nuclear activities. Bans on technology exports, restrictions against the transfer of conventional weaponry and WMD technology, sanctions based on terrorism activities, and bans on foreign assistance will all continue.

Without this deal, experts estimate that Iran will have enough nuclear material for weapons in 2 or 3 months. During negotiations, Iran stopped installing centrifuges, but they will resume if this agreement falls apart, potentially accelerating that timeline.

The opponents of this agreement propose rejecting this deal and pursuing a stronger one, but that plan could have grave consequences. If the United States rejects this deal, Iran will continue developing more sophisticated enrichment technologies. By the time any new negotiations begin, Iran would likely already be a nuclear state. There is also no guarantee that Iran would return to the negotiating table after having wasted 2 years on this agreement.

Is this worth the risk? I do not believe that it is. We should support this agreement.

This agreement accomplishes a critical goal: establishing a set of verifiable provisions to prevent Iran from developing enough nuclear material to build a bomb.

This deal does not change, in any way, our solemn commitment to protecting Israel, nor does this prevent us from using any other measures if Iran should violate this agreement, including using the full force of the strongest military in the world.

But the United States must lead not only with our military might; we have worked diligently to achieve a peaceful resolution to this issue, and it is time for us to show our integrity and values for which we stand.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), a true American hero who served this country with distinction in Korea and in Vietnam and as a prisoner of war for nearly 7 years.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, at this grave hour, I come to express my opposition to President Obama's deal with Iran.

To this day, Iran chants "death to America." In fact, Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. Its regime has the blood of America's servicemembers on its hands.

Iran is our enemy.

The President asks us to trust Iran; but what has Iran done to earn our trust? Nothing. This is a deal of surrender, and, with it, Iran will go nuclear.

The alternative isn't war. The alternative is to strike a better deal. I say this as one of the few Members of Congress who has seen combat, who has fought two wars, and who has spent nearly 7 years as a POW.

So I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Do the right thing. Put country above party. Listen to the American people. Uphold your most sacred duty—safeguard our Republic from those who seek to destroy it. Vote this deal down.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend for yielding to me on this important subject for our country today and in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, while many Republicans have been trying to find a way, just this very day, not to have a vote on the Iran agreement, I have been searching for a way to represent my 650,000 constituents by voting on any version offered. Five nations, whose systems differ from one another in every conceivable way, and the United Nations have approved this deal, but the Republicans are torn on whether to even vote on the deal at all.

No wonder.

Left with no credible argument against the deal, itself, Republicans have changed the subject, even knowing that Iran is close to getting the bomb as I speak and risking the loss of U.S. international credibility. Instead, Republicans cite side agreements. However, they have all of the information available to any nation on all nuclear agreements, or they cite issues not under negotiation at all, like Iran's role in the Middle East.

Here is what my constituents cite, Mr. Speaker:

\$12,000 in Federal taxes per resident—the most per capita in the United States—but no vote on the Iran deal or on anything else on this House floor. With statehood, D.C. would vote "yes" and be counted just as Uncle Sam counts our taxes every single year.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank the chairman for yielding this time. I thank him for his strong leadership to reject this administration's agreement with Iran.

Mr. Speaker, this deal is a dramatic reversal of U.S. policy in the Middle East and towards the Iranian Government. For years, the Iranian Government has actively opposed U.S. interests in the region and has directly financed some of the world's most oppressive terrorist groups, most notably, Hezbollah.

As a result of this agreement, over \$100 billion will be released from repatriated oil profits back to the mullahs in Iran, and 46 banks in Iran will now be approved to transmit money through the international financial system. Look at what they have done previously with their finances. We gave them \$700 million a month as a precondition just to come to the negotiations—\$12 billion over a 16-month period. You can see their footprint in Lebanon; you can see it in Iraq; you can see it in Yemen; you can see it in Syria; you can see it in South America.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing today is going to translate into increased, enhanced terrorist activities throughout the world. May we look back on this day as one of the most consequential votes we will take tomorrow in this Chamber, as consequential as what we did in declaring war against Japan and Germany. May we recognize the reality of what is taking place.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the distinguished ranking member of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak as a freshman Member of this body who has been able to learn a great deal about this difficult, difficult area of the world—a place where America has invested too many lives and too much

money—and to talk about my journey in coming to the decision to vote with the President and feeling like he deserves a congratulatory note for this accomplishment in a very difficult and complex piece of diplomacy, perhaps equal to the difficulty and the complexity of this area of the world which has had so much turmoil and history.

I have spent the last 60 days taking every opportunity to listen to constituents and experts.

I, with a small group of my freshman colleagues, have been personally briefed at the White House by President Obama. I traveled to Israel for the first time and met with high-level Israeli officials for almost 2 hours, including with Prime Minister Netanyahu. I learned about the 3,000 years of history and animosity amongst groups and also of the very close proximity in which those groups have lived for thousands of years and shared their difficult history. I met with leaders of our international coalition, and I continue to be a staunch supporter of the U.S.-Israeli relationship as, I believe, most of my colleagues on both sides are.

I held six townhalls—a certain measure of masochism, perhaps, by a freshman Member—that took hours, meeting with both pro and opponents in my district, in the San Francisco Bay Area. We received over 1,000 phone calls, emails, and constituent questions on this issue, and more than 70 percent of them were in favor of the proposal.

Ultimately, at the heart of my decision in supporting a deal is the possibility that this deal promotes the long-term investment in peace on this difficult part of our planet. In addition, it creates security and stability, ultimately, for the United States. I believe that this accord is our best option for achieving both of those goals.

As recently as yesterday, I was able to listen to advisers and leaders who represent our coalition partners. The sanctions regime, due in large part to the European Union's participation, deflated Iran's economy and forced them to the negotiating table. In 2012, Iran's economy shrank for the first time in two decades by almost 2 percent.

This is the final proposal, I believe, if the U.S. were to withdraw. Our coalition partners that helped negotiate this deal and create the ability and the leverage to negotiate will not come back to the table. Our authority and standing in the world community will be severely diminished.

There are some who say that Iran cannot be trusted, and I think we all agree on that. The future of this rollout is not black-and-white, and it has many unknowns and hypotheticals on both the supporters' and the opponents' sides. We do not know if Iran will cheat, but we do know that oversight and compliance is strong and consequential, and consequences for cheating will be enforced by the international community.

In my view, it is in the national security interests of the United States of

America to support this agreement. It is an opportunity to let diplomacy work and to put it in action.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disapproval of President Obama's deal with Iran.

I ask myself this question: Has Iran earned the right to be trusted?

We must ask this because we know there are secret deals that my colleagues and I were not privileged to. Therefore, a vote to support this deal is a vote to trust Iran.

The behavior of Iran's leaders over the last 30 years offers no indication that the next decade will be any different; and now, with these secret details, we cannot know if the deal is verifiable, enforceable, and accountable.

The people who know Iran best trust them the least. Iran's neighbors have already requested additional arms from the United States to protect themselves from this very deal. Any deal should include these three powerful principles: safety, security, stability. This deal falls short, and I cannot support it.

□ 1600

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this has probably been one of the most difficult decisions I have had to make during my time in Congress. For the record, I still have deep reservations about the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

However, while it is not without flaws or risks, I believe the plan presents our best chance to limit Iran's nuclear ambitions and protect the security of the United States and our allies, particularly the State of Israel.

The preamble to the agreement is both critically important and crystal clear when it states that "Iran reaffirms that under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons." And we will hold Iran to it in perpetuity, as they have committed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not trust Iran. But this agreement is built on verification, not trust, and I believe that it includes the needed monitoring and enforcement tools.

If Iran violates the deal in any way, increased international monitoring will allow us to know quickly and act decisively. Conversely, if we were to abandon this agreement despite the international community's support, Iran's nuclear ambitions could go unchecked, and that is not a risk I am willing to take.

Mr. Speaker, like many of my constituents, I still have significant con-

cerns with the agreement and with Iran's pattern of behavior, particularly its support of terrorism.

That is why I am committed to exercising rigorous oversight of this plan's implementation, leaving no doubt that cheating will result in severe repercussions.

As the President has said publicly and he has reiterated to me personally, all of our options remain on the table when it comes to responding to failed Iranian commitments, including military options and the reimposition of sanctions, either in whole or in part, either unilaterally or multilaterally.

Additionally, all the terrorism-related sanctions are outside the scope of this agreement and remain in force, and I am committed to providing any further tools necessary to constrain Iran's destructive nonnuclear activities.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should also establish an oversight commission or Select Committee to ensure Iranian adherence to the deal and recommend courses of action in response to any breach of Iranian commitments.

This would be in addition to the Oversight Committee related to Intelligence or the Foreign Affairs Committee or other committees, including the Armed Services Committee that might also have jurisdiction.

The more eyes on Iran in this agreement in making sure that they are living up to the commitments, the better.

Mr. Speaker, we need to show our resolve and ability to execute the fundamental objectives of the JCPOA, preventing an Iranian nuclear weapon.

While I have deep concerns about aspects of the deal, rejecting it now would potentially lead us down an even darker path without the support of the international community and with severe and unpredictable consequences.

I will vote to support this deal and what I believe is now our best chance to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear threat, our best chance for an international community united in support of our interests, and our best option for peace. We must give diplomacy a chance to work.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the House of Representatives will stand on the right side of history in rejecting this dangerous deal. I have asked myself, as many people in this Chamber have asked, "Why is this a good deal for the United States?"

Iran is holding four Americans illegally hostage in their country. That was not part of the negotiations. Iran continues to support worldwide terrorism. There is no restrictions on that in this deal.

Fifty billion dollars will be immediately released to the regime with no restrictions on its use. That was not part of the deal. They continue to develop ICBMs, intercontinental ballistic

missiles, that could reach the American mainland. There were no restrictions on that during this deal.

We are told by the administration that, if we reject this deal, the rest of the P5+1 will not join us. Well, last week Iran's top cleric said America remains Iran's number one enemy.

Days after the deal was announced, Iran's Supreme Leader called for "death of America," not the death of France, not the death of Great Britain, not the death of Russia, not the death of China. It was the death of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield another 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, since when is America afraid to stand alone?

I was one of the fortunate freshman that got to go to Israel recently and I sat with the Prime Minister, who told us this deal guarantees that, in 15 years, Iran will have a nuclear arsenal. Just yesterday the Supreme Leader tweeted that Israel won't exist in 25 years.

I also visited the Holocaust Museum and, like many people who weren't alive during that historic tragedy, I asked myself, "Why didn't anyone stop this?" Well, my fear is that some day in the near future people are going to ask, "Why didn't America stop Iran?"

The bottom line is that this is a bad deal for America. It is a bad deal for Israel, and it is a bad deal for the world.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this historic agreement with Iran. It is good for America, absolutely critical for Israel, and is a historic step toward a more stable Middle East.

We entered into P5+1 negotiations with one prevailing goal, to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. That is what this agreement does.

Under this deal, Iran can never have a nuclear weapon. I want to repeat that because there has been a lot of false reports and fearmongering about Iran being able to build a bomb in 10 years or 15 years. Under this deal, Iran can never have a nuclear weapon.

This is the third provision of the deal: "Iran affirms that under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons."

Iran has agreed to never have a nuclear weapon. With this agreement in place, we will have an unprecedented inspection regimen to guarantee it.

IAEA inspectors will have more access in Iran than in any other country

in the world. No nuclear site is off limits. They will have access wherever they need it, whenever they need it, and at every single stage of the process.

This agreement is built on verification and full cooperation. If Iran fails to meet either of those standards, if at any point inspectors believe that Iran is stonewalling or being uncooperative, the deal is violated and strict sanctions return.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good deal, and there is no possibility of a so-called better deal. Our partner nations have made it clear that, if we walk away from this agreement, they will not support the tough sanctions that have brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place.

That is the reality. As a result, a vote against this agreement is a vote to weaken international sanctions against Iran. It is a vote to allow them a clear path to a nuclear weapon, and it is a vote to make Israel less safe and the Middle East more dangerous.

I urge my colleagues to recognize that reality, to support this agreement and allow our President and our Nation to take these historic steps toward a more peaceful world.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to President Obama's disastrous Iran nuclear deal. This deal not only threatens the safety and security of the United States, one of our closest allies, Israel, it threatens the safety and security of the entire world.

It fails to prevent Iran from eventually having a nuclear weapon, the exact opposite of what it is intended to do. Iran now simply just has to wait a decade before becoming a nuclear power.

In the meantime, because Iran gets everything they need and want in return for so-called reductions in their nuclear capabilities, they can dramatically expand their dominance in the region, build up their ballistic missile and weapons capabilities, grow their economy and military, and have even greater ability to fund and promote terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, can we really expect to trust a government like Iran's whose leaders chant "Death to America"?

I strongly advise my colleagues to oppose this horrible deal. Our Nation and our allies deserve better.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action not as a perfect agreement, but as the only viable path forward to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. I do not come to this decision lightly or easily.

Iran is a deadly state sponsor of terrorism, and the Iranian regime has repeatedly threatened America and our close ally, Israel.

Despite decades of sanctions by the United States, Iran has come within months of succeeding in its effort to acquire sufficient material for a nuclear bomb.

Mr. Speaker, the question before us today is not, Is this a perfect agreement that addresses all of Iran's dangerous behavior? The truth is there are no perfect options in dealing with this regime.

Instead, we must ask: "Will this agreement verifiably prevent a nuclear armed Iran? Will this agreement advance American national security interests in the region? Will this agreement advance the national security of our ally, Israel?"

Through a very long and deliberate process, I have reached the conclusion that the answer to these three questions is yes.

I believe that it is better to have this imperfect international agreement that we can aggressively enforce than to have no agreement at all.

During August I spent a week in Israel meeting with political and military leaders and hearing from ordinary citizens who are deeply concerned about Iran's intentions.

As I stood on the Golan Heights, I could see the smoke rising from shelling in Syria. That smoke is a visible sign of the chaos and danger in the region for both the United States and for the entire Middle East.

I am keenly aware of the very real threats Iran poses to Israel's security and to our national security. I share the deep concerns of many of my constituents, of many Jewish leaders, who distrust Iran.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I believe that, after this week's vote, we have another critical choice to make. It is an important choice to make for our children, our grandchildren, and our men and women in uniform.

Our choice is this: Will we come together as Americans to enforce the Iranian nuclear agreement in the years to come?

As the Iran nuclear agreement goes into effect, we must work together—no matter our vote this week—to enforce Iran's commitments and to stand prepared to act decisively when Iran tests our resolve. We cannot afford to cast a vote and walk away.

Mr. Speaker, we have the greatest opportunity to achieve stability in the region when we lead our allies and work with other international partners, as we did when we created the international sanctions that have brought Iran to the negotiating table.

The Iranian nuclear agreement is the beginning of a long-term, multinational commitment. We must stand strong with our allies. We must commit to ensuring that the inspectors have the access and resources to carry out the agreement.

We must stand ready to act, to lead the world to respond to signs of cheating or other Iranian efforts to undermine its obligations.

□ 1615

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge rejection of the underlying Iranian agreement. The President did not submit to Congress two inspection side agreements secretly negotiated between the IAEA and Iran.

Congress and the American people have no information on what these secret side agreements entail, although news reports have suggested that Iran will be able to inspect at least some of its own military facilities.

Under the underlying agreement, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism—an antagonist of the United States, of Israel, and of several Arab nations, a 35-year-old regime known for horrible human rights abuses—will receive at least \$100 billion immediately, some of which will undoubtedly be used for terrorism.

A better underlying agreement can be negotiated, making sure Iran does not acquire nuclear weapons or ICBMs whose only purpose can be militaristic. It is important to note that a clear majority of the American people and a clear majority of both houses of Congress—Republicans and some Democrats, together the representatives of the American people—oppose this deal.

This is the most consequential vote I shall cast as a Member of Congress on foreign policy since I have been privileged to be here.

I urge rejection of the Iranian agreement, which is not in the best interests of the national security of the United States.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to just clear up some things. The IAEA's separate arrangements with Iran are not part of the agreement within the definition of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. The separate arrangements were negotiated between the IAEA and Iran to resolve outstanding issues. The arrangements between Iran and the IAEA are considered safeguard confidentials, meaning that the IAEA does not share the information with member states.

The U.S. also has safeguard confidentials, arrangements with the IAEA, and we would not want any member state to be able to request access to information about our nuclear infrastructure.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, IAEA Director General Amano has declared that the arrangements between the IAEA and Iran are technically sound and consistent with the Agency's long-established practice. They do not compromise the IAEA safeguard standards in any way.

Let's be clear. There is no self-inspection of Iranian facilities, and the IAEA has in no way given responsibility for nuclear inspections to Iran, not now and certainly not in the future. That is not how the IAEA does business.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against a deal which I believe will become one of the most dangerous mistakes in U.S. history. This deal does not stop Iran from pursuing a nuclear program. It recognizes and legitimizes their nuclear program in short order.

It allows Iran to develop ballistic missiles and brings an end to the arms embargo against that regime. It frees up hundreds of billions of dollars to fund and export terrorism. I am convinced that this deal will also lead to a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. This deal, Mr. Speaker, is one of the biggest mistakes that we, our children, and our grandchildren will pay a very dear price for.

Mr. Speaker, history will record this deal as the moment that the United States and the world granted the largest, most dangerous sponsor of terrorism that which it covets the most, nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them.

I hope I am wrong, Mr. Speaker, but I fear that I am not.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear that this agreement isn't based on trust. It is based on the most intrusive verification regimen in history. The international inspectors will have 24/7 access to surveillance of enrichment facilities and reactors and regular non-restricted access to all other declared sites.

Beyond declared facilities, the inspection provisions give the international inspectors the access they need, when they need it, to carry out the most intrusive inspection system ever peacefully negotiated.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber has a lot of heroes. SAM JOHNSON is one of those. I am proud to have followed him, and I salute him.

I have been fortunate to do many things. I was an Army officer in West Germany, a high school teacher, and a local elected official. Now, as a Member of Congress, I am honored to cast votes for the people that I represent.

My constituents want the President to follow the law, as is his responsibility under article II of the Constitution. The President did not submit all the necessary documents as required

under the law. I and my constituents want to know what is in these side agreements.

To my colleague from Maryland, those assurances are not good enough when we are going down this path of peace and war to trust the IAEA with no documents, not being able to see that.

Our primary responsibility here is to protect our citizens against all enemies, foreign and domestic. This deal gives Iran more money. They will remain the number one state sponsor of terror. They will continue to chant "death to America" and "death to Israel." They will not free our citizens. Now, we assure that Iran will get nuclear weapons; the region will go into a nuclear arms race, and the world and the U.S. will be less safe. This is a terrible deal, an embarrassing deal, and one we will regret in the future.

Vote to fully disclose this deal; vote against the deal, and vote to keep the sanctions on.

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

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, no one wants Iran to have a nuclear weapon; I certainly don't think the President wants them to, but I think it is clear that they are going to. The question is when. Clearly, the President tried to make a good deal. I don't think he thinks that Iran can be trusted, but I do think he thinks that they won't cheat.

Mr. Speaker, the road to hell was paved with good intentions, and I am sure that the administration had and has good intentions, but the facts remain. Iran has been cheating, literally, for thousands of years—or at least that region has—and certainly, we know the facts.

The facts are, for the last 36 years, Iran has cheated on every single agreement they have signed. They are cheating at this very moment. An agreement that is based on that, that they wouldn't cheat, is an agreement that is fatally flawed.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same country that won't cheat, this is the same country that leaders recognize and recommend the stoning of women, the hanging of homosexuals, the sponsor of mass terrorism. This is the nation that we have signed an accord with.

Mr. Speaker, the other side will tell you that this is a great agreement with robust controls and an inspection paradigm. With all due respect, none of us know what that is; yet the pillar of this agreement is based upon solely that, an inspection paradigm that is so robust that Iran can't cheat, and no one knows what it is. We are literally voting for something and on something that we don't know what it is, and we are being urged to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, Iran cannot be trusted. The blood will not be on my hands from these rockets that Hamas launches into Israel and these American soldiers that come home in body bags in the future.

I just want to let everybody know that the blood will not be on my hands and the hands of those who vote against this agreement.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate all day, and I really have to be, I guess, angered by the amount of misstatement of fact here and about this House being so negative about this country and about our President.

You can't get away with criticizing Presidents or leaders of other countries being negative about us when you are standing around being negative about our own country and our own President.

This agreement is about trust, and it isn't about trust with Iran. It is about trust with the International Atomic Energy Agency. Nobody has spoken about what that Agency does, other than the chairman, about how important it is.

It has been around since 1957. We helped create it. It has 2,400 employees. We probably trained most of them. They know about inspections. They are an international organization. They don't belong to anybody. No country owns them.

You can't go and trash all day that they have a secret agreement with Iran when they have a secret agreement with the United States and with Russia and with China and with all the other signatories. That is their business. They go in and verify.

We don't allow them to go into our top classified areas without some agreement of how you are going to handle that classified information. They are not going to release that information to other countries. They wouldn't have any credibility.

When you are asking that the President release that information, he doesn't have it. He doesn't own it. It is the IAEA and Iran. What if Iran was saying, We don't want to enter into this agreement because we don't know what the IAEA has entered into with the United States?

Stop trashing the process. Trust this organization. We have been proud of it for 58 years. It is the top cop on nuclear inspections, all the 1,100 facilities around the world, nuclear power plants, military bases with nuclear equipment, weapons. They are the inspectors. They are the ones that trust and verify. Give them a chance.

Everybody in the world thinks this is the toughest agreement ever negotiated. Why would we not be celebrating it? This is diplomatic history. We have done great things here, and you want to trash it, and you want to trash the administration. That is not America. Give peace a chance.

Vote “no” on this awful bill.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, some of us have seen this before. Some of us were around for the North Korean nuclear agreement, and President Obama’s Iran nuclear deal looks increasingly like the dangerous deal that we struck with that regime in North Korea.

In 1994, the U.S. Government signed a deal with North Korea that, according to then-President Clinton, would make the United States, the Korean peninsula, and the world safer, in his words.

The agreement, we were told, did not rely on trust, but would instead involve a verification program which would stop the North Koreans from ever acquiring a nuclear bomb. That sounds familiar today.

Unfortunately, the North Korean deal had holes that you could fire a ballistic missile through. The deal did not dismantle North Korea’s program. It committed the United States to rewarding North Korea with large quantities of fuel oil without requiring the regime to implement the terms.

Worst of all, the deal relied on inspection provisions that were naive and ultimately were worthless. The predictable result was that, on October 4, 2002, North Korea revealed it had been lying all along and that it had continued to secretly develop nuclear weapons.

Four years later, North Korea’s dictator, Kim Jong Il, ordered an underground nuclear test, and today, North Korea is a global menace, and it supports and sponsors terrorism, and it is the most unstable nuclear power on Earth. There is a reason why some of us raise these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this so-called Iran deal because it paves the way for Iran to obtain nuclear capabilities that will not only threaten Israel and create an arms race in the Middle East, but will also be a direct threat to America.

□ 1630

Time and time again, the Government of Iran has demonstrated its unwillingness to be transparent and open regarding their nuclear arms development and fraudulent behavior. Let’s not forget that we just recently discovered two of their secret nuclear facilities, and who knows how many more they have.

The sanctions relief included as part of this deal guarantees that Iran, the world’s number one sponsor of terrorism, will have billions more to fund their evil acts. And if there is any confusion, Iran’s stated intentions of wiping Israel off the face of the Earth and its public chants of “death to America” make their intentions very clear.

Mr. Speaker, America has always stood for what is right—the greatest

force for good mankind has ever known. Let’s keep it that way and defend this agreement.

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

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to this deal. This is a terrible deal for America, for the Middle East, and for the world.

This is a deal that can’t be verified. The IAEA, as so eloquently talked about by my colleague across the aisle, is the same IAEA that had their inspector buying nuclear material for North Korea.

This is a deal that will embolden Iran. It will make them stronger. They are the number one sponsor of terrorism in the world, shouting, “Death to America.” When they stop having the rhetoric from their Ayatollah and from their President saying “death to America” and they start denouncing terrorism and release our hostages, then we can go forward with this. But this will do nothing but embolden Iran, make them stronger, and make the Middle East more unstable.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

The Congress is not on the clock, because we haven’t received the entire agreement. And for anyone out there who wants to be supportive of this deal, let’s think what the President was telling the American public and all of us.

The House has a deal that wasn’t based on trust; it is built on verification. How do you support a deal based on verification without knowing what the verification is?

I would be happy to yield if anyone wanted to stand up and explain how you support a deal without knowing what the verification is. You can’t. That is why we are asking for it.

And for those who say that opposing this deal is somehow negative towards America, I took an oath to be an officer of the United States military, willing to fight and die in protection of our freedoms and liberties. I love this country. I took an oath to serve here the members of my district because I love America.

So don’t tell me that somehow opposing this deal is negative toward America. I oppose this deal because I love my country.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, did you notice something? Did you notice that, for the past 2 years, the President of the United States has said that if we were going to have a deal, it was going to be based on full disclosure?

Mr. Speaker, the President said that we were going to know all of the infor-

mation. And the State Department submitted to the Congress a document that said: Here is all the information.

But after that, Mr. Speaker, you know what we found out? There are two secret deals. There are two secret side deals, side arrangements, that we have not seen.

Now, think about it. There are two alternatives: either this is sacrosanct between the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Iranian Government and no one is allowed to see it under the law—no one absolutely; it is totally confidential—or it is not.

Now, how can it be, Mr. Speaker, that some elements of the administration have been briefed on those documents but they have not been disclosed to Congress and they have not been disclosed to the American public? How can that be?

I will tell you how it can be. Because this is absurd. The administration has not disclosed material information.

And so why are we here today? Why is Chairman ROYCE managing this time? Why are we contemplating this resolution that is brought forth by Congressman POMPEO and Congressman ZELDIN? It is to say this: Administration, you have not complied. Therefore, Corker-Cardin has not been invoked. Therefore, the House is not going to vote on this nefarious deal.

This is an awful deal, Mr. Speaker, and it should be wholeheartedly rejected with all urgency. I urge the passage of this resolution to make it very clear that we are not going to be complicit. We are not going to be complicit, Mr. Speaker. We are not going to be midwives and bring into the world this awful thing. We won’t be complicit.

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

A few speakers ago, there was a statement made about folks loving America. Well, guess what. We all love America. The fact that we may have disagreements with regard to this proposal does not take away from our love of this great country. We may differ, but the fact still remains that we love our country. And I just want to make that clear, because it is sickening to hear those kinds of comments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. The American people have spoken and overwhelmingly oppose this agreement. Our allies in the region, who know Iran best, oppose this deal. The President, enabled by Senate Democrats, continues to live in a fantasyland.

The President’s track record in the region is appalling: Libya, Yemen, Somalia, Benghazi, the reset with Russia, red lines in Syria, his failed ISIL strategy, and his catastrophic withdrawal from Iraq, just to name a few, now handing billions, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and a legal pathway to a nuclear weapon to Iran.

The American people deserve the truth rather than lies and half-truths about snapback sanctions; secret side deals; anytime, anywhere inspections; Iran's right to enrich uranium or plutonium; and, as we stand here today, Congress' role in this bad deal.

Members of Congress must ask themselves two questions: Does this deal make us more secure? Does this deal make us more safe? The answer to both questions is a resounding, no, it doesn't.

Secretary of State Kerry said "no deal is better than a bad deal." I couldn't agree more.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear: Iran is an enemy to the United States of America, not by our declaration but by a proclamation of the most senior military leaders of that nation that have stated their destiny is to destroy the United States of America. Now, I was recently told by the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, that when someone says they want to destroy you, believe them.

So what are we to trust? Are we to trust Iran, when they say that their destination, their goal, is to destroy the people of the United States of America? Or do we trust them when they say that they will commit to not develop a nuclear weapon? Or do we trust an international organization who has details about verification that they won't even share with the representatives of the people of this Nation who would be drastically affected by that?

Oh, yes, but I have been told it is not about trust; it is about verification. But the details of the most critical part of that verification are being kept secret from the Members of this Congress who are expected to approve this deal that would have drastic effects upon the people of the United States.

I would submit to you that those who chant "death to America," the leaders in Iran, know the details of it.

We must stop this now.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the chairman for the work that he has done on this issue and the awareness that he has helped to raise not only with Members of this body, but with the American people.

The American people are speaking out. They do not want this Iran deal to be on the books. And there are good reasons why.

As I was home and talking to my constituents, many are like me. They are a mom, they are a grandmother, and they fear for what this will do to our country. They fear for what it will

do to the safety of our children and future generations. They are asking the right questions:

Does Iran deserve the right to be trusted? Absolutely not.

When their neighbors don't trust them, should we trust them? The answer is of course not.

Is this a transparent agreement? Of course not. The secret side deals that have been made, why would we do that? Why would we incentivize, create a pathway, for Iran to have a nuclear weapon?

I think what we should do is require the President to come forward with every component to expose this so we know what kind of future this creates for our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Returning to an argument I was making earlier about this body's experience with North Korea, it does look to me like many are willing to concede to Iran the same loopholes that we gave North Korea.

Supreme Leader Ayatollah has declared that his country would never agree to anywhere, anytime inspections. That is what is a little confusing about this. Especially, he says, in Iranian military sites. What we are informed of is that Iran is going to do its own inspection at Parchin. Without a full picture of Iran's nuclear program, without full ability to inspect these sites, we will be verifying in the dark, just as we were with North Korea.

The Ayatollah is also demanding sanctions be lifted before Iran dismantles its nuclear infrastructure. In short, the Supreme Leader, again, is not going to let international inspectors into the places he builds his secret weapons, and yet he wants billions of sanctions in relief that he could funnel into terrorist groups that he funds, including Hezbollah and Hamas.

Just like North Korea, Iran wants its rewards upfront. Again, like North Korea, what is Iran demanding? The best prize of all: the stamp of international legitimacy for its nuclear program.

The truly stunning thing about this nuclear deal is that even if Iran fulfills all of its commitments in a few short years, the mullahs will be free from restraints, have international blessing for Iran's nuclear program, and will have billions of dollars that they will use, in my opinion, for destabilizing the region. Because the IRGC controls most of these business contracts, their military controls the contracts.

It is not too late to stop Iran from getting nuclear weapons, but to do so, we need to learn from our mistakes; and if we don't, the Ayatollah, just like Kim Jong-il before him, will have, in my view, an easy path to the bomb.

Mr. CUMMINGS. May I inquire as to how much time we have remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes

remaining. The gentleman from California has 8½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that this agreement is not based on trust; it is based on the most intrusive verification regimen in history.

There has been a lot of talk about \$100 billion—others have floated other figures—in sanctions relief, but we know that it is more like around \$50 billion, and it is conjecture as to how Iran will spend this money. Our terrorism sanctions will remain firmly in place to combat the money that Iran passes to any terrorist groups.

□ 1645

This is a good deal, not because the President says so, not because I say so, not because anyone else in this Chamber says so. It is a good deal because the experts say so.

Nuclear physicists, disarmament experts, antinuclear proliferation experts, members of the intelligence community—including the former head of Mossad—and our allies all agree that the right thing to do to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon is to support this deal.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Neville Chamberlain landed at Heston Aerodrome on September 30, 1938, and spoke to the crowds. He said: "The settlement of the Czechoslovakian problem has been achieved."

He said, "This morning I had another talk with German Chancellor, Herr Hitler, and here is the paper that bears his name on it, as well as mine."

He went on to say, "We regard the agreement signed last night and the Anglo-German Naval Agreement as symbolic of the desire of our two peoples never to go to war again."

Later that day, he stood outside of 10 Downing Street and read again. He said: "My good friends, for the second time in our history, a British Prime Minister has returned from Germany bringing peace with honour."

He said, "I believe it is a peace for our time. We thank you from the bottom of our hearts. Go home and get a nice quiet sleep."

Mr. Speaker, we all know how that turned out.

My friends, if this deal passes—and make no mistake, it is quite a deal for Iran—Americans will not get a quiet night's sleep.

As long as Barack Hussein Obama is in office aiding and abetting the Iranian terroristic regime, we will not be safe and Americans will not sleep well.

This is a bad deal. You don't argue, you don't make deals with the devil, deals with the enemy. Do we not learn from history?

Did we not learn anything from World War II?

This is a bad deal. I urge my colleagues to vote this deal down. It is time to put America first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some try to demean the importance of what the chairman and others here on the Republican side are trying to do right now.

The fact is that, when we talk about the information that has not been provided about the outside agreements with the IAEA, it is not only material, relevant, but it is also critical.

I am reading directly from the Iran deal. Eight years after the adoption date or when the IAEA has reached the broader conclusion that all nuclear material in Iran remains in peaceful activities, whichever is earlier—it goes on to talk about sanctions that will be lifted.

Another place, same thing, or when the IAEA has reached the broader conclusion that all nuclear material in Iran remains in peaceful activities, then another protocol is lifted.

If we don't know what the agreement is with the IAEA, then these years mean nothing. The IAEA, I have already heard say, as far as it knows, nuclear material is being used for peaceful purposes. That would mean that these years are worthless.

We have got to have the secret agreements.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 6 minutes remaining.

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

With regard to what the gentleman just stated, I would refer him to Senator BOB CORKER, who drafted the process that gave Congress the right to review the agreement. In talking about this situation that we are addressing today, he says that the motion is not worth considering. Apparently, he feels satisfied that the arrangement with regard to the IAEA has been satisfied.

Let's also focus with the matter at hand, and the matter at hand is preventing Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, instead of working on pointless partisan measures like this one and others we will be considering tomorrow.

This entire piece of legislation that we have been debating is about accusations that the President did not comply with the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. Even, as I said a moment ago, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee does not believe that.

Let's get back to the business of the people and stop wasting their money and wasting their time.

I urge a "no" vote on this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I guess the point that I would begin by making is that Iran won't have to cheat like North Korea did to get close to a bomb, and that is because the essential restrictions on Iran's key bomb-making technology expire or, in the words of the agreement, sunset in 10 to 15 years.

After these restrictions expire, Iran will be left with an internationally recognized industrial scale nuclear program. Iran could even legitimately enrich to levels near weapons-grade under the pretext of powering a nuclear navy. All these activities are permissible under the nonproliferation treaty, and all would be endorsed by this agreement.

Indeed, to quote the President, President Obama said, of this agreement, in year 13, 14, 15, Iran's breakout times would have shrunk almost down to zero.

A former State Department official testified to the Foreign Affairs Committee that this sunset clause is a disaster. It is a disaster as it will enable the leading state sponsor of terrorism to produce enough material for dozens of nuclear weapons, all under the terms of the agreement.

As another expert witness pointed out, the bet that the administration is taking is that, in 10 to 15 years, we will have a kinder, gentler Iran. The agreement does not dismantle Iran's nuclear infrastructure. Iran doesn't have to dismantle any centrifuges or give up any of its nuclear facilities. Even Iran's once-secret facility at Fordo, buried under a mountain top, does stay open.

Instead, the deal temporarily restricts elements of the program. It does do that. It restricts elements of the program, but it does it in exchange for something else that is permanent.

What is permanent in this, as opposed to temporary? What is permanent is the sanctions relief. Key restrictions begin to expire after only 8 years.

If fully implemented, this agreement will destroy the Iran sanctions regime, which Congress has built up over decades, despite opposition from several administrations.

I will remind the Members again, this was a hard-fought case over several administrations; and, in point of fact, in the prior Congress, myself and ELIOT ENGEL had legislation which would have put additional pressure on Iran that passed here by a vote of 400-20.

It was the administration and it was Secretary of State Kerry who made certain that that bill was bottled up in the Senate and could not see the light of day.

Now, the billions in sanctions relief that Iran will get up front will support

its terrorist activity, but those billions are just a downpayment, as this agreement reconnects Iran to the global economy.

One of the things that bothers me most about this is that Iran is not a normal country with normal businessmen running those companies. When those companies were nationalized, they were turned over to the IRGC. They were turned over, basically, to the leaders in the military, and they were turned over to the clerics.

As future contracts go forward with Iran, it is that entity that is going to be rewarded. It is going to have the political power.

For those of us that hoped to see change in Iran, now the best connected people in Iran are going to be the IRGC leaders. If we think for a minute what that will mean for those that would like to see real change, I think we lost a historic opportunity here to put the kind of pressure that would have forced change, but we did not do that.

In a major, last-minute concession—and this is the final point I would make—the President agreed to lift the U.N. arms embargo on Iran, and in 5 years, Iran will be able to buy conventional weapons and, in 8 years, ballistic missiles.

Russia and China want to sell these dangerous weapons to Iran, and that is why they pushed. That is why it was Russia pushing, at the eleventh hour, after we thought this agreement was done.

The reason we were waiting those extra days is because Russia was running interference for Iran, saying: Oh, no, wait. We also want the arms embargo lifted, including the ICBM embargo lifted.

As the Secretary of Defense of our country testified, the reason that we want to stop Iran from having an ICBM program is that the "I" in ICBM stands for intercontinental, which means having the capability of flying from Iran to the United States.

Ask yourself why Iran wants to build ICBMs, why it is that the Ayatollah says it is the duty of every military man to figure out how to help mass-produce ICBMs.

Someone once asked President Kennedy the difference between our space program and the ICBM program that Russia was building at that time, and he quipped "attitude." Kennedy's answer was "attitude."

The answer here is that attitude counts for a lot, and the attitude in the regime, when they say they are not even going to be bound by this and are now going to transfer rockets and missiles to Hezbollah and Hamas, tells us a lot about their attitude.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, for years, the Congress, the President, our European partners, and the international community have imposed a series of tough economic sanctions on Iran with the goal of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. Those

sanctions brought Iran to the negotiating table and I commend President Obama, Secretary Kerry, and the entire team, along with our P5+1 partners, for their efforts to negotiate an agreement to prevent Iran from building a nuclear weapon.

The question for Members of Congress, who will vote on this agreement, is whether it achieves its stated goals. Given the importance of this question, I believe every Member of Congress has an obligation to thoroughly review the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), consider the testimony presented at the Congressional hearings, and listen to competing views before reaching a final judgment.

Since the JCPOA was submitted to Congress on July 19, 2015, I have carefully reviewed all of its terms, attended the classified briefings and numerous presentations, and reviewed the transcripts of all the hearings that have been held in both the House and the Senate. I have also met with opponents and supporters of the agreement. While I respect the opinions of those on both sides of this issue, I have concluded that this agreement advances the national security interests of the United States and all of our allies, including our partner Israel. This agreement is the best path to achieve our goal—that Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon. Indeed, I firmly believe that, should Congress block this agreement, we would undermine that goal, inadvertently weaken and isolate America, and strengthen Iran.

The benefit of any agreement must be measured against the real-world consequences of no agreement. Many forget that when these negotiations began in earnest two years ago, Iran was a threshold nuclear weapons state and remains so until and unless this agreement is implemented. As Prime Minister Netanyahu warned at the United Nations in 2012, Iran was a few months away from having enough highly enriched uranium to produce its first bomb. Today, prior to the implementation of this agreement, it has a nuclear stockpile that, if further enriched, could produce up to 10 bombs. It currently has installed nearly 20,000 centrifuges that could convert that fuel into weapons material. Indeed, many analysts believe that the combination of Iran's nuclear stockpile and its centrifuges would allow it to produce enough weapons-grade nuclear material for a bomb in two months.

In addition, Iran has been enriching some of its nuclear material at its deep underground reactor at Fordow, a very difficult target to hit militarily. Moreover, Iran was in the process of building a heavy-water reactor at Arak, which could generate plutonium to be used for a nuclear weapon. Finally, Iran has been operating for years under an inadequate verification regime that increases the risks of a covert program going undetected.

This agreement blocks all of these paths to acquiring weapons-grade nuclear material and puts in place an inspection system that assures the detection of any violation and future dash to acquire a nuclear weapon. The Interim Agreement has already neutralized Iran's stockpile of highly enriched uranium that Prime Minister Netanyahu highlighted in his speech. This final agreement will significantly scale back the remainder of its program. Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium will be cut from 9,900 kg to 300 kg, and that remainder will be limited to low-enriched uranium that cannot be

used for a weapon. In addition, the agreement removes two-thirds of Iran's installed centrifuges. No enrichment activities may be conducted at Fordow for a period of 15 years, and the facility at Arak will be permanently converted to one that does not produce weapons-grade plutonium.

Taken together, these measures will extend the breakout time from about two months to at least a year and put in place layers of verification measures over different timelines, including some that remain in place permanently. It is generally agreed that these measures would allow us to detect any effort by Iran to use its current nuclear facilities—Natanz, Fordow, or Arak—to violate the agreement. The main criticism with respect to verification is that the agreement does not sufficiently guard against an effort by Iran to develop a secret uranium supply chain and enrichment capacity at a covert place. However, the reality is that the agreement permanently puts in place an inspection mechanism that is more rigorous than any previous arms control agreement and more stringent than the current system. The agreement ultimately requires inspections of any suspected Iranian nuclear site with the vote of the United States, Britain, France, Germany, and the European Union. Neither the Chinese nor the Russians can block such inspections in the face of a united Western front. Are we really better off without this verification regime than with it?

In exchange for rolling back its nuclear program and accepting this verification regime, Iran will obtain relief from those sanctions that are tied to its nuclear program. However, that relief will only come after Iran has verifiably reduced its nuclear program as required. Moreover, if Iran backslides on those commitments, the sanctions will snap back into place. The snapback procedure is triggered if the U.S. registers a formal complaint against Iran with the special commission created for that purpose. In addition, those U.S. sanctions that are not related to the Iranian nuclear program will remain in place, including U.S. sanctions related to Iran's human rights violations, support for terrorism, and missile program.

There are some who oppose the agreement because it does not prevent Iran from engaging in adversarial actions throughout the Gulf, the Middle East, and elsewhere. That conduct, however, was never within the scope of these negotiations nor the objective of the international sanctions regime aimed at preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. President Reagan understood the distinction between changing behavior and achieving verifiable limits on weapons programs. He negotiated arms control agreements with the Soviet Union, not because he thought it would change the character of "the Evil Empire" but because limiting their nuclear arsenal was in the national security interests of the U.S. and our allies. That reality is also true today. An Iranian regime with nuclear capability would present a much greater threat to the region than an Iran without one. In fact, today, as a threshold nuclear weapons state, Iran wields more influence than it will under the constraints of this agreement. That is why our focus has appropriately been on reining in the Iranian nuclear program.

The lifting of the sanctions will certainly give Iran additional resources to support its priorities. Given the political dynamic in Iran, some of those additional resources will likely be in-

vested to improve the domestic standard of living. But even if all the resources were used to support their proxies in the region, respected regional observers agree that they are unlikely to make a significant strategic difference. Moreover, any effort by Iran to increase support for its proxies can be checked by the U.S. and our allies through countermeasures. Finally, it is clear that any alternative agreement opponents seek would also result in the lifting of the sanctions and freeing up these resources.

In my view, opponents of the agreement have failed to demonstrate how we will be in a better position if Congress were to block it. Without an agreement, the Iranians will immediately revert to their status as a threshold nuclear weapons state. In other words, they immediately pose the threat that Prime Minister Netanyahu warned about in his U.N. speech. At the same time, the international consensus we have built for sanctions, which was already starting to fray, would begin to collapse entirely. We would be immediately left with the worst of all worlds—a threshold nuclear weapons state with diminished sanctions and little leverage for the United States.

I disagree with the view that we can force the Iranians back to the negotiating table to get a better deal. All of our European partners have signed on to the current agreement. Consequently, the U.S. would be isolated in its quest to return to negotiations. And in the unlikely event that we somehow returned to negotiations, the critics have not presented a plausible scenario for achieving a better agreement in a world where fewer sanctions means less economic pressure.

The bottom line is that if Congress were to block the agreement and the Iranians were to resume nuclear enrichment activities, the only way to stop them, at least temporarily, would be by military action. That would unleash significant negative consequences that could jeopardize American troops in the region, drag us into another ground war in the Middle East, and trigger unpredictable responses elsewhere. Moreover, the United States would be totally isolated from most of the world, including our Western partners. The folly of that go-it-alone military approach would be compounded by the fact that such action would only deal a temporary setback to an Iranian nuclear program. They would likely respond by putting their nuclear enrichment activities deeper underground and would likely be more determined than ever to build a nuclear arsenal.

We don't have to take that path. This agreement will give us a long period of time to test the Iranians' compliance and assess their intentions. During that period, it will give us a treasure trove of information about the scope and capabilities of the limited Iranian nuclear program. Throughout that period and beyond, we reserve all of our options, including a military option, to respond to any Iranian attempt to break out and produce enough highly enriched material to make a bomb. But we will have two advantages over the situation as it is today—a more comprehensive verification regime to detect any violation and a much longer breakout period in which to respond.

As former Secretary Clinton has indicated, the fact that we have successfully limited the scope of Iran's nuclear program does not mean we have limited its ambitions in the region. We must continue to work with our

friends and allies to constantly contain and confront Iranian aggression in the region. The United States and Israel must always stand together to confront that threat. The fact remains that Iranian support for their terrorist proxy Hezbollah continues to destabilize Lebanon and poses a direct threat to Israel, as does its support for Hamas. We must do all we can to ensure that our ally Israel maintains its qualitative military edge in the region, including providing increased funding for Israel's Arrow anti-ballistic missile and Iron Dome anti-rocket systems. Consideration should also be given to previously denied weapons if a need for such enhanced capabilities arises. We must always remember that some of Iran's leaders have called for the destruction of Israel and we must never forget the awful past that teaches us not to ignore those threats.

The threats Iran poses in the region are real. But all those threats are compounded by an Iran that is a threshold nuclear weapons state. This agreement will roll back the Iranian nuclear program and provide us with greater ability to detect and more time to respond to any future Iranian attempt to build a nuclear weapon.

For all of the reasons given above, I've concluded that this is an historic agreement that should be supported by the Congress.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble.

The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 186, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

YEAS—245

Abraham	Comstock	Gosar
Aderholt	Conaway	Gowdy
Allen	Cook	Granger
Amash	Costello (PA)	Graves (GA)
Amodel	Cramer	Graves (LA)
Babin	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Barletta	Crenshaw	Griffith
Barr	Culberson	Grothman
Barton	Curbeo (FL)	Guinta
Benishek	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Bilirakis	Denham	Hanna
Bishop (MI)	Dent	Hardy
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Harper
Black	DesJarlais	Harris
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Blum	Dold	Heck (NV)
Bost	Donovan	Hensarling
Boustany	Duffy	Herrera Beutler
Brady (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Hice, Jody B.
Brat	Duncan (TN)	Hill
Bridenstine	Eilmers (NC)	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Emmer (MN)	Hudson
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	Huelskamp
Buchanan	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Buck	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Hunter
Burgess	Fleming	Hurd (TX)
Byrne	Flores	Hurt (VA)
Calvert	Forbes	Issa
Carter (GA)	Fortenberry	Jenkins (KS)
Carter (TX)	Foxen	Jenkins (WV)
Chabot	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (OH)
Chaffetz	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam
Clawson (FL)	Garrett	Jolly
Coffman	Gibbs	Jones
Cole	Gibson	Jordan
Collins (GA)	Gohmert	Joyce
Collins (NY)	Goodlatte	Katko

Kelly (MS)	Noem	Sessions
Kelly (PA)	Nugent	Shimkus
King (IA)	Nunes	Shuster
King (NY)	Olson	Simpson
Kinzinger (IL)	Palazzo	Smith (MO)
Kline	Palmer	Smith (NE)
Knight	Paulsen	Smith (NJ)
Labrador	Pearce	Smith (TX)
LaMalfa	Perry	Stefanik
Lamborn	Pittenger	Stewart
Lance	Pitts	Stivers
Latta	Poe (TX)	Stutzman
LoBiondo	Poliquin	Thompson (PA)
Long	Pompeo	Thornberry
Loudermilk	Posey	Tiberi
Love	Price, Tom	Tipton
Lucas	Ratcliffe	Trott
Luetkemeyer	Reed	Turner
Lummis	Reichert	Upton
MacArthur	Renacci	Valadao
Marchant	Ribble	Wagner
Marino	Rice (SC)	Walberg
Massie	Rigell	Walden
McCarthy	Roby	Walker
McCaul	Roe (TN)	Walorski
McClintock	Rogers (AL)	Walters, Mimi
McHenry	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)
McKinley	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)
McMorris	Rokita	Wenstrup
Rodgers	Rooney (FL)	Westerman
McSally	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland
Meadows	Roskam	Whitfield
Meehan	Ross	Williams
Messer	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)
Mica	Rouzer	Wittman
Miller (FL)	Royce	Womack
Miller (MI)	Russell	Woodall
Moolenaar	Ryan (WI)	Yoder
Mooney (WV)	Salmon	Yoho
Mullin	Sanford	Young (AK)
Mulvaney	Scalise	Young (IA)
Murphy (PA)	Schweikert	Young (IN)
Neugebauer	Scott, Austin	Zeldin
Newhouse	Sensenbrenner	Zinke

NAYS—186

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Lipinski
Aguilar	F.	Loeb sack
Ashford	Duckworth	Lofgren
Bass	Edwards	Lowenthal
Beatty	Ellison	Lowe y
Becerra	Engel	Lujan Grisham
Bera	Eshoo	(NM)
Beyer	Esty	Lujan, Ben Ray
Bishop (GA)	Farr	(NM)
Blumenauer	Fattah	Lynch
Bonamici	Foster	Maloney, Sean
Boyle, Brendan	Frankel (FL)	Matsui
F.	Fudge	McCollum
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	McDermott
Brown (FL)	Gallego	McGovern
Brownley (CA)	Garamendi	McNerney
Bustos	Graham	Meeks
Butterfield	Grayson	Meng
Capps	Green, Al	Moore
Capuano	Green, Gene	Moulton
Cárdenas	Grijalva	Murphy (FL)
Carney	Gutiérrez	Nadler
Carson (IN)	Hahn	Napolitano
Cartwright	Hastings	Neal
Castor (FL)	Heck (WA)	Nolan
Castro (TX)	Higgins	Norcross
Chu, Judy	Himes	O'Rourke
Cicilline	Hinojosa	Pallone
Clark (MA)	Honda	Pascrell
Clarke (NY)	Hoyer	Payne
Clay	Huffman	Pelosi
Cleaver	Israel	Perlmutter
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Peters
Cohen	Jeffries	Peterson
Connolly	Johnson (GA)	Pingree
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Cooper	Kaptur	Polis
Costa	Keating	Price (NC)
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Crowley	Kennedy	Rangel
Cuellar	Kildee	Rice (NY)
Cummings	Kilmer	Richmond
Davis (CA)	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz
DeFazio	Kuster	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Langevin	Rush
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Linda
DeBene	Lawrence	T.
DeSaulnier	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta
Deutch	Levin	Sarbanes
Dingell	Lewis	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Schiff

Schrader	Swalwell (CA)	Veasey
Scott (VA)	Takai	Vela
Scott, David	Takano	Velázquez
Serrano	Thompson (CA)	Visclosky
Sewell (AL)	Thompson (MS)	Walz
Sherman	Titus	Wasserman
Sinema	Tonko	Schultz
Sires	Torres	Waters, Maxine
Slaughter	Tsongas	Watson Coleman
Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	Welch
Speier	Vargas	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—2

Maloney, Wilson (FL)
Carolyn

□ 1722

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:
Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 492, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 412, I call up the bill (H.R. 3461) to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3461

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

SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION.

Congress does favor the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 3 hours equally divided and controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the minority leader or their designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) will control 90 minutes. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, in the Foreign Affairs Committee, we have held 30 hearings and briefings on Iran since these negotiations began. We have reviewed this

agreement in depth; but, Mr. Speaker, I can come to no other conclusion than not only does it come up short, it is fatally flawed and, indeed, dangerous. I will oppose the measure before us. We should have gotten a better deal.

Indeed, when the House passed stiff Iran sanctions legislation—now, this was in 2013—in the prior Congress, we passed this legislation, authored by myself and Mr. ENGEL, by a vote, a bipartisan vote in this body, of 400–20.

The intention of that legislation was to put that additional leverage on Iran and force the Ayatollah to make a choice between real compromise—real compromise—on his nuclear program and economic collapse if he did not.

□ 1730

Unfortunately, the Secretary of State and the administration worked to ensure that the other body never took that measure up.

This legislation would have put more pressure, as I say, on Iran and might have led to an acceptable deal; but instead of an ironclad agreement that is verifiable and holds Iran to account, we are considering an agreement that leaves Iran, in a few short years, only steps away from a nuclear weapons program, one that would be on an industrial scale.

Under the agreement, Iran is not required to dismantle key bomb-making technology. Instead, it is permitted a vast enrichment capacity, reversing decades of bipartisan nonproliferation policy that never imagined endorsing this type of nuclear infrastructure for any country, never mind a country that lives by the motto “death to America.”

While Members of Congress insisted on anywhere, anytime inspections, U.S. negotiators settled for something called managed access. So, instead of allowing international inspectors into those suspicious sites within 24 hours, it will take 24 days, and that is to commence the process.

Worse, there have been revelations in recent days about an agreement between Iran and the United Nations’ nuclear watchdog. This agreement sets the conditions in which a key Iranian military site that is suspected of nuclear bomb work—suspected in the sense that we have 1,000 pages of evidence of that bomb work—will be explored.

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard, those details have been kept from Congress. We don’t have those details in our hands; but it is reported that, instead of international inspectors doing the inspecting, the Iranians, themselves, will take the inspection lead. Iran has cheated on every agreement they have signed, so why do we trust them now to self-police?

The deal guts the sanctions web that is putting intense pressure on Iran. Billions will be made available to Iran to pursue its terrorism. Indeed, Iran’s elite Quds Force has transferred funds—and this should bother all of

us—to Hamas. It has committed to rebuild the network of tunnels from Gaza to attack Israel.

Mr. ENGEL and I were in one of those tunnels last year. They have agreed in Iran to replenish the medium-range missile arsenal of Hamas, and they are working right now, they claim, to give precision-guided missiles to Hezbollah. I can tell you I was in Haifa in 2006 when it was under constant bombardment by those types of rockets, but they weren’t precision-guided. Every day, they slammed into the city, and there were 600 victims in the trauma hospital. Now Iran has transferred eightfold the number of missiles, and they want to give them the guidance systems. They need money to pay for those guidance systems.

Iran won late concessions to remove international restrictions on its ballistic missile program and on its conventional arms, and that imperils the security of the region and, frankly, the security of our homeland.

For some, the risks in this agreement are worth it as they see an Iran that is changing for the better. As one supporter of this agreement told our committee, President Obama is betting that, in 10 or 15 years, we will have a kinder, gentler Iran.

But that is a bet against everything we have seen out of the regime since the 1979 revolution. Already, Iranian leaders insist that international inspectors won’t see the inside of Iran’s military bases and that Iran can advance its missiles and weapons without breaking the agreement. It is guaranteed that Iran will game the agreement to its advantage.

So we must ask ourselves: Will international bureaucrats call out Iran, knowing that doing so will put this international agreement at risk? We are not calling them out now as they are transferring weapons.

Will this administration, which didn’t even insist that four American hostages come home as part of this agreement, be any tougher on Iran in implementing this deal?

Does this serve the long-term national security interests of the United States? Does it make the world and, frankly, the region more safe? more stable? more secure?

Is there any other reason Iran—an energy rich country—is advancing its nuclear technology other than to make a nuclear weapon?

And why do its leaders chant “death to America” and “death to Israel”?

The New York Times ran a story on Quds Day, which is the national parade. It was some weeks ago. There was President Rouhani—the so-called moderate—marching in that parade. Behind him, the crowd was chanting. It was chanting “death to America.” In front of them, they carried placards on either side of him that read, “Death to Israel.” Why does their leader march in the Quds parade, and why does that refrain constantly come from the clerics?

I hope that all Members will consider these questions as they consider this vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Over the past 2 years, I have supported our negotiating team in the P5+1. I have favored giving time and space to achieve a diplomatic breakthrough to foreclose Iran’s pathways to a nuclear weapon. I am grateful for the tireless efforts by President Obama, Secretary Kerry, Secretary Moniz, Secretary Lew, and Undersecretary Sherman. I appreciate the work of our P5+1 partners in concluding an agreement with Iran.

But, unfortunately, I cannot support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, and I plan to oppose this resolution.

Let me say at the outset, I was troubled that Iran was not asked to stop enriching, while we were talking, despite several U.N. Security Council resolutions calling for a pause; and after using this review period to assess the details of the agreement, I am not convinced that this deal does enough to keep a nuclear weapon out of Iran’s hands.

I have raised questions and concerns throughout the negotiating phase and review period. The answers I have received simply don’t convince me that this deal will keep a nuclear weapon out of Iran’s hands. It may, in fact, strengthen Iran’s position as a destabilizing and destructive influence across the Middle East.

First of all, I don’t believe that this deal gives international inspectors adequate access to undeclared sites—24 days is far, far too long a time. Iran can stall, and, in 24 days, they can cover up whatever they have. I am especially troubled by reports about how the Iranian military base at Parchin will be inspected. With these potential roadblocks, the IAEA inspectors may be unable to finish their investigation into the potential military dimensions of Iran’s nuclear program. I don’t think it is essential that Iran provide a full mea culpa of its past activities, but we should have a clear picture of how far Iran has gotten in developing a nuclear weapon.

I also view as a dangerous concession the sunset of the international sanctions on advanced conventional weapons and ballistic missiles. I was told that these issues were not on the table during the talks; so it is unacceptable to me that, after 5 years, Iran can begin buying advanced conventional weapons and, after 8 years, ballistic missiles. Worse, if Iran were to violate the weakened provisions in this agreement, such an action wouldn’t violate the JCPOA and wouldn’t be subject to snapback sanctions.

In my view, Iran is a grave threat to international stability. It is the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world. It continues to hold American citizens behind bars on bogus charges, and our prisoners still languish there. We have an agreement. Their release was not part of the agreement. Iran’s actions

have made a bad situation in a chaotic region worse.

Even under the weight of international sanctions these past few years—when Iran had no money, when its currency was worthless, when its economy was in the toilet—Iran found money to support international terror. Iran has been able to support terrorist groups, such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and other violent extremists. Awash in new cash provided by sanctions relief, Iran will be poised to inflict even greater damage in Syria, Yemen, Iraq, Lebanon, Israel, and our Gulf partners. Iran's leadership has every interest in shoring up support from hard-liners. After all, if a deal goes through, hard-liners will need to be placated.

I can tell you that, within the next few years—in the next Lebanon war with Israel—Hezbollah will have missiles raining down on Israel, and some of those missiles will be paid for by the windfall that Iran is going to get as a result of sanctions being lifted. I think that is unacceptable.

We can have no illusions about what Iran will do with its newfound wealth. We can have no doubt about the malevolent intent of a country's leader who chants "death to America" and "death to Israel" just days after concluding a deal. The ink was not even dry on the deal, and 4 days later, the Supreme Leader led a chant of "death to America." After negotiating with us and agreeing to this agreement, he could not even wait more than 4 days—back to the same old "death to America."

Finally and very importantly, I have a fundamental concern that, 15 years from now, under this agreement, Iran will be free to produce weapons-grade, highly enriched uranium without any limitation. What does that mean? It means Iran will be a legitimized nuclear threshold state after the year 2030, with advanced centrifuges and the ability to stockpile enriched uranium. So, in reality, this agreement does not prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon; it only postpones it.

If Iran pursues that course, I fear it could spark a nuclear arms race across the region. After years of intransigence, I am simply not confident that Iran will be a more responsible partner.

Before I finish, I would also like to say a few words about the debate surrounding this issue so far.

We can disagree on the issues. We should debate the details of any important policy, such as this one, and we must rely on our democratic institutions to carry us forward as they have for so long; but we cannot question the motives of any Member of Congress no matter where he or she stands on this issue.

So, instead of using this time to grind a political ax, let's, instead, look down the road. After all, we know that this deal is going forward, and when that happens, we need to ask how we can make this agreement stronger.

How do we ensure the security of Israel and our other friends and allies

in the region? How do we keep resources out of the hands of terrorists as sanctions are lifted? What support does Congress need to provide so that the United States and our partners can hold Iran to its word and ultimately keep it from getting a bomb?

The time to start answering these questions is now.

That is why, in the days and weeks ahead, I will reach out to colleagues—Republicans and Democrats alike—to chart a path forward. I will be working with Chairman ROYCE and others on both sides of the aisle. I will develop new legislation to counter Iran as it dumps its soon-to-be-acquired billions of dollars into terrorist groups and weapons programs. I will work with other lawmakers toward new initiatives that support Israel and our Middle East allies so that they can stand up to an unleashed Iran; and I will work here in Congress and with the administration to make sure the deal is fully implemented to the letter.

We need to focus on strengthening our deterrence in the region; and, most importantly, we have to work hard to continue to enhance the U.S.-Israel relationship. We must reinvigorate the bipartisan consensus which has been the foundation of America's relationship with Israel; and we must ensure that Israel is able to maintain its qualitative military edge and its ability to defend itself.

The world is watching us this week. The United States is being looked to, not for rhetoric and outrage, but for leadership and resolve. So let's present our arguments and cast our votes. Then let's work together to move forward in a productive way. I appreciate how we have worked together on the Foreign Affairs Committee with Chairman ROYCE.

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

□ 1745

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the bipartisan relationship that all of the Members on the Foreign Affairs Committee have, but especially today, the words of Mr. ENGEL that every Member of this House should be mindful that impugning motives, questioning the motives of those who disagree with us, is not conducive to an honest and fair debate over these issues. I thank him for making that point on the floor today.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, when the President started these negotiations with Iran, I think, when you look at the fatal flaw in the beginning of those negotiations, they should have started with one basic premise. That premise, Mr. Speaker, ought to have been to finally force Iran to dismantle their nuclear weapons program.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that was not the objective of these negotiations. In fact, if you look, it seemed there

was more interest on making sure that a deal could be reached that China and Russia and Iran could finally agree to.

And the problem is, when you look at the fatal flaw of that negotiation, what has it yielded? And why is there such strong opposition across the country from members of both parties to this agreement?

I think most Americans recognize that Iran cannot be trusted with a nuclear weapon. Just look at their own rhetoric. Just this week the Ayatollah himself led the chant "death to America."

These are the people that the President is negotiating with to ultimately end up at the end of this deal with the ability to develop not just a nuclear bomb, but a nuclear arsenal, Mr. Speaker.

Just look at the tenets of the deal itself. One of the conditions in the deal actually allows Iran to have more than 5,000 centrifuges. If they comply with the deal, they can keep more than 5,000 centrifuges to enrich uranium.

It took Pakistan about 3,000 centrifuges to develop their bomb, and Iran will have over 5,000 centrifuges if they comply with the deal, let alone if they cheat. And we know the history there.

Let's look at other components of the deal, Mr. Speaker. In this deal, if there is a site that is undeclared and our intelligence along the way over these next few years exposes the fact that there is something there that we want to go look at, that we question whether or not they are cheating, Mr. Speaker, we have to get permission under this deal and wait over 24 days.

Imagine all of the things that can be hidden in 24 days if we have the intelligence that they are cheating. How could this be part of a deal that we would agree to that is in the American best interest?

Ultimately, what we have to come to an agreement on is what is in the best interest of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, we also ought to be concerned about our allies, Israel, and the other Arab states in the region that have deep, grave concerns about this, others that are indicating that this will start a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

Within 10 years, you could have nearly a half a dozen states in the Middle East with nuclear arms. This isn't the way we ought to go.

Then, of course, there are the secret side deals. We have seen evidence now that there are secret side deals that the President won't disclose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, under the law that President Obama himself signed, the law actually says the President has to disclose to Congress and the American people all information

related to this deal, including “side agreements.”

And now we are hearing at least two secret side agreements exist, one that allows Iran to actually do their own inspections.

Mr. Speaker, these are the people that this deal is going to allow to inspect their own nuclear facilities. The President ought to release to the American people the details of these secret side agreements right now or withdraw this entire proposal.

President Reagan said, “Trust, but verify.” Under this agreement, President Obama is saying trust Iran to verify. You cannot allow this to go through.

I urge all of my colleagues to reject this deal. The President lays out a false premise that it is this deal or war.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, there is a much different approach, a much better approach, and that is to go get a better deal that protects the interest of the United States of America for today and for decades to come.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a very valued member of our committee and one of the subcommittee ranking members.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, when I came to this House in 1997, a few months after I started serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I said back then that the Iran nuclear program was the greatest single threat to the security of Americans. It was true then. It is true now.

On July 14, a few hours after the deal was published, I came to this floor and said that what this House ought to do is consider a Resolution of Approval of the nuclear deal and to vote it down by a large vote. That is exactly what we will do tomorrow morning.

Let me go through a number of points that proponents and opponents of this deal can both agree on. The first is this resolution is quite a bit different than the one we have been thinking about for the last month.

This is a Resolution of Approval. And even if we vote it down, the President can and will carry out this agreement.

That is very different from the Resolution of Disapproval that we have all talked about and made commitments about.

We don't have any commitments on this resolution. It is a totally new resolution. This resolution will express the feelings of Congress, but will not prevent the President from carrying out the deal.

Second, we can agree this deal is better during the next year and a half than it is the next decade. The controls on Iran's nuclear program are much stronger for the first 10 years than they are thereafter.

Whether you like the deal or hate the deal, you have got to agree that it is better up front than it is in the out-years.

The third thing we can agree on is that the President only promised Iran

that he would sign the deal and that he would carry out the deal and that he would use his veto, as he has threatened to do and has successfully done, in effect—that he would carry out the deal using his powers to do so. That is already settled.

Mr. Speaker, the President never told Iran that Congress would approve this deal. Why should we give Iran more than they bargained for? They bargained for the President's signature together with his freedom to carry out the deal. That is already settled. Why should we give Iran something extra in return for nothing?

We should not vote to approve this deal.

The next thing we can all agree on is that this deal is not a binding agreement as a matter of U.S. Constitutional law or international law.

The Constitution defines a treaty. This is not a treaty and certainly wouldn't get a two-thirds vote confirmation in the Senate.

If you look at the Vienna Convention on the law of treaties, this is not a ratified treaty, it is not an unratified treaty, it is not a legislative executive agreement. It is simply an agreement between the executives of the respective governments.

Mr. Speaker, the next thing we can agree on is that we don't know what the best policy for America is in the next decade. Let's keep our options open. Iran is not legally bound by this agreement. Even if they were, they would conveniently ignore that any day of the week.

We cannot feel that we are legally bound. Now, as a legal matter, we are not. But appearances matter. And if this agreement that has been signed by the President gets a positive vote of approval in this House, there will be those around the world who believe that it is binding on the United States, even while, as a legal matter, it is not binding on Iran and, oh, by the way, their legislature hasn't voted to approve it.

So we need freedom of action. What form will that action take? Will we demand that Iran continue to limit its nuclear program beyond year 10, beyond year 15?

After all, we are continuing the sanctions relief all through the next decade. I don't know if that will be the right policy or not.

Mr. Speaker, the current President's hands are untied. He gets to carry out his policy for the remainder of the term. Vote no on this resolution. Because if we vote yes, we are tying the hands of future Presidents in a decade to come.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who currently chairs our Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight the hard work of our esteemed chairman, Mr. ROYCE of Cali-

fornia, and our ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, who have done an incredible job throughout—I don't know how many hearings we have had in our Foreign Affairs Committee—highlighting the many flaws of this deal and giving the other side the opportunity to present what is good about this deal.

Mr. Speaker, after all of those hearings in our Foreign Affairs Committee led by Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL, it is simple to realize what is before us today. This deal paves the way for a nuclear-armed Iran in as little as 15 years.

This deal lifts the arms embargo. This deal lifts the sanctions on Iran's ballistic missile program. This deal releases billions of dollars that will allow the regime to increase funding to support terror, as it has been doing, to support its regional hegemonic ambitions.

If all of that were not bad enough, with this deal, the P5+1 countries will actually be obligated to help Iran modernize and advance its nuclear program. Yes. You heard that right. This is important because this modernization requirement gets lost with all of the other many flaws of this deal.

We actually have an agreement before us to help Iran strengthen its ability to protect against nuclear security threats, to protect it against sabotage, to protect all the physical sites.

Incredibly enough, we will be helping Iran with its nuclear program. So now, not only do we have to allow Iran to enrich, not only do we have to allow Iran to become a nuclear threshold state, but, yes, we must actually protect Iran's nuclear program from sabotage and outside threats.

Mr. Speaker, how does a rogue regime that has been in violation of its nonproliferation treaty obligations for decades, a rogue regime that has been in violation of—one, two, three, four, five—six United Nations Security Council resolutions and a regime that violates other international obligations get to be the beneficiary of such protections from the U.S. and other P5+1 countries?

This is madness, Mr. Speaker. It simply defies logic. We must oppose this deal. Let's vote that way.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a very important member of the committee, the ranking member of the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding. I thank the chairman for his leadership in the committee.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a lot of points made during this debate. I would like to set some context for the rest of the evening.

Iran's regime is anti-American. They are anti-Israel. They are homophobic. They are misogynistic. They violate the human rights of their people.

Iran's support for terrorists has led directly to the deaths of American citizens. It actively works to destabilize

the Middle East. It vows to destroy Israel.

It is responsible for the death of civilians and members of the military from Beirut to Buenos Aires. It has assisted in Assad's slaughter of 300,000 of his own people.

As we gather here today, four Americans—Jason Rezaian, Amir Hekmati, Saeed Abedini, my constituent Bob Levinson—are in Iran, held by the regime and unable to return home to their families.

Mr. Speaker, it is well known that I oppose this deal. On the nuclear issue, it does not dismantle Iran's nuclear program. It pauses it.

Now, inspections in Nantanz and Fordow are very positive, as is the monitoring of the fuel cycle and the reduction in enriched uranium. But we cannot access other suspected nuclear sites in less than 24 days.

If we find Iran in violation of this agreement, we cannot restore sanctions to the punishing level of today and, if we snap back sanctions, Mr. Speaker, Iran has the right to cease performing its obligations under the agreement altogether.

□ 1800

While there has been a lot of speculation about what could happen in the absence of a deal, we know that, under this deal, the regime will get billions of dollars to support terrorism; we know the arms embargo will be lifted, meaning that the most advanced weapons will be available to the regime; and we know that the ban on the development of ballistic missiles will be lifted.

Now, I have heard a lot of criticism of those of us who oppose the deal. I don't want war, Mr. Speaker. To the contrary, I want to prevent Iran from using billions of dollars to cause more violence and its surrogates to cause more bloodshed.

I don't want the start of an arms race. To the contrary, I want to prevent Iran from developing advanced centrifuges and an industrial nuclear program with an unlimited number of centrifuges so that other nations will not seek nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I don't oppose this deal because of politics or my religion or the people who live in my district. I have simply concluded that the risks are too great.

Now, these past few weeks have been challenging for all of us. Reasonable people can disagree, and I am saddened by the often vitriolic comments hurled at those of us with different views on both sides. I also disagree with the decision by the Republican leadership to make up new rules, ignoring our ability to have an impact right now through the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act that passed 400-25.

The consequences of this deal, Mr. Speaker, present us with some harsh realities, but rather than denying them, it is now time for Congress to begin the work of defying them, and it will require bipartisan support to do it.

That means ramping up intelligence sharing and counterterrorism cooperation with Israel and our Gulf partners and making clear to our allies that Iran's violent activities in the region will not be tolerated. It means enhancing Israel's qualitative military edge and making Iran know that the penalties should it cheat and break out to a bomb will be punishing.

It means intensifying sanctions already enshrined in U.S. law for Iranian support for terrorism and violation of human rights. President Obama rightly made this point last week: nothing in this deal prevents the United States from sanctioning people, banks, and businesses that support terrorism, and we must do so together.

What happens next? I will vote against the deal. Mr. Speaker, there will be a day after the final resolution of this nuclear deal, and on that day, this House must work together to ensure that Iran's terrorism is checked and that Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon. On that, we all agree.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security and a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, for the last decade, Congress has passed bipartisan sanctions to get to the point where we are today, and the purpose of these sanctions was to dismantle Iran's nuclear weapons program.

This agreement does not achieve that goal. In fact, this agreement puts Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terror, on a glidepath to a nuclear bomb. Proponents say it is the only alternative to war, but I believe that is a false choice.

I recently met with Prime Minister Netanyahu, and he agreed that our goal should be a good deal, but that we cannot put our security at risk for a bad deal. Make no mistake, this is a bad deal for America and for our allies.

It will not stop Iran's nuclear program. It will leave Iran with the ingredients for a bomb and infrastructure to build it, and it will spark a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. It will give Iran a cash windfall, freeing up over \$100 billion to fuel the regime's global campaign of Islamist terror.

Incredibly, this agreement lifts restrictions on Iran's ballistic missiles, which the Ayatollah himself said that they will mass-produce. There is only one reason to develop an ICBM, Mr. Speaker, and that is to deliver a nuclear warhead across continents, which means the United States.

A top Iranian general bragged recently that his country will have "a new ballistic missile test in the near future that will be a thorn in the eyes of our enemies."

President Reagan's famous negotiating advice was to "trust, but verify." We can't trust a regime that has cheated on every deal. President Rouhani says his country's centrifuges will

never stop spinning and that they will "buy, sell, and develop any weapons we need and will not ask for permission or abide by any resolution."

Now, the White House is counting on verification measures spelled out in secret side deals between Iran and the IAEA, which Secretary Kerry testified to me that even he has not seen. Astonishingly, the AP reports that the side deal allows Iran to self-inspect its nuclear sites.

Now, the American people, through their representatives in Congress, are expected to vote on this measure without seeing these secret deals, which goes to the heart of verification. This, in my judgment, is nothing short of reckless.

Let's be clear-eyed about what we are debating. This was not a negotiation with an honest government; it was a negotiation with terrorists who chant "death to America" and are responsible for more than a thousand American casualties in Iraq alone. If we allow this deal to go forward, we are putting the security of the world at grave risk.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our Nation's security and in defense of the free world, I cannot in good conscience support this agreement.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to approve this agreement. After a thorough review process, I believe it is in the best national security interests of the United States and our allies for Congress to support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

I have been a public official for nearly 23 years. This is the most consequential vote I have taken and the most difficult decision I have ever faced. I have spent the review period methodically going through the agreement, raising concerns with the administration, and speaking with independent sources, including nuclear nonproliferation experts, economists, and foreign ambassadors.

I also held a series of meetings and spoke with many constituents who fervently hold very strong and differing positions. My goal was to determine whether the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is the most likely path to prevent Iran from achieving their nuclear weapons goals.

This agreement is clearly not perfect. It is one tool that we have to combat Iran's nuclear ambitions. Ultimately, my support is based on substance. Importantly, my Jewish identity and Jewish heart weighed heavily in my decisionmaking process.

As we listen to Iran's leaders call for the destruction of the Jewish people in Israel, history offers a brutal reminder of what happens when we do not listen.

Iran continues to be a leading state sponsor of terrorism, but an Iran with a nuclear weapon or Hezbollah or Hamas with a nuclear shield is far

more dangerous. With the JCPOA in place, we will have Iran's nuclear program under the most intrusive monitoring and inspection mechanisms in place, while we continue to combat Iran's terrorist reach.

I have personally spoken with the President and my colleagues about steps that we must and will take to continue strengthening Israel's and our other allies' intelligence and military capabilities. Opponents say we must press for a better deal, but after thoroughly investigating this prospect, I am left with no evidence that one is likely or even possible.

I heard directly from our allies, top diplomats, and analysts from across the political spectrum that the sanctions regime that we have in place now will erode, if not completely fall apart. Moreover, our partners will not come back to the negotiating table, and neither will Iran, and no one opposed to this deal has produced any evidence to the contrary.

I cannot comprehend why we would walk away from the safeguards in this agreement, leaving Iran speeding toward a nuclear weapon. Safeguards like 24/7/365 access, monitoring all of Iran's previously declared nuclear sites, eliminating 98 percent of Iran's highly enriched uranium stockpile, and the unprecedented standard of monitoring every stage of the nuclear supply chain.

Even if Iran cheats, we will know much more about their nuclear program, allowing us to more effectively eliminate it if that ever becomes necessary.

As a Jewish mother and as a Member of Congress, nothing is more important to me than ensuring the safety and security of the United States and Israel. I am confident that supporting this agreement is the best opportunity that we have to do that.

Mr. Speaker, we have an expression in Judaism, may the United States go from strength to strength, and as we say in synagogue, the people of Israel live—am Yisrael chai.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), chairman of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to President Obama's nuclear deal with Iran. Now, the President says it is a good deal; and you know what, he is right. It is a very good deal for Iran; but it is a very bad deal for America.

I fear, in his rush to try to build a legacy, the President has clearly given up far too much for far too little. He has done this at the expense of our security, as well as the security of our friend Israel and other U.S. allies.

Mr. Speaker, this is a deadly serious matter. The first thing the President does in his agreement with Iran is to give them some startup capital. An estimated \$120 billion held abroad will now be repatriated back to Iran's central bank, \$120 billion to a regime

whose Supreme Leader, to this day, calls for the annihilation of Israel, a regime that still chants "death to America," a regime that has put bounties on the heads of American soldiers and has the blood of American citizens on its hands, a regime whose sponsorship of Hezbollah has left our closest ally in the region, Israel, with 80,000 rockets trained on it.

In sum, it is a regime that simply represents the world's largest and most dangerous state sponsor of terrorism.

Now, President Obama would have us believe that waiving sanctions against this regime would make the world safer, but this is the very same President that dismissed the Islamic State as the JV team, and we see what that has gotten us.

This is simply not an administration whose assessment of national security threats is credible, and the stakes involved with a nuclear Iran leave zero room for error.

In truth, Mr. Speaker, I fear it is we who sent the JV team to negotiate with Iran. Sadly, they were outplayed, outmaneuvered, and outwitted; and the result of their failure is the dangerous agreement we have before us today.

It is such a flawed agreement that the President, yet again, tells Congress we have to pass something to actually find out what is in it. In other words, the President has utterly failed to provide the secret side agreements.

President Obama once told us we cannot allow Iran to get a nuclear weapon, but under his deal, Iran's nuclear program will not be dismantled, only temporarily slowed, and that is if the Iranians don't cheat; but the President's team has failed to achieve anytime, anywhere inspections. Thus, it will be impossible to ensure the Iranians aren't cheating.

Ah, but don't worry, Mr. Speaker, we are told the Iranians will turn themselves in if they cheat—really? In short, the President's agreement rewards Iran's terrorist-sponsoring regime with billions of dollars in relief without any guarantee of compliance.

When you look at the record, Mr. Speaker, I don't trust this administration. I don't trust the Iranians. Why would we ever trust the two together? For the sake of our national security, I urge all of my colleagues to reject this flawed, dangerous agreement.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this historic nuclear agreement reached by the United States and our negotiating partners with Iran. For the sake of our national security and that of our allies, we must seize this unique opportunity.

In the midst of all these wild charges, let's just try to get some perspective. In fact, this agreement goes far beyond any negotiated nuclear deal in history.

□ 1815

It will reduce Iran's stockpiled uranium by nearly 98 percent; it will per-

manently prevent the plutonium pathway to a nuclear weapon at Arak; it will disable and mothball two-thirds of Iran's enrichment centrifuges, including more advanced models; it will terminate all enrichment at Fordow; and it will provide for intrusive inspections of nuclear sites in perpetuity.

This is an unprecedented degrading—not just a freezing, a massive degrading—of Iran's nuclear program. No military strike or strikes could achieve as much.

I challenge any of the agreement's detractors to present a viable alternative that achieves the same result and will verifiably prevent a nuclear-armed Iran for the foreseeable future. They won't—and they haven't—because they can't. There simply isn't a viable diplomatic or military alternative for preventing an Iranian nuclear weapon.

The notion that we could somehow unilaterally reject the agreement and still compel the P5+1 to resume negotiations is pure fantasy. Our international partners have made clear that reinstating the effective sanctions regime that brought Iran to the negotiating table would be impossible. For Congress to scuttle the deal would destroy our credibility as a negotiating party and would very likely put Iran right back on the path to developing a weapon.

The stakes couldn't be higher. The nuclear issue should transcend political opportunism and partisan rancor. We should be working together across party lines to ensure the swift and effective implementation of the JCPOA. We should be exploring ways that we can enhance cooperative efforts with Israel and the international community to address Iran's support for Hezbollah and its gross abuse of human rights as well as other critical challenges in the Middle East.

Today, we can start down that path by supporting the agreement. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the resolution of approval.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank my colleague from the Foreign Affairs Committee for his leadership on this work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to this legislation that would clear the way for the President's misguided deal with Iran.

The United States must continue to stand between Iran and nuclear weapons capability, but instead, the deal legitimizes Iran's nuclear achievements and strengthens its extremist regime.

The agreement gradually removes the key barriers that prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons capabilities, from growing its economic influence in the Middle East, and from continuing its state funding of terrorist organizations that threaten the security of the country and the well-being of our allies.

This deal lifts critical economic sanctions that have limited Iran's

scope of influence in the region, removes the arms embargo, and lifts mis- sile program restrictions.

For these reasons, I oppose the Presi- dent's deal and urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gen- tleman has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Iran nuclear agreement should be judged on what is best for our national security and what is more likely to produce peace. I believe that peace has a better chance if we reject this deal, keep sanctions on, and go back to the negoti- ating table to get a better agreement.

This agreement was supposed to pre- vent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, but, at best, Iran will be a nu- clear threshold state in 15 years. By practically guaranteeing and legiti- mizing this access, there will be a rush by others in the region to gain their own nuclear weapons, creating an enor- mously dangerous arms race in the most volatile part of the world.

The inspections protocols in the agreement are troubling because they give Iran 24 days to delay inspection requests at suspected nuclear sites, a far cry from "anytime, anywhere." And the agreement contains deeply concerning sanctions relief on Iran's acquisition of conventional weapons and ballistic missile technology in 5 and 8 years, respectively.

These are just some of my concerns that lead me, after careful consider- ation, to oppose this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, we should and we can do better. I urge my colleagues to re- ject this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT).

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for all of their hard work.

The fact that we are even debating whether to enter into this agreement is very troubling.

Let's be clear what we are talking about. The United States of America is going to enter into a deal with a rogue nation who refuses to release the four Americans they are holding, who has cheated on every deal they have been party to over the past 30 years, who is a party to secret deals we cannot see, who calls all of us the Great Satan, who calls for death to our citizens and wants to wipe Israel off the face of the Earth. And we are told the deal is nec- essary because the United States of America has no other option.

Has it really come to this? We have options. One option is a better deal, and a better deal looks like this: re- lease the four Americans, no sunset clause, and inspections just like we were promised—anytime, anywhere. And if these terms are unacceptable to Iran, then the United States of Amer-

ica will use all of its economic might to put tough sanctions back in place.

If we do this deal, let's look at what the next 25 years looks like.

Immediately, in the next 12 months, Iran will get their hands on \$50 billion to \$150 billion. The money will not be used for their citizens. It will be used to perpetuate terror around the world. Iran will get its money; we won't get our four Americans.

Over the next 12 months, they will start to cheat and they will get a bomb or two. Over the next 12 months, we are going to start an arms race in the Mid- dle East. Over the next 1 to 5 years, we will try and snap back sanctions, but that will be ineffective because all the long-term contracts will be grand- fathered in.

In 5 years, Iran will be buying con- ventional weapons. In 8 years, they will have a ballistic missile. In 10 years, be- cause of their cheating, they will have a ballistic missile with a nuclear bomb pointed at the United States of Amer- ica. And in 25 years, our friend and ally Israel may not exist.

I was in business for 30 years before I got here, and the one thing I knew is you cannot do a good deal with a bad guy.

We cannot do this deal with Iran.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NAD- LER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution of approval of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Throughout this debate, there have been accusations questioning the mo- tives and loyalties of Members in mak- ing this decision. It is precisely be- cause I believe this agreement is in the interest of the United States and be- cause I have been a strong supporter of Israel my entire life that I am sup- porting the Iran nuclear agreement.

This must not be a vote of politics but of conscience. I, for one, could not live with myself if I voted in a way that I believe would put the lives of Americans and Israelis at greater risk of an Iranian nuclear bomb.

My priority and overriding objective in assessing this agreement has been to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear bomb. The interests of the United States and of Israel in this respect are identical. In addition to constituting an existential threat to Israel, a nu- clear-armed Iran would make Iran's conventional threats more dangerous and difficult to counter and pose a greater danger to the United States, to the region, and to the world.

The question before us is not whether this is a good deal. The question is which of the two options available to us—supporting or rejecting the deal—is more likely to avert a nuclear-armed Iran. I have concluded, after examining all the arguments, that supporting the Iran nuclear agreement gives us the better chance of preventing Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

The agreement will shut Iran's path- ways to developing the necessary fis-

sionable material for a nuclear bomb for at least 15 years. The inspection and verification procedures against il- licit plutonium production or uranium enrichment are airtight.

The questions that have been raised about inspection procedures—the so- called side deals, the alleged self-in- spection—do not relate to the central issue of production of fissionable mate- rial. And without fissionable material, you cannot make a bomb.

Even after 15 years, when some of the restrictions will be eased, we would still know instantly about any attempt to make bomb materials because the inspectors and the electronic and pho- tographic surveillance will still be there. The options available to a future President for stopping Iran then would be better than the options available now if the deal is rejected because we would have more access, instant intel- ligence, and more knowledge of the Ira- nian program.

The argument that if we reject the deal, we can force Iran back to the ne- gotiating table and obtain a better deal is a fantasy. It is not a viable alter- native. The other countries that have joined us in multilateral sanctions against Iran have made it clear that they will drop their sanctions if we re- ject the deal; and American sanctions, by themselves, have been proven inef- fective in coercing Iran.

We must be very clear that, if nec- essary, the United States will use mili- tary force to prevent an Iranian nu- clear bomb; but the odds of that being necessary are significantly less with approval of this deal than with rejec- tion of the agreement.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NADLER. Going forward, it re- mains vital that we continue to pursue ways to further guarantee the security of the United States, of Israel, and of our other allies in the Middle East. This will require strict and diligent oversight of the implementation of the agreement, maintaining Israel's quali- tative military edge, and countering Iran's support for terrorism and other destabilizing conduct.

We must be ready to take action against Iran's nefarious behavior, and Iran must know that the United States will never allow it to pose a nuclear threat to the region and the world.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), chairman of the Committee on Ethics.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in op- position to this bill and the underlying Iran nuclear agreement.

Despite entering into these negotia- tions from a position of strength—that would be the United States—the deal before us fails to achieve the goal of preventing Iran's capacity to develop a nuclear weapon. It simply contains or manages Iran's nuclear program.

By agreeing to a lax enforcement and inspections regime and fanciful, unrealistic snapback sanctions, the administration has accepted that Iran should remain 1 year away from a nuclear bomb. I am not prepared to accept that. The sanctions relief will provide Iran with billions of dollars of funds that will bolster the Revolutionary Guard and nonstate militant groups. The deal ends the conventional arms embargo and the prohibition on ballistic missile technology. Not only will this result in conventional arms flowing to groups like Hezbollah, it concedes the delivery system for a nuclear bomb.

This agreement will provide Iran with nuclear infrastructure, a missile delivery system, and the funds to pay for it all. And, by the way, the I in ICBM means "intercontinental." I don't believe that New Zealand and Mexico are the intended targets. That would be us.

This deal cripples and shatters the current notion of nuclear nonproliferation. If Iran can enrich uranium, which they can under this agreement, their Gulf Arab neighbors will likely want to do the same.

I do not want a nuclear arms race, a nuclearized Middle East, a region of state instability in irrational nonstate actors. Someone explain to me how deterrence works under that scenario. We should not reward the ayatollahs with billions of dollars and sophisticated weapons in exchange for temporary and unenforceable nuclear restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, I have always supported a diplomatic resolution to the Iran nuclear issue, but this is a dangerously weak agreement. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

□ 1830

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS).

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action between the P5+1 and Iran. The deal fails to dismantle Iran's nuclear program. It fails to guarantee intrusive enough inspections to ensure that Iran does not cheat, it fails to keep Iran from achieving nuclear threshold status, and it rewards Iran's horrific behavior.

In the initial phase of this agreement, Iran would quickly receive a whopping sanctions relief package potentially totaling \$150 billion. We all know that Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism and that this money will embolden a regime openly committed to confronting the United States and destabilizing the Middle East.

In 8 years, Iran legally begins expanding its ballistic missile program and continues expanding its intercontinental ballistic missile program under the guise of satellite testing.

And who do we think these missiles are aimed at?

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. VARGAS. As recently as yesterday, Ayatollah Khamenei declared: "I am saying to Israel that they would not live to see the end of these 25 years. There will be no such thing as a Zionist regime in 25 years."

This is a bad deal, and we should reject it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank Chairman ROYCE for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the approval process that is going on and the underlying deal with Iran. It is one of the most consequential foreign policy issues that we will confront, certainly since I have been here and, I expect, for the next several decades.

This is a terrible deal. I can't state it any more forcefully.

We have seen this movie before. In 1994, President Bill Clinton made a deal with North Korea. His deal with North Korea would rid the Korean Peninsula of nuclear weapons and would usher North Korea onto the stage as a responsible citizen of the world's nations. That didn't happen. This is the exact same verbiage we heard on this floor then that is being said tonight, and this is the exact same outcome we will get with Iran and their nuclear program.

Look at their current record. Chief sponsor of state terrorism around the world. As their economy improves with the dropping of the sanctions and the resources they will get, do you realistically think that this ayatollah will, in fact, become a moderate voice within his country?

Do you not think he will take those resources and expand the mischief and terror that he has conducted around the world already under the sanctions that were in place?

The other side has already given up on the snapback provisions. They have argued very eloquently that those won't happen because we can't reinforce the sanctions that were the heart of what got Iran at the table today.

Mr. Speaker, this deal ushers in a world that is less safe, less stable, and less secure.

Trust must be earned. I trust Iran's word when they say that Israel must go away. I trust Iran when they say "death to America." I do not trust Iran when they say they will abide by this agreement.

I wouldn't play golf with these people because golf is one of those events where you have to self-assess your penalties. They will not do that in playing golf, and they are not about to do it with respect to this nuclear program that is going on.

We have no way of knowing what their covert activities might be over the next several years. They will cheat. They have cheated, and they will continue to cheat. We cannot trust these people with a deal.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the motion of approval and reject this deal. Tell the world where we stand. Whether our partners around the world can see the clear-eyed threat that these folks represent to the world for the next several decades, we can see it, and we must vote "no."

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 64, which disapproves of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action negotiated by the P5+1.

I reviewed the agreement thoroughly, participated in classified briefings, and listened to the many details and intricacies present by the nuclear and security experts on all sides. This agreement may not be perfect, but it is the most viable option we have in reducing Iran's capability of acquiring a nuclear weapon.

The JCPOA prolongs Iran's nuclear weapon breakout time, reduces their number of operating centrifuges, and decreases Iran's current stockpile of low enriched uranium.

More importantly, the agreement allows the International Atomic Energy Agency the ability to access and inspect Iran to verify and ensure compliance.

Should Iran cheat, the international community will come together and once again reimpose the sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table.

In every situation that involves the possibility of using military force to overcome a threat, I will always side with exploring and exhausting every possible avenue towards a diplomatic resolution first.

I support the JCPOA because it provides a reasonable, balanced, and diplomatic solution rather than a worst-case scenario.

In closing, with the support of 36 retired generals and admirals and 29 of the Nation's top scientists, I am confident we are on the right track with this plan. All of these highly distinguished and experienced leaders agree that this agreement is the most effective means currently available to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), the chair of the Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this legislation and the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, also known as the Iran nuclear deal. A chief reason for this opposition is important, yet simple: The Iran nuclear deal doesn't make America safer, it doesn't make Israel safer, and it doesn't make the rest of the world safer either.

Whatever your thoughts on this Iran nuclear deal, we should all be able to agree, the world will be a much more dangerous and unstable place if Iran were to obtain a nuclear weapon. Unfortunately, the deal the President negotiated won't stop that from happening.

Instead, under this deal, Iran gets to keep its nuclear facilities. Amazingly, it will be allowed to self-police those facilities and report directly to the IAEA, an idea that would be laughable if it were not so crazy.

Iran will get to enrich uranium, all while receiving sanctions relief to the tune of \$150 billion—\$150 billion pumped into a \$400 billion a year national economy; \$150 billion that will no doubt be used by Iran to bankroll terrorist organizations, further destabilize the Middle East, and continue their work to wipe Israel off the map.

It was Ronald Reagan who said “trust but verify” during arms control negotiations with Communist Russia more than a generation ago, but it seems the Obama administration is asking us to trust Iran and then trust some more. Well, I'm not willing to do that, and the American people aren't willing to do that either.

We need to stop this bad deal before it is too late and negotiate a better deal, a deal that stops Iran's nuclear program and ensures the safety of America, Israel, and the rest of the world now and into the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) has expired.

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

I rise in support of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and against the resolution—well, actually, in favor of the resolution of approval.

I must say, in starting, we are at a paradoxical moment. The fears, the haunting specter, a terrible thing, the existential threats posed by a nuclear Iran are all legitimate fears and legitimate haunting specters, regional hegemony to be avoided.

But ironically, those concerns and those fears and those outcomes raised by my friends on the other side of the aisle and the opponents of this agreement actually come true and are realized if we do what they want us to do, which is to reject this agreement.

The alternative to this agreement is an opaque, unconstrained Iranian nuclear program, Mr. Speaker, hanging like the sword of Damocles over all of our heads. And the security of the United States and Israel and regional partners, who knows?

The false hope offered by the critics is let's return to the negotiating table to seek a better deal. A man that I respect, at one of our hearings that Chairman ED ROYCE chaired on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, former Senator Joe Lieberman, said just that.

I said: How did that work? He said: Well, let's just go back to the partners

and Iran and say, we just couldn't sell it; let's start over.

The proposition that we would renounce our own agreement that we negotiated, wrought by more than a year of tough negotiations, and expect that our negotiating partners, including Russia and China and, of course, Iran itself, would sit back down at the table and start all over again under our leadership is specious, if not delusional, as an argument.

We cannot be naive about the scenario in which Congress rejects this agreement brokered by our own country. Among our allies, we divest ourselves of the goodwill that undergirded these negotiations; and among our adversaries, we would confirm their suspicion we cannot be trusted.

The international sanctions regime that drove Iran to the negotiating table would collapse, and our diplomatic leverage would be diminished in all future U.S.-led negotiations.

Most concerning of all, we would return, once again, to the situation we are at, one of deep anxiety and uncertainty regarding Iran's nuclear ambitions.

Critics of the agreement have offered no alternative and have tried to define that agreement by what it is not. It is not a perfect deal that dismantles every nut and bolt of the Iranian nuclear development program, peaceful or otherwise.

It is not a comprehensive resolution of the entire relationship and the myriad issues the U.S. and our allies have with the repressive regime in Tehran and its reprehensible support for terrorist insurgencies in the region. No one ever said it would be.

What arms control agreement in the history of our country has ever attempted to circumscribe every aspect of a relationship with an adversary?

And certainly not this one. In other words, this agreement is the diplomatic alternative we sought to attain when we entered into these very negotiations.

The deal adheres to the high standards of verification, transparency, and compliance on which any acceptable agreement with Iran must be founded. That isn't just my word. That is what former Republican Secretary of State Colin Powell says. That is what Republican former NSC Adviser Brent Scowcroft says. That is what former Republican Senator John Warner from my State says.

The agreement erects an unprecedented and intrusive inspection regime that provides the IAEA with access to declared nuclear facilities and suspected covert nuclear development sites.

Additionally, they will be able to monitor Iran's entire nuclear program supply chain, including uranium mines, mills, centrifuges, rotors, bellows production, storage facilities, and dedicated procurement for nuclear-related or dual-use materials technology.

The agreement also rolls back major components and places strict restric-

tions on the Iranian nuclear program. If these restrictions are not adhered to, the United States can, at any time, unilaterally revive the sanctions currently in place.

Congress should immediately begin to conduct close oversight to ensure those terms are implemented and that Iran is living up to its obligations.

This isn't about trust. It was Ronald Reagan who said “trust, but verify.” Former Secretary of State Clinton today kind of echoed those words, saying “distrust and verify,” and that is why she supports the agreement. It does just that.

More broadly, the United States must signal to Iran that its condemnable record on human rights, terrorism, and regional subversion will not be tolerated; nor will we hide, with this agreement, that action and our response to it. In fact, quite the opposite. We will redouble our efforts to stop them in that egregious behavior.

□ 1845

Mr. Speaker, in closing, article I, section 8, clause 11, of the Constitution vests Congress with the duty to authorize war.

Implicit in that text is Congress' additional responsibility to exhaust all reasonable alternatives before committing the American people and our men and women in uniform to such a fateful path.

The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action represents our best endeavor to provide just that alternative. It is the product of earnest diplomacy. Congress should put aside partisanship and support it for the sake of our country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, several Members spoke of Iran's commitments under this agreement. While it is true that Iran has committed to taking certain steps under the agreement, it is also true that Iranians have never complied with any agreement related to its weapons program.

So let's start with considering what Iran's leaders have been saying today about this agreement. This is what they say. They say that Iran can pursue the development of missiles without any restrictions. How can that be, given what is in this agreement?

Well, President Rouhani—the supposed moderate here—has argued repeatedly that the only restrictions on Iran's missile developments are in the U.N. Security Council resolution.

Endorsing the deal, he says, it is not in the agreement itself. They don't recognize the Security Council resolution. So he says: We are not restricted by this agreement. So what the gentleman is quoting, they say they are not restricted by that.

Mr. Speaker, Iranian leaders say that Iran can violate the U.N. Security Council resolutions without violating the agreement. Sanctions do not, therefore, snap back if Iran violates

the U.N. Security Council resolutions, according to Iran, and that Iran intends to violate the U.N. Security Council restrictions on weapons sales and on imports.

This is President Rouhani again:

We will sell and buy weapons whenever and wherever we deem it necessary. We will not wait for permission from anyone or any resolution.

So Iran's defense minister has said that Iran is negotiating right now to purchase Russian fighter jets. We know they are negotiating in terms of ballistic missiles right now. They are in violation of the agreement, yet we don't see any intention to enforce that.

So we have got to ask ourselves: Just what kind of agreement is this? Who is this agreement with?

As the committee heard yesterday, it is an agreement with a regime whose world view was founded in large part on a fiery theological anti-Americanism and a view of Americanism as Satanism.

I don't have to tell the Members here. I mean, they hear it every week, those of you that are watching what is coming out of Iran "death to America" every week.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement gives up too much too fast with not enough in return, and we have to judge it on the long-term national security interests of the United States.

Does it make the region and the world more safe, secure, stable? In my mind, clearly it does not. So I don't feel this is worthy of the House's support.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in opposition to the so-called Iran nuclear accord. I do so for all the reasons that have been well-articulated over the last couple of hours.

But I also do so based simply on the reason of history. And it is a history that is actually shared with the chairman, in that we were here together in the 1990s.

Then-President Clinton at that time met with North Korea. They formed an accord that basically said: We will give you benefits now for the promise of becoming a responsible member of the world community going forward. The benefits went and accrued to North Korea. The responsible membership in the world community never came.

In that regard, though, the President is certainly well-intended in his efforts. This promise will prove as real as this notion of, if you like your health insurance, you can keep it.

His intentions were good in that regard, with regard to providing health insurance, but it just didn't pan out. I don't think it will be any different in this particular deal.

In that regard, I think it is important to think about what neighbors think of neighbors. In this case, it is important to look at what the Prime Minister of Israel has said in that he believes this is a mistake of "historic proportions."

I think in many ways it mirrors what we saw in 1938. At that point, Neville Chamberlain negotiated with Hitler and gave away Czechoslovakia in the process.

But there in the Munich accords there was this promise of peace, lasting peace in our time. The peace lasted less than a year, and it did not materialize.

I think that the saying is that those who don't learn from history are destined to repeat it.

I think we would be very well-advised to look at the recent history of the 1990s in the North Korea deal, the history of the 1930s, and a whole lot of history across the last 1,000 years that say trading off peace for security is never something that works so well.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, before I recognize the gentleman from New York, I would simply say I think that last analogy is invidious.

The history of World War II is the fact that people ignored warnings for so long that, by the time Munich happened, it most certainly was appeasement.

What should have happened was active engagement to preclude that ever happening. That is precisely what this administration has done.

It will prevent a Munich. It will prevent appeasement. It will provide the dynamic engagement we need to prevent a nuclear Iran.

I now proudly yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. King once said, "On some positions, Cowardice asks the question, 'Is it safe?' Expediency asks the question, 'Is it politic?' Vanity asks the question, 'Is it popular?' But Conscience asks the question, 'Is it right?' And there comes a time when one must take a position that is neither safe, nor politic, nor popular, but one must take it because one's conscience tells one that it is right."

I have often reflected on those words when faced with tough decisions.

Today's vote on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is one of the most consequential votes we will take as Members of Congress.

My support for the Iran agreement is about doing what is right for America, our allies, and the world. It is, indeed, a matter of conscience.

Mr. Speaker, since the conclusion of the agreement, I have traveled to 10 nations and vetted this deal from every angle I could think of so that, at this moment of decision, I could act without reservation and with full understanding.

As I listen to this debate, I am deeply disheartened that we are not adequately weighing the realities of our globalized world.

After years of effort toward a more unified approach to addressing Iran's nuclear ambitions, key partners in the Middle East region and most of our allies consider the Iran agreement as an

important next step in diplomatic efforts.

Former U.S. ambassadors; former Israeli military; former U.S. Secretaries of State, including Colin Powell; and so many others from an array of vantage points have expressed support for this landmark deal, as have over 100 nations.

We should not ignore the considered judgment of scientists, security experts, renowned diplomats, and our allies. The consensus is that this is a good deal.

Now, some of my colleagues believe that, despite the risk, rejecting this deal can lead to a better deal down the road. Others oppose the deal out of reckless political gamesmanship.

But what has become clear to me in my assessment of the risks involved in supporting or rejecting the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is that, if Congress derails this deal, history will record such act as a monumental mistake and the alternatives would not change Iranian nuclear and weaponization pursuits.

Mr. Speaker, rejecting the plan and resorting to unilateral sanctions would prove futile, as it has in the past, while relying on military action would not curb Iran's ambitions or erase its technical knowledge.

Critics also assert that this deal does not address concerns about issues with Iran that are outside the scope of the plan. We know from past experience that reaching an agreement on one critical issue does not preclude us from working on other serious concerns by other means.

We negotiated with the Soviet Union during Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, which took place in the midst of the Vietnam war that was waged against us with Soviet-made arms, yet those agreements lessened the danger of nuclear confrontation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration has shown tremendous leadership on the world stage by choosing diplomacy first. Leadership is never easy. By definition, it is a lonely and sometimes an unpopular exercise.

Today we must show leadership, we must display fortitude, and do what is right. And what is right in this scenario is that we support the Iran agreement.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, this deal is a capitulation by the greatest nation in the world to the most rogue nation in the world.

What makes the deal so bad is that Iran doesn't even have to cheat to emerge in 10 or 15 years with an industrial-sized nuclear program and with little or no breakout time to achieve nuclear weapons capabilities.

By lifting the financial sanctions, we are literally financing the very weapons and terror that will be directed at us and our allies by the biggest state sponsor of terrorism in the world today.

Amazingly, we are abandoning the arms embargo and the ballistic missile embargo against Iran for good measure.

Not only is our national security threatened, but our close ally, Israel, fears for its very existence under this deal. We simply cannot abandon Israel.

Let history record that I stand against this weak and dangerous deal with a regime that hates the U.S. and hates Israel.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution approving the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action regarding the nuclear program of Iran negotiated by the Obama administration in concert with five other nations, the P5+1.

I want to commend President Obama's Secretary Kerry, Under Secretary Sherman, Secretary Moniz, and their teams for their leadership and continued, persistent engagement with our international partners and Members of Congress to make this moment possible.

None of us comes to this decision lightly. It is perhaps the most important decision of our public life, no matter what decision we come to.

But after reading the agreement and the classified and unclassified underlying documents, taking part in numerous briefings at the White House and here on Capitol Hill, meeting with constituents, and studying the analyses of experts, I am confident that this strong diplomatic achievement provides the only option that prevents Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and, by some estimates, in as few as 2 to 3 months. This is not achieved by trust, Mr. Speaker, but through verification.

Mr. Speaker, after 14 years of continuous military engagement for our armed services, this agreement cuts off all pathways to an Iranian nuclear weapon and does so without unnecessarily risking American lives in yet another military action, even as the agreement preserves that ultimate option, should it become necessary in the event of Iran's default.

This agreement sends a clear message to Iran that the global community stands united today and well into the future in ensuring that Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon.

Much has been said of Iran's capacity after 10 to 15 years. And even there, the agreement places Iran in the confines of a nuclear non-proliferation treaty, just as the rest of us are.

If Iran violates the agreement, they will, without question, face complete isolation, even more severe repercussions, and the U.S. retains our ability to engage unilateral sanctions and our military option.

It is true that this agreement is not perfect. But if this agreement does not

go forward, there is no better deal, Mr. Speaker. In fact, there is no deal. No sanctions, no international partners, no inspections, no deal. This is a negotiation which is, by definition, not perfect.

□ 1900

It is my hope that we will divorce ourselves from the hyperbole and the rhetoric in favor of the seriousness this issue deserves. I have concluded that the agreement is the best path forward.

This is not just my considered judgment; it is the judgment of the highest levels of the military, nonproliferation experts, nuclear scientists, and our diplomatic partners who join in their overwhelming support of the agreement.

As a Congress, we can only do our best and our part to move forward to provide the necessary resources for proper oversight to ensure effective monitoring and aggressive verification. If Iran cheats, we will know it; we will know it quickly, and we will act decisively.

Once again, the world turned to the United States for our leadership on dealing with Iran and its nuclear program. This agreement, reached through rigorous diplomacy, in conjunction with our partners, provides the tools we need to ensure a pathway to peace and security for the United States, for Israel, the region, and the world.

I will vote to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

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

I would just note that over 200 retired generals, flag officers, and admirals signed a letter in opposition; and we have heard continuously, including this week, from retired generals, officers, and admirals about their concerns about this agreement.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS), the Republican Conference chair.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, the votes this week on the President's nuclear deal with Iran are some of the most important we have taken in years. As the world's largest sponsor of terror, Iran continues to play an enormously destructive and destabilizing role in the world.

Iran's actions are destroying the lives of millions of vulnerable innocents. The current refugee crisis in the Middle East and Europe is only the most recent example.

Iran has been propping up Assad's regime in Syria for the past 4 years, sending weapons and thousands of fighters there to brutalize the Syrian people. ISIS has exploited these conditions, and now, millions of Syrians have been displaced, many of them going to unimaginable lengths to seek refuge in Europe. Iran bears responsibility for this.

This deal is not reform. This deal is incentivizing bad behavior. A vote in favor of this deal is a vote that favors

party politics over the will of the American people and global security. It is a terrible way to do business.

The American people deserve full transparency from the White House on this deal, as required by the law and even basic respect for American voters.

The President is required to turn over all the agreements—even the side deals made with third parties—and he has yet to do that.

While I was home the last few weeks in my district in eastern Washington, not a day passed that I didn't hear grave concerns about this deal. It wasn't Republicans versus Democrats, liberals versus conservatives; it wasn't anti-President Obama. People are sincerely worried about what this deal means for our safety and security.

We were told by the administration early on that no deal was better than a bad deal. Now, the President claims it is either this deal or war.

Mr. Speaker, we aren't asking the President to stop his efforts to reach an agreement with Iran. We need a better deal. We are asking the President to continue and strengthen his efforts so that we get a deal that, first, truly denies Iran a path to a nuclear weapon by dismantling its extensive infrastructure; second, includes a robust inspections process, not one that is conducted by Iran itself; and, third, compels Iran to cease its support of terrorist organizations and brutal dictators like Assad, whose actions are destabilizing the entire region, as well as Europe.

Until this deal includes, at a minimum, these three components and the President has made his obligations under the law, I will continue to oppose it, and I will urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Let's send the President back to the negotiating table.

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

Maybe the President could get some advice from the leadership of the Republican Conference in how to figure out what resolution to bring to the floor.

I now proudly yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), my friend.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, the question before us today is whether or not this body will approve the negotiated agreement to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. It is one of the most consequential issues of our time and requires serious and sober consideration by every single Member of this body.

You would think, Mr. Speaker, that in a matter of such gravity involving the foreign affairs of our Nation and the safety and security of our allies, particularly Israel, we could set aside urges to score political points and avoid dangerous hyperbole and instead debate the merits of this agreement.

I regret that the process for considering this agreement has sometimes devolved into a sad show of partisanship. Our Nation is better than this.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am mindful of President Kennedy's inaugural address, which he delivered from the east front of the Capitol, just a few hundred feet from this Chamber. Addressing the threat from the Soviet Union, President Kennedy said: "Let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness."

He went on to say: "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

Those words still ring true today. This agreement shows the power of diplomacy to advance our national security interests and ensures that, before being required to send our brave men and women into a dangerous military conflict, that we have had the courage to exhaust every possible alternative.

Like all of my colleagues, I have spent the last 2 months carefully studying the terms of this agreement that the United States and our negotiating partners reached to prevent a nuclear Iran; meeting with military, scientific, and nonproliferation experts; participating in dozens of classified briefings and committee hearings; meeting with the President and members of his administration, as well as meeting with my constituents.

After a great deal of serious deliberation, I believe that the United States and the world are safer with this deal in place than without it.

I fully recognize that this agreement is not perfect—far from it—but like any decision in life, we have to confront the choices we face, not the one we would rather have before us or like to imagine.

I believe approval of this agreement is the most responsible and effective way to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. By its very terms, it affirms that under no circumstance will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider what we will be giving up if we reject this deal. This agreement requires Iran to submit to the most intrusive and rigorous inspections regimen ever negotiated. This is in stark contrast to the complete lack of access currently available to the international community to monitor Iran's nuclear program.

If Congress rejects the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, it will mean zero restrictions on Iran's nuclear ambitions, no limitations on their enrichment activities or centrifuge production, and no ability for international inspectors to monitor Iran's nuclear program.

Many experts agree that rejection of this agreement would mean Iran could develop a nuclear weapon in just a matter of months, the worst possible outcome.

Approval of this agreement does not end our responsibility, Mr. Speaker. Congress must work closely with the administration to ensure that we take additional steps to mitigate the risks reflected in the agreement, to discour-

age Iran from escalating its destabilizing activities in the region, and to enhance the likelihood that Iran complies with all the terms of the agreement.

Additional resources have to be devoted to supporting, monitoring, verification, and intelligence gathering activities.

Above all else, we must make it absolutely clear to Iran that any violation of the agreement will be met with swift and decisive action by the United States and the international community.

I look forward to working with the administration and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make certain that all of this happens.

In the end, this was not an easy decision or one I arrived at quickly. There is risk in accepting this agreement, and it contains real tradeoffs. No responsible person should claim otherwise.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that rejecting this agreement would present even greater and more dangerous risks to our national security and our allies than the risks associated with going forward. Because of this, I intend to support the resolution of approval and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE for his outstanding leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, our Founding Fathers included in the preamble of the United States Constitution the intention of our government to provide for the common defense. Protecting and defending our Nation was not an afterthought; it was a first thought.

The defense of America and our allies has always been a strategic and moral goal. The agreement we have before us today, however, primarily meets Iran's goals. Sanctions are lifted; nuclear research and development continues, and America's safety is compromised. Under this deal, in a matter of years—likely in our lifetimes, but certainly in the lifetimes of our children and grandchildren—Iran will have a bomb.

The President of the United States has said that this agreement is not based on trust, but on verification. I wish that was true because this agreement shouldn't be based on trust. I certainly do not trust a government that has acted as a bank for terrorists.

Any agreement should be based on verification; but where is the simple assurance of anytime, anywhere inspections? We don't have verification. What we have is misplaced hope, hope that Iran has disclosed all of its past nuclear activities, hope that Iran will be transparent, hope that Iran has somehow changed.

Earlier this year, 367 bipartisan Members of Congress sent a letter to the President outlining several conditions that any final nuclear agreement

must address. Unfortunately, the agreement we have before us does not meet congressional standards and has numerous fatal flaws.

For example, in 2012, Congress barred Iranians from coming here to study nuclear science and nuclear engineering at U.S. universities. One would think that is a good policy, given that they are seeking to get a bomb.

In one of the most outrageous provisions of this deal, the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of State will no longer be allowed to enforce the bar. This deal will actually make the U.S. an accomplice to Iran's nuclear weapons program by granting Iranians the ability to come to the U.S. to acquire knowledge instrumental in their being able to design and build nuclear bombs.

Other concerns include giving Iran a signing bonus, lifting the arms embargo, failure to cut off Iran's pathway to the bomb, and the lack of protection for not only our own safety, but for the safety of the world. A nuclear Iran is a threat to our great ally, Israel, but is also a threat to the rest of the Middle East, America, and the world.

While the administration has said that any deal is better than no deal, Thomas Jefferson once said, "Delay is preferable to error," and I agree with Jefferson.

Had our negotiators remained at the table a while longer, perhaps we would not be where we are today; yet, as it stands, this so-called deal, if it goes through, will likely mark the pages of history as a great error.

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

I am reminded back to Churchill. He said it is always better to jaw-jaw than to war-war.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank Representative CONNOLLY for yielding me time and, really, for your tremendous leadership on this very vital issue. Also, I must salute our Leader PELOSI for her unwavering support and hard work for global peace and security.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3461, a resolution to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Now, in the last two Congresses, mind you, I introduced the Prevent Iran from Acquiring Nuclear Weapons and Stop War Through Diplomacy Act, which called for the appointment of a high-level special envoy to address Iran's nuclear program and an end to the no-contact policy between our diplomats.

Since the 1970s, quite frankly, I have worked on many nuclear nonproliferation issues and believe very strongly that the deal that President Obama and our P5+1 partners negotiated demonstrates how effective diplomacy can be. It will lead us closer to a world where our children and future generations can live without the fear of Iran acquiring a nuclear weapon.

The JCPOA, supported by the majority of Americans and key international allies, including France, Germany, and Britain, though not perfect, it is the best way to prevent Iran from ever acquiring a nuclear weapon.

The Iran nuclear deal puts into place the most intrusive inspection system, including a 24/7 surveillance of Iran's enrichment facilities and reactors; it cuts off all of Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon, and it will enhance regional and global security.

□ 1915

United Nations Ambassador Samantha Power stated in her recent political op-ed: "If we walk away, there is no diplomatic door No. 2, no do-over, no rewrite of the deal on the table."

Rejecting the Iran deal will isolate the United States from our international partners. It will not make us any safer, and it certainly won't result in a better deal with Iran. Instead, it would allow Iran to accelerate its weapons programs with no oversight. That is unacceptable. We cannot afford the alternative to this deal.

This is a defining moment for our country and for our world. Let us continue to work for peace. We all know that the military option is always there. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution of approval.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution and against this disastrous nuclear agreement with Iran.

The actions that Iran will be allowed to pursue under this agreement are a direct threat to the United States and to our allies, and it falls far short of the commitment the President made to the American people, which is to verifiably prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

Under the deal, Iran will maintain a robust nuclear infrastructure. They will be able to conduct research on advanced centrifuges that are capable of rapidly enriching uranium and developing ballistic missiles that are capable of carrying a bomb to Israel, Europe, or the United States. Instead of anytime, anywhere inspections, the bureaucratic process ensures lengthy delays, which will allow Iran to cover its tracks.

This troubling deal will provide billions of dollars to fund Iran's international terror enterprise even as they call for Israel's annihilation and chant "death to America."

It is time to lead the world to a better deal that will result in Iran's forever abandoning its threats to the world.

Mr. Speaker, while this House actually votes on the merits of this deal, I know what happened today in the other House of Congress—the Senate.

There, almost all Democrats have joined to block a vote on this deal. One Democrat who wanted to vote was Senator SCHUMER of New York. Senator SCHUMER released a statement last month that showed he understands the serious defects of this deal—from the inadequate inspections to the billions that will flow into Iran's terror enterprise. Because of these defects, Senator SCHUMER concluded, we will be worse off with this agreement than without it.

But there is another choice, Mr. Speaker—a better deal—one negotiated with a clear understanding of the nature of our enemy.

I ask my colleagues to reject this deal, to encourage the President to go back to the negotiating table, and to vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, it was John Kennedy who negotiated the first nuclear Test Ban Treaty successfully with our archenemy that threatened to bury us—the Soviet Union. He said that we should never negotiate out of fear, but we should never fear to negotiate.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs).

Mrs. CAPPs. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the P5+1 nuclear agreement with Iran, formally known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. Like my vote against the Iraq war, this decision is one of the most important foreign policy votes I will take during my time in Congress.

The intent of sanctions and negotiations has always been to diplomatically cut off Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon and to verifiably increase the transparency of their nuclear activities. It is clear to me, as well as to numerous nuclear, diplomatic, and national security experts around the globe, that this agreement achieves these critical goals.

It not only cuts off all pathways to a nuclear weapon, but it also imposes unprecedented and permanent inspections, and it ensures we can automatically reinstate international sanctions if Iran violates the agreement.

In contrast, defeating this deal would allow Iran to resume its nuclear program with no restrictions or oversight, increasing the likelihood of military conflict and a regional nuclear weapons race—precisely the scenario sanctions were designed to prevent.

Another costly war in the Middle East would put American lives at risk and undermine the security of our Nation and our allies, including Israel.

While the risks of a nuclear-armed Iran are unquestionably dire, there is simply no scenario in which these risks are reduced by rejecting this deal.

There are no decisions I take more seriously than those that involve potentially sending American troops into harm's way. This is, undeniably, one of those decisions. Under this agreement, every option is and will remain on the

table, including that of military force; but we have a solemn obligation to ensure that every diplomatic avenue is exhausted before military action is taken. That is why I opposed authorizing the Iraq war and why I support this nuclear deal with Iran.

This deal has certainly not been perfect, but perfect is not and never has been an option. Those who are urging the defeat of this deal have a responsibility to propose a viable alternative, yet no such alternative has been put forward. This agreement before us is the best path available. It has my full support.

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, in 2012, when the President was running for reelection, he said: Look, with Iran, it is very simple. We will remove the sanctions when they dismantle and give up their nuclear program.

That was a promise he made to the American people, but this deal doesn't even come close to that. Iran is allowed to maintain a vast, vast nuclear infrastructure.

Two years ago in this House, we passed more robust sanctions, which would have further tightened the screws on the Iranian regime. I think, at that time, Iran desperately wanted to get out of the sanctions. If you had asked Iran what they wanted, they would have, obviously, wanted the sanctions relief because they needed the money—the regime needed it to solidify themselves in power—but they also would have wanted to keep their nuclear program. Then, of course, they would have wanted to continue to fund terrorism.

This agreement basically gives Iran everything it wants, so I join my colleagues who have urged that we resoundingly reject this agreement.

I want to point out something that, I think, is very personal to a lot of veterans.

If you look right here, this is an up-armored Humvee in Iraq in, probably, the 2007–2008 time period. It has been ripped to shreds by an EFP device—an explosively formed penetrator. This is something wherein the explosion will cause these pieces of metal to go 3,000 meters per second. It will ravage the individuals who are in the Humvee, and it will even go through the armor. These devices caused the deaths of hundreds of our servicemembers, and they wounded many, many more.

Why do I bring that up?

Because this was perpetrated by this man, Qasem Soleimani, who is the head of the Quds Force—Iran's Revolutionary Guard terrorist outfit. He was orchestrating those attacks on American servicemembers. That is enough, right? We are doing a deal with a country that has a lot of American blood on its hands.

It is even worse than that. This deal relieves the international sanctions on

Qasem Soleimani and the Quds Force. It empowers the very people who harmed our servicemembers in Iraq. I think that that is an insult to the memories of the people who lost their lives on our behalf and an insult to their families.

For that reason, in addition to all of the other great ones that have been mentioned, we need to resoundingly reject this deal.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out for the record that Soleimani remains on the list.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in 2012, Prime Minister of Israel Netanyahu went to the U.N. with a graph, much like the one right beside me. It was a picture of a bomb with a red line. The Prime Minister said: "The red line must be drawn on Iran's nuclear enrichment program."

This deal does that.

Today, we can say that Iran cannot produce or stockpile highly enriched uranium, and it has to get rid of 98 percent of its low enriched uranium. To make sure that they don't achieve a nuclear weapon, we have the strictest inspection regimen in the history of nuclear agreements. The impetus for 2 years of negotiation has been achieved.

So what is the problem?

The gears of war are halted when we prove that negotiation and diplomacy are the best methods of achieving peace. This deal is a triumph of diplomacy over military conflict. It is a win for those who reject the misconception that diplomacy is weakness.

In 2003, Vice President Cheney said: "I have been charged by the President with making sure that none of the tyrannies in the world are negotiated with." The ensuing decades of war brought 6,840 U.S. soldiers home in coffins and squandered trillions of hard-earned, American tax dollars.

Yet, we have learned from that.

We have learned our lesson that we must negotiate, that we must talk it out before we begin to shoot it out. The fact that a majority of Americans supported this deal means that people are tired of sacrificing so much for the bankrupt idea that a conversation is capitulation.

This agreement keeps nuclear weapons out of Iran's hands for decades. In 2003, Iran had 164 centrifuges. In 2005, they had 3,000. In 2009, they had 8,000. By 2013, they had 22,000. While we were rattling sabers and making bravado-type comments about what we were going to do to them, they were making centrifuges. When the President got down to the business of negotiation, we had brought that process to a stop.

We will continue to sanction human rights violators wherever they are, including in Iran, and we will also continue to confront people who export terrorism; but the best way to empower reformers within Iran is to engage. Diplomatic victories require

playing the long game. You need patience, and you need unshakable courage in your convictions.

Let me say that I remember the moment in 2007 when then-Senator Obama said he would engage in personal diplomacy with leaders in the Middle East in order to stop bloodshed in the region. That is the moment that I knew I would vote for him, and I am proud to stand here nearly a decade later to congratulate the President for this diplomatic victory.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues have come to the floor today and have stated that this is the most important vote or the most important series of votes that we will take in this Congress. I agree with them because these votes boil down to the fundamental question:

What kind of a world do we want to live in?

What kind of a world do we want for ourselves? for our children? for our grandchildren? for future generations?

Do we want to live in a world where we legitimize the most radical, the most extremist, the most terrorist government in the world—a government that has a long and well-documented history of lying to the world? of holding Americans hostage? of hanging homosexuals from cranes? of executing juveniles?

Do we want to empower that government with an investment of at least \$56 billion, a portion of which will surely go to terrorist activities not just in the Middle East but all over the world?

Do we want to guarantee that whether it is in 10 years or in 13 years or in 15 years or in 20 years that that same government will have the ability to build a nuclear arsenal?

Do we want to afford that same government—the mullahs in Iran—the ability to have intercontinental ballistic missiles? Those aren't for Israel. Those aren't for the Middle East. Those are for us. The only purpose of those missiles is to carry a nuclear warhead.

What kind of a world do we want to live in?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that, many years from now, my daughters, ages 5 and 3, will look up how their dad voted on this critical issue. I think—and I am very hopeful and I am confident—that they will thank me, because this is a bad deal. This is a deal that not only endangers our allies in the Middle East, it endangers us. This is a deal where we have to ask ourselves who we are, what we stand for, and what kind of a world we want to live in.

For that reason, I am opposing the Iran deal, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1930

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, our friend from Florida asks the right

questions. He has just got the wrong answer. I can answer those questions.

I want a world that rolls back the nuclear capability of Iran, not a world based on a false hope that we can make it work somehow without a plan.

That is what puts the world at risk. That is what puts my children and grandchildren at risk. I am not willing to take that risk.

Mr. Speaker, before I recognize Mrs. DAVIS of California, can I inquire how much time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The gentleman from Virginia has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 42½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Forty-two?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Okay. What a lucky man my friend from California is.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, after much deliberation and soul searching, I am convinced that the P5+1 Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action creates a viable path to reduce Iran's nuclear weapons capability.

For that reason, I believe this agreement is in the best interest of the United States. Of course, the agreement must also be in the best interest of our friends in the Middle East.

As someone who has lived in Israel and has returned many times since, I understand that, for Israelis and Americans with close ties to Israel, Iran threatening to wipe Israel off the map is not an abstract concern.

It has been less than a hundred years since the Jewish people nearly suffered such a fate. The threat of annihilation is very real to Israelis, and it is very real to me.

I would never take a vote that I thought could leave my grandchildren a world without a strong, safe Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I am under no illusions that this agreement will end Iran's hegemonic ambitions, but I can't allow their destabilizing behavior to have the protection of a nuclear umbrella.

I agree with the former head of the IDF, the Israeli Defense Force, the head of that intelligence agency, Amos Yadlin, that, if we walk away from this agreement, Iran will remain closer to a nuclear bomb in the coming years, and the chances of a collapse of the sanctions regime will increase.

Nobody in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, trusts Iran. That is why we need and we must have and take the responsibility to come together after this vote to make sure that the United States is exercising all of its initiative to implement this agreement and to address what we know will come, those inevitable challenges.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK), a member of the Armed Services and Intelligence Committees.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, when President Obama announced that the P5+1 had reached an agreement on

Iran's nuclear program, he stated that the deal was not built on trust, that it was built on verification.

This was a clear acknowledgement by the administration that the Iran regime is not a trustworthy negotiating partner and that any agreement must contain stringent verification guidelines to ensure that Iran adheres to its obligations.

Unfortunately, the verification procedures in the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action are impotent at best. While the agreement does allow for 24/7 monitoring of declared sites, it includes a provision that gives Iran up to 24 days to grant inspectors access to suspected undeclared facilities.

According to former IAEA officials, this greatly increases the probability that nefarious nuclear activities could escape detection.

While this verification scheme is already embarrassingly weak, it gets worse when one considers the secret side deals that prevent inspection of the Parchin military complex and allow Iran to inspect itself. This is not the "anytime, anywhere" inspections the administration claimed it was pursuing.

The fact is that, in spite of claims of the administration, this agreement is not built on verification. It is built on trust.

It requires us to trust a regime that is the largest exporter of terrorism in the world, that has already violated the interim nuclear agreement and whose Supreme Leader just today stated that Israel will not exist in 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, as the President himself has said, no deal is better than a bad deal. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad deal, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1963, President Kennedy, who served in this Chamber, spoke at American University about preventing nuclear war and that to do so it was necessary to deal with our most feared and distrusted enemy at the time, the Soviet Union, as mistrusted and evil in the eyes of Americans then as Iran is today. As you recall, Prime Minister Khrushchev boldly stated, "We will bury you."

President Kennedy understood, though, that in negotiations with an enemy, "We must avert those confrontations which bring an adversary to a choice of either a humiliating retreat or nuclear war."

President Obama, along with the other five nations at the negotiating table in Vienna, confronted the same reality.

When President Reagan engaged in detente with the Soviet Union, he also was negotiating with our most feared and distrusted enemy.

In negotiations with Iran, it has been the same for President Obama as it was for President Kennedy in negotiating with the Soviet Union.

Both President Kennedy and President Obama had the same goals as

America has had for over a half a century, and that is to prevent nuclear war. And to do so, it has been necessary to deal with an untrusted foe.

I have listened to my constituents. I have been privy to many classified briefings. I have spoken personally to President Obama and Secretary Kerry.

I have met with officials in Vienna at the headquarters of the IAEA and with diplomats and officials from Europe and Asia and considered the opinions of renowned physicists and military generals.

Over those past several weeks and months, I have often thought about President Kennedy's eloquent words at American University in August of '63 when he said that, in the final analysis, "We all inhabit the same small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal." The same holds true today.

I support this agreement based upon the information I have gleaned from the aforementioned individuals and groups and with the understanding there is no more important mission than preventing nuclear war.

Mr. Speaker, our people and our planet are in the balance. I am convinced this is the most effective way that Iran will not build a nuclear weapon.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California, the chairman of the committee, for yielding me time and for the excellent job he has been doing tonight during the debate on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, this week is a somber week for our Nation. September the 11th reminds us of the sacred responsibility we, in Congress, have to protect the American people from those who want to kill us. That is why we must oppose the Iran deal.

This deal only emboldens our enemies at the expense of our friends and our own national security. So it is no surprise that a majority in Congress oppose this deal, as do most Americans, for many reasons.

First, it allows Iran to develop nuclear weapons in the future.

Second, it lists sanctions and frees up as much as \$150 billion in assets for Iran. These funds inevitably will be used by Iran to export terrorism as even the President himself has admitted.

Third, the longstanding arms embargo against Iran will be lifted. This enables Iran to buy long-range surface-to-air missiles from Russia by the end of the year.

Fourth, there is no credible way to conduct inspections of Iran's nuclear weapons-building sites. Under the proposed deal, Iran is given weeks, if not months, of advanced notice of any inspection. This provides ample time for Iran to hide evidence of nuclear weap-

ons activities and violate the agreement.

Secret deals that the administration has hidden from Congress and the American people have now been revealed. One secret deal permits Iran to conduct its own inspections at a military facility suspected of ties to nuclear weapons.

Finally, by increasing the odds of a nuclear Iran, this deal directly threatens the security and future of Israel. The Iran deal destabilizes the Middle East, jeopardizes America's security, and endangers the world. The Iran deal must be opposed now and in the future.

Remember, this is not the law of the land. This deal is a nonbinding executive agreement. Only the Constitution is the law of the land.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I hope our fellow Americans understand what is really at stake here: engagement and the rollback of a nuclear threat or the kinetic option, which is military intervention that takes us down a path that will lead to more terrorism, more violence, and the necessity of troops on the ground. I choose the former, and I believe our fellow Americans will, too.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise my vehement objection to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and to call on my colleagues to do the same.

In March, I joined 346 of my bipartisan colleagues in a letter outlining the issues needed to be addressed by Iran in a comprehensive nuclear agreement.

The last sentence of that agreement said: Congress must be convinced that the agreement's terms foreclose any pathway to a bomb, and then and only then will Congress be able to consider permanent sanctions relief.

Mr. Speaker, I have read this entire agreement, and I am profoundly disappointed to say that it falls remarkably short of foreclosing a pathway to a bomb.

To the contrary, this agreement brings Iran to the brink of becoming a nuclear weapons state and 8 short years from now provides them a pathway to acquiring technology to strike Europe and well beyond.

To ease the concerns of my noncommittal colleagues, the President has promised a military option remains on the table.

I am simply awestricken by the fact that my colleagues on the left have fallen for these assurances. It is the same administration that promised the red line in Syria.

It is the same empty rhetoric that has sustained the Syrian civil war, the Libyan civil war, ISIL's control of western Iraq, and, of course, the imperialist Vladimir Putin that has annexed the sovereign territory of the Ukraine.

I therefore urge my colleagues to reject this deal and any deal that enables

a belligerent state sponsor of terror to have access to hundreds of billions of dollars and nuclear weapons that will allow its atrocities to continue in perpetuity, all the while four Americans, one of them a native of the State of Michigan, my home State, Amir Hekmati, is being held hostage.

Mr. Speaker, in no other world, public or private, would this agreement be considered credible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. I was saying that, in no other world, Mr. Speaker—and to all of you—having served in the public and in the private sector, have I ever seen an agreement where we are negotiating with a party that has no respect for the other party.

In this case, the Supreme Leader of the State of Iran as late as yesterday referred to the United States as the Great Satan and called for us to be wiped off the face of the Earth, not just Israel.

We are the Great Satan. They are Satan, according to the Ayatollah. We are the Great Satan. I object to entering into an agreement with a country that has no respect.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by thanking Democratic Leader PELOSI for her tireless and unyielding advocacy for the Iran nuclear deal agreed to between Iran and six major world powers, with the unanimous support of the U.N. Security Council.

□ 1945

I very much share the leader's view that diplomacy and peace must be given every chance in our dealings with Iran before we contemplate the use of any other options.

I also want to acknowledge the fact that, acting with the President's full support, Secretary of State John Kerry has done a masterful job of holding the P5+1 coalition together. It was far from certain that Russia and China, intent as each of them is on reducing America's influence in the world, would continue their participation in the tough multinational effort necessary to get us to this point.

This agreement proves that world leaders, despite being divided on a range of issues, can still work together and reach an agreement with profound implications for international peace and security. This is truly extraordinary.

I support this agreement not because it is perfect, but because it is a deal that stands up extremely well as a barrier against nuclear proliferation for at least 15 years. It also establishes an intrusive inspections regimen to ensure that Iran's program remains heavily monitored and exclusively peaceful for even longer.

One of the most important provisions of this deal allows any permanent member of the U.N. Security Council who can show that Iran has violated the agreement the ability to snap back the tough sanctions that had previously been in place.

Now, I know there are critics who believe that, by rejecting the deal and increasing sanctions on Iran, that the U.S. can somehow coerce the leaders of Iran to completely dismantle its nuclear program. As effective as the current sanctions have been in bringing Iran to the table to negotiate, they have not stopped Iran from becoming a threshold nuclear state.

If Congress rejects this deal, it will not lead to a better one. If the U.S. walks away from this deal, we will have squandered the best chance we have to solve this problem through peaceful means. In fact, U.S. rejection of the deal is more likely to isolate the United States rather than Iran from the rest of the world.

It would reinforce questions around the world about our commitment to multilateralism and American political dysfunction. Furthermore, it would seriously undermine our ability to lead any future diplomatic efforts on terrorism and on a range of other issues important to our national security interests.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, which is necessary for the success of the nuclear deal, the preservation of the international financial sanctions architecture, and for maintaining the credibility of U.S. diplomatic commitments in the future.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this ill-conceived agreement between our current administration and the fanatical regime ruling the nation of Iran.

I find it impossible to understand how those who are sworn to protect the security and interests of the American people could enter into such a one-sided deal. This is a deal that expands the lethal potential of a ruthless regime by giving them a path to a nuclear weapon; a regime whose stated objective is the destruction of the United States; a regime committed to the complete and utter destruction of Israel, our most trusted friend and ally in the Middle East; and a regime that almost no one believes will honor this deal.

It is incomprehensible that we would so blindly ignore the warnings of the world's most aggressive supporter of terrorism by allowing them access to \$150 billion in assets and allowing them to use those assets to project their war against our Nation and our allies.

If the rantings of this regime are not enough to cause us to reject this deal, then we should let history instruct us. This regime has been responsible for

the deaths of hundreds of American soldiers. This regime has been responsible for the deaths of innocent civilians in Israel and other nations. In 2009, this regime murdered their own citizens who courageously advocated for the freedom of the Iranian people. The actions of the Iranian regime speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, history is a great teacher, and I believe the past mistakes of world leaders who failed to recognize the lethal danger posed by ruthless and ambitious regimes have been written in the pages of history with the blood of millions upon millions of people.

We must not allow our Nation to take rank with those nations and leaders who chose appeasement over courage, who chose to take what appeared to them to be the easy path, instead of bearing the responsibility of making the harder decision because it was the right decision.

If the administration is correct that allowing the ruling regime in Iran to become armed with nuclear weapons will pose no threat to America and Israel, then no one will remember how the Members of this Congress voted; but if this administration and the supporters of this agreement are wrong and we suffer a catastrophic loss of lives, no one will ever forget what we did here. We will bear the burden of this vote for the rest of our lives.

America's foreign policy is at a crossroads. I am reminded how a great President described how we should deal with dangerous nations. President Theodore Roosevelt said we should speak softly and carry a big stick. He described this approach as the exercise of intelligent forethought and of decisive action sufficiently far in advance of any likely crisis. This deal does not meet that standard.

Mr. Speaker, this is the time when the burden of leadership that has been entrusted to every Member of Congress falls most heavily upon us. The American people look to us to do our duty and bear this responsibility without regard to party or politics, to put their safety and security first and foremost. I urge all the Members of this House to put aside the politics and partisanship that otherwise divide us and stand together in opposition to this deal.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the goal of the negotiations between world powers and Iran has always been to prevent them from developing a nuclear weapon. I think we have to be realistic about this.

This agreement, as opposed to rejecting the agreement, takes us very far toward that goal; and I think accomplishes that goal in a way that we should all be able to live with and accept. The alternative is just too treacherous, I think, for us to even imagine.

I have been involved in this issue for as long as I have been here, this last 2½ years that I have been in Congress. I,

as many Members, have had countless hours of briefings. I have read the documents; I have read the classified reports, and I am confident that this agreement, simply put, makes the world a safer place, both for the U.S. and our allies.

What this agreement does not do, however—and I think it is important to keep in context—this agreement does not make Iran a good actor on the world stage. It is intended to tamp down their nuclear aspirations.

It doesn't mean that Iran can be trusted. In fact, the very nature of the agreement is that it will rely on inspections; it will rely on the eyes of the world to be on Iran to ensure that the agreement is adhered to with robust inspections.

Like any negotiated agreement, it is not perfect. If Iran cheats, we will know it through inspections. If Iran violates the agreement, our allies and the United States will be able to put back in place those sanctions that were so important to get them to the negotiating table in the first place. In fact, even if our allies don't agree, we would have the ability to unilaterally take steps to reinstate those important sanctions.

Finally, I think, importantly, under this question, the U.S. will be in a much stronger position than we are today if, in fact, military intervention ultimately is required because we will have allowed the diplomatic process to work, I believe, and I think most Americans believe, it strengthens our hand, it strengthens our standing in the world if, in fact, the necessity of military action does come upon us. The fact that we gave diplomacy a chance, I think, is a really important point.

Now, I have heard, from friends on both sides of the aisle, concern about the Americans that are being held, and this is a subject that I know something about. I represent the family of Amir Hekmati, and I appreciate the efforts of Members on both sides to call upon Iran to release the Americans that they hold.

I personally thank Chairman ROYCE for his effort through his leadership on the Committee on Foreign Affairs to assist me in developing a resolution that allowed this House to speak with one voice on that question.

It would be a mistake, as some have suggested, to have included the freedom of innocent Americans as one of the provisions of an agreement because, by the very nature of an agreement through negotiation, in order to secure a concession, in order to secure the release of those Americans in exchange for something else that was negotiated at the bargaining table, we would have had to exchange something that makes the world a less safe place.

Don't take my word for it. Listen to the position taken by that young, brave man that I represent, that young marine, Amir Hekmati, who himself has said that the onus is on Iran to unilaterally release him and not to in-

clude him as part of a transaction that deals with Iran's nuclear capabilities.

That is the position that I take because I think it is the right position, but I think it is important to note that that is also the position that this brave young man, who for 4 years has been sitting in an Iranian jail cell, also takes.

Finally, we have to be honest with ourselves about the question that is before us. Now, if I were to have written this agreement by myself, it would be a different agreement, and I am sure that is true of virtually everybody in this House.

The fact of the matter is, when evaluating our position on this question, we have to first search our own conscience, but we have to measure the effect of this agreement and the consequences of adhering to it and enacting this agreement with the consequences of walking away from a multilateral negotiated agreement with no prospect.

Listen to the voices of the other nations involved, with no prospect of being able to come back to the negotiating table.

The conclusion, I think, that I have come to in examining my conscience is that we are in a far better position as a world and we are far more secure through this agreement than we would be with the uncertainty of walking away from the diplomatic process and allowing Iran to pursue a nuclear weapon in the next months.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this is the conclusion that I have come to, but this is also the conclusion that experts on both sides of the political spectrum have come to.

Ambassadors from across the world—former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright thinks this is the right path forward; former Secretary of State Colin Powell thinks this is the right path forward.

I understand that individuals in this House may come to different conclusions after examining the facts. The only thing I ask and encourage my colleagues to do is to vote your heart. Vote what you think is right.

Examine the documents and do what you think is in the best interests of this country and of the world, and the conclusion that I have come to is that supporting this agreement is the right thing.

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

I would also point out, though, that we have heard from many experts. We have heard from many generals, admirals, and there are over 200 generals and flag officers, admirals who have come to the opposite conclusion, who have come to the conclusion that this makes the country less safe, and throughout the course of the afternoon

and evening here, supporters of this agreement have argued that we will be aggressive against Iran, aggressive against Iran on its regional aggression, aggressive against Iran on its human rights violations.

□ 2000

I will just bring up some concerns I have for the consideration of the body here.

I don't see it. This administration was silent during Iran's Green revolution, when the Iranian people were in the streets revolting against the regime at the time of the stolen election there in Iran. They needed U.S. leadership the most at that time.

And since the administration began its negotiations with Iran, we have had a grand total of three human rights abuse designations from the administration—three designations against the backdrop of a record number of executions under the so-called moderate Rouhani, more executions this year than under alternative leadership in the past.

So if you are seeing unparalleled levels of repression and executions and we don't see that being countered forcefully, I come to a certain conclusion. I see the same thing with the administration not confronting Assad's mass murders. Assad is Iranian-backed.

From my standpoint, if the administration is locked into an agreement, I will tell you how I think. I presume the administration will defend that agreement, and I presume that that will mean ignoring Iran's abuses at home and probably ignoring Iran's aggression abroad. The negotiations were a constraint on the administration taking action and protesting, and I presume that the new agreement is going to be a constraint on the administration's taking action against Iran.

I am just pointing out my view of this, based upon what I have observed going back to the Green revolution and this desire for a rapprochement with Iran. I wish that the administration would take on a new life in confronting Iran. I don't see it. And we will have a really bad deal to contend with.

The other part about the deal, and other points were made here tonight, but sanctions relief provided to Iran under this agreement will enable them to increase the size and scope of their ballistic missiles.

So the other observation I would make is the medium-and long-term threat of an Iranian ballistic missile that can reach the United States is very real. That is what we have heard from so many retired officers and what we have heard from the Pentagon, and yet the administration has been reluctant to ensure that the United States has adequate protective measures to guard the homeland against the Iranian ballistic missile threat.

The missile defense program has suffered greatly under President Obama. One of his first major decisions was to cut funding for the Missile Defense

Agency. Then there was the unilateral abrogation of signed missile defense agreements with our allies Poland and the Czech Republic in terms of the interceptor program that was supposed to defend Europe and the United States against any future Iranian potential launch.

And contrary to the representation provided to Congress as part of the New START, the President canceled phase 4 of the European missile defense plan, which was specifically designed to increase protection of the U.S. homeland.

So now that this agreement will pump resources and technology advancements into the ballistic missile threat to the U.S. by Iran, my other hope is that this institution will have uniform opposition to the administration's record of cutting missile defense and support proactive measures to protect the U.S. homeland. Because I will remind everyone here, Iran claims today that they are not bound in this agreement on the issue of ballistic missiles. They do not recognize the U.N. sanctions on their ballistic missiles, and they are claiming we did not put it specifically into the agreement. So as far as they are concerned, they are moving forward. They are moving forward with their ballistic missile program.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Iran agreement.

In 2009, I was able to visit Israel and was in separate meetings with Prime Minister Netanyahu, then-President Peres, and the Israeli Chief of Staff of the IDF, or Israeli Defense Forces. I asked the same question: What would it take to stop Iran from gaining a nuclear weapon? And they all gave me the same answer. They said: You have to impose economic sanctions that are tough enough that the Government of Iran fears a collapse of the economy and a resulting loss of power. And that is the only thing short of war that will cause them to give up their quest for a nuclear weapon.

The Obama administration, merely to bring them to the negotiating table, threw them a lifeline and relaxed economic sanctions. And then, even before going to the Congress of the United States, they went to the United Nations to unravel economic sanctions on Iran.

Michael Oren, Ambassador to the United States from Israel, said that, even though the President has tried to box the Congress in—the United States has a \$17 trillion economy, and that by the United States imposing economic sanctions on Iran, that in fact other countries will be forced to follow in order to be able to do business with the United States.

This is really the hope and change applied to American national security. The hope and change is that the conduct of Iran will change over time; that the ruling mullahs will in fact somehow become enlightened. And that

when they say “death to America,” it is more of a cultural expression.

In 1983, 241 marines died from an Iranian-backed Hezbollah guerilla in a truck bomb.

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

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COFFMAN. In 1996, 19 airmen died in the Khobar Towers by an Iranian-backed attack.

When they say “death to Americans,” they mean death to Americans.

In 2005, I was in Iraq with the United States Marine Corps, and we were losing soldiers and marines on the ground due to IEDs, but we up-armored our vehicles and we did better route reconnaissance and security. Iran introduced what was called an EFP—a shape charge, or an explosive force penetrator—that was designed to penetrate the thickest hulls of our vehicles and killed hundreds of soldiers and marines on the ground. When the Iranians say “death to Americans,” they mean it.

This deal will threaten the stability of the region, the security of the United States and of Israel, and I would urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for leading this debate on our behalf, and I want to thank her for the great work she has been doing on all of this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3461, legislation to approve the Iran nuclear agreement. While I will admit this deal is not absolutely perfect, I believe it does offer the best chance of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Speaker, the Iran nuclear agreement is an opportunity, the likes of which we could not even imagine a few years ago: a chance to stop Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, and to do so without engaging in another costly and bloody war.

Now, I did not reach this conclusion lightly. I did so only after closely examining the deal and the classified and unclassified supplementary documents. I also spoke to experts and numerous officials who were closely involved in the talks, including one of the IAEA inspectors, and carefully weighed the arguments from both sides.

While I still have some concerns, I simply do not see an alternative that will constrain Iran's nuclear program and maintain the global cooperation needed to enforce these limits.

Mr. Speaker, the plain language of this agreement explicitly states that “under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons.” There is no waiver, no exception, no qualifier or sunset. Iran may never have a nuclear weapon, period. That is what the agreement says.

Now, of course, nobody believes a simple affirmation alone is enough, especially with Iran's history, which is

why this deal imposes tough limitations on Iran and includes safeguards to better ensure that if Iran cheats, we will know and can respond by reimposing economic sanctions, or, as the President has indicated, the military option remains on the table.

I want to note some of the limitations that are in the agreement.

Iran must cut its low enriched uranium stockpile by 96 percent. It currently has 7,500 kilograms of low enriched uranium. It has to cut that to 300 kilograms—from 7,500 to 300.

Iran must cut its centrifuge capacity by over 66 percent—from 19,000 centrifuges to 6,104; and of the 5,000 it may run, all must be the lower efficiency, first generation centrifuges.

The reactor core in the heavy water plant at Arak must be removed and filled with concrete, making it unusable for nuclear weapons, and it must be redesigned for nuclear energy purposes only.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that this deal is not based on trust. In fact, it assumes Iran will try to cheat. That is why the inspections regime is so intrusive. In addition, IAEA inspectors will have full access to all declared sites and use of the most advanced technology available.

It also subjects Iran's entire nuclear fuel cycle to inspections, from uranium mining to waste disposal and every stage in between. No other member of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty is subject to that scrutiny, nor would we be inspecting Iran's whole fuel cycle if we trusted them.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear about something. The United States did not negotiate this agreement alone. This was a joint effort with the UK, Germany, France, China, Russia, and the EU. Those countries are in a more vulnerable position than the United States if Iran should violate this agreement.

Now, any observer of foreign affairs will tell you that in recent years it has been next to impossible to get this mix of countries to agree on anything, much less a deal with such significance as this. Yet that is what we have here—an agreement that major global powers back and are ready to enforce the agreement. And if we sabotage it now, if we are the only country to say “no” to diplomacy and “yes” to military action, we may very well do so alone.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, this agreement is not perfect. However, no one got everything they wanted in this agreement. For every critic who says the P5+1 gave away too much, there is one in Iran who says the Iranians did the same.

This deal has vast potential, but its success will ultimately hinge on its implementation. It would be better use of our energies to focus on ensuring that this deal succeeds and that the IAEA has what is necessary to carry out its mandate.

One final point, if some of the critics are right and we eventually have to resort to a military option with or without our international neighbors, I

think it would be much better for us to have had hundreds of inspectors on the ground inspecting nuclear and non-nuclear facilities.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LYNCH. It would be far better for us and our international allies to have had international inspectors—hundreds—on the ground in Iran, so that if we do have to take military action, we have that information, we have that intelligence, so that any military action that eventually is necessary will be much more effective.

But I agree that this agreement is our best chance, this opportunity for diplomacy, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

□ 2015

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in strong disagreement with the President's deal.

Tonight is the eve of the 14th anniversary of attacks on America by radical Islamic terrorists. These were direct, premeditated attacks on our soil that targeted and murdered thousands of Americans, just because they were Americans.

It was a dirty, cowardly act that reflects the lack of civility and values of all terrorists, those who finance terror, those who plan terror attacks, and those who carry them out.

Who would have thought we would be here at this time debating whether to approve an agreement with the number one state sponsor of terrorism in the world, a deal with a country that chants "death to America" while holding four American hostages, a deal that removes sanctions and allows billions of dollars to flow into a regime that wants to annihilate us and our allies, a deal that allows thousands of centrifuges to continue spinning and enriching nuclear fuel that can and most likely will be used in nuclear weapons.

There is a better way to deal with this regime, by not making any concessions until Iran ends their support of terrorism and demonstrates they can be civilized and trusted. They must earn our trust.

Mr. Speaker, America's \$18 trillion to \$19 trillion economy dwarfs Iran's \$400 billion economy, and some sell America short to say that the world would stand with Iran over us if we kept our sanctions and showed resolve.

Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would see the day when America negotiated with terrorists, and I certainly never thought I would see the day when those who swore to protect her would agree to a deal shrouded in secrecy—not Congress' deal, not the American people's deal, the President's and the minority that supports its deal that jeopardizes so much of our safety and security and gains so little.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I encourage a strong "no" vote on this deal. I encourage this Chamber, the Senate, and the administration to do the right thing by rejecting this deal in its entirety; and I pray that God would intervene and help us.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, as the only Ph.D. physicist in Congress—in fact, the only Ph.D. scientist of any kind—I have taken very seriously my responsibility to review the technical aspects of the proposed agreement.

After over a dozen briefings, many of them individual classified briefings by the technical experts who have supported our negotiators, I have come to support this deal not based on trust of Iran, but based on science.

I would like to take a moment to make four technical points that underpin my support of this deal.

First, in regards to the claim that "Iran gets to be in charge of inspecting itself" in investigations of its past weaponization activities, this is simply not true. The investigations will be carried out by a team of IAEA inspectors, using equipment and sampling kits prepared by the IAEA, with samples being sent to the international Network of Analytical Laboratories, of which a number of U.S. laboratories are members.

I urge my colleagues who harbor doubts about this inspection regime to avail themselves of classified briefings on the details. What I can say publicly is that our technical experts have full confidence in the technical inspection capability of the IAEA.

Secondly, in regards to the 24-day inspection delay, which has been a source of concern for many, including myself, under the proposed agreement, Iran's declared nuclear facilities will be available for anytime, anywhere inspection.

However, for undeclared facilities, including military facilities, Iran has the opportunity to contest what is normally a 24-hour inspection regime under the nonproliferation treaty and additional protocol for a period of up to 24 days. This is clearly not ideal. It is a negotiated number.

However, when I look closely at the many steps that must be taken to produce and to test a nuclear weapon, the ability to detect activities in a window of 24 days versus 24 hours has limited operational significance.

This is because, while many steps toward weaponization can unfortunately be hidden from even a 24-hour inspection, things like design and testing of nonnuclear components, but the moment that Iran touches nuclear materials, it will be subject to detection by the IAEA, even months after any attempted scrubbing of the facility.

Thirdly, I support the administration's estimate of a 1-year minimum

breakout time. This is the reaction time that the world community will have for a diplomatic, economic, and military response if Iran decides to resume its nuclear weapons program.

Because of the importance of this issue, I have spent a great deal of time and effort personally vetting this estimate. The breakout time calculation is complex because there are many possible paths to obtain the fissile material for a first weapon, and each of these must be examined.

After many hours of study and detailed questioning of our experts, I have concluded that the 1-year estimate for the minimum breakout time is accurate.

Fourth, in regards to the weaponization timeline, this is the time needed by Iran from the point that it possesses a sufficient quantity of nuclear material for a first weapon, to the time that it will take them to assemble and to test that first nuclear weapon.

Unfortunately, Iran has made significant progress toward weaponization, including such items as the multipoint initiation system for implosion devices that is referenced in the IAEA report of 2011.

Moreover, if Iran breaks out of this agreement, it will resume the weaponization activities during the same year that it takes to accumulate fissile materials for a first weapon.

Therefore, I concur with the assessment that, in the context of a 1-year breakout effort, the additional time for weaponization may be small. However, at the end of this agreement, when the breakout time to obtain fissile material is shortened, the weaponization activities become the dominant factor in the time line.

This underscores the importance of maintaining maximum visibility into all aspects of the Iranian nuclear capability, a position that is surely strengthened by the adoption of this agreement and, also, of significantly strengthening the nonproliferation treaty for Iran and for all other nuclear threshold countries.

This must be the work of the coming decade, so that by the end of the main terms of this agreement, Iran and its neighbors in the Middle East and around the world will be bound by a much stronger and more verifiable nonproliferation treaty.

As was emphasized by former Senators Dick Lugar and Sam Nunn, two gentlemen who have actually reduced the threat of nuclear war, instead of just talking about it, that this is not a perfect deal, but it is the best path forward and our best chance to achieve our goal of preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

I urge my colleagues to support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action as the best opportunity to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran. Remember, we did not negotiate this deal alone, but if we walk away, we walk away alone.

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

We did not negotiate this deal alone. Also negotiating this deal was Iran and was Russia and was China—true enough—but when it comes to the question of inspections, I do not have the document that indicates how these inspections will be done; but what I do know is what is reported to be the procedure and what is asserted also by the Iranians to be the procedure.

As reported, it is Iran, not international inspectors, who will provide the agencies the photos of the locations. It is Iran that will provide the Agency videos of the locations. It is Iran, not international inspectors, who will provide the Agency the environmental samples. It is Iran that will use Iran's authenticated equipment, not the equipment of the international inspectors.

The point I make, again, is that one of the reasons we wanted to have the agreements, the side agreements, the two side agreements, including the one addressing the 12 questions that have never been answered about the thousand pages of bomb work that the IAEA had in its possession, that Iran supposedly conducted at Parchin, was to get Iran to answer these questions. To this day, to my knowledge, scientists in Iran are not available to answer these questions.

Now, perhaps if we obtain these documents, these two side agreements, we will have the details that assure us that, finally, these 12 questions have been answered, but I can tell you, during the interim agreement, we only got half of the first question answered, and after that, Iran shut it down. There was to be no more discussion about their past bomb work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY).

(Mr. KELLY of Mississippi asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to the Iran nuclear agreement.

On the eve of September 11, I remember the American lives lost to terrorism and the unfortunate reality that people want to do America harm.

Based on my review of the agreement, combined with my personal experience of being deployed in the Army in Iraq in 2005 and, again, in 2009 and 2010 and seeing firsthand the Iranian influence there, I have no reason to believe that Iran will act in good faith in this agreement.

It is not just my concerns that I have regarding this deal, but it is also my concerns I have consistently heard throughout the August work month from my constituents, regardless of party affiliation, that did not support this agreement with Iran.

Lifting economic sanctions that Congress has imposed for more than two decades only gives Iran, a recognized state sponsor of terrorism since 1984, access to billions of dollars to finance terrorism activities in the region and

to get closer to their ultimate goal of building a nuclear weapon.

I oppose with all my heart and soul the Iran nuclear agreement because I do not believe the agreement negotiated by the administration is in the best interest of our national security, nor is it in the best interest of our allies in the Middle East, nor is it in the best interest of America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to the administration's Iran nuclear agreement.

On the Eve of September 11, we remember the lives lost and unfortunate reality that people want to do America harm.

Based on my review of the agreement combined with my personal experience of being deployed to Iraq in 2005 and again in 2009–2010 and seeing firsthand the Iranian influence there, I have no reason to believe Iran will act in good faith

It is not just concerns I have regarding the deal, but concerns I consistently heard from constituents, regardless of party affiliation, during the August work period.

Just this week, Iran's Supreme Leader said America remains the "Great Satan" and reiterated his desire to wipe Israel off the map. Common sense would prevail that the goal of Iran's nuclear program is not to promote peace but exactly the opposite.

Lifting economic sanctions that Congress has imposed for more than two decades only gives Iran—a recognized state sponsor of terrorism since 1984—access to billions of dollars to finance terrorist activities in the region and get closer to their ultimate goal of building a nuclear weapon.

Increased access to wealth coupled with a lack of "anytime, anywhere" inspections will only allow Iran to increase their support of terrorism in the region to groups like Hamas and Hezbollah and is not nearly sufficient in stopping their pursuit of a nuclear weapon.

I oppose the Iran nuclear agreement because I do not believe that the agreement negotiated by the administration is in the best interest of our national security nor is it in the best interest of our allies in the Middle East.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, this agreement is the best option available to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. The alternatives are simply too risky and too costly, which is why the deal's opponents have failed to articulate a realistic alternative.

During my time in Congress, I have voted for every bill that imposed crippling sanctions on Iran, which brought the regime to the negotiating table and united the world to stop Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon.

Sanctions were meant to be a tool to ensure negotiations; that is exactly what they have done, but as we have learned from the past decade, sanctions alone are not enough to stop Iran from expanding its nuclear program.

Before negotiations began, Iran greatly increased its enrichment stockpile and centrifuge capacity, despite sanctions. That is why a verifiable agreement that will cut off Iran's ability to build a nuclear weapon is necessary.

The International Atomic Energy Agency will have nearly continuous access to Iran's declared nuclear facilities and can gain unprecedented access to other suspicious, undeclared sites in as little as 24 hours.

Under this agreement, Iran will dismantle two-thirds of its installed centrifuges, remove over 97 percent of its uranium stockpile, and make changes to its Arak plutonium reactor before it receives sanctions relief.

United States Department of Energy Secretary and nuclear physicist Ernest Moniz has confirmed that the agreement increases Iran's breakout time significantly for well over a decade, from 2 to 3 months today to at least 12 months moving forward. This additional time will give us ample opportunity to catch and stop Iran should it choose to pursue a nuclear weapon.

Some have suggested that we need to reject this deal in order to get a better one, but I have found no evidence to believe that a better deal is possible.

It is clear that some of our negotiating partners and other allies do not want more sanctions. If we reject this deal, the robust international sanctions regime would certainly erode, if not unravel entirely.

In the meantime, Iran could move forward with its enrichment program without inspections; limitations on manufacturing, installation, research, and development of new centrifuges; and constraints on its enriched uranium stockpile. Simply put, no deal would mean no inspections and no constraints on Iran's nuclear ambitions.

Some have suggested that we cannot make an agreement with a country that we do not trust, but we must remember that this deal is not based on trust, but rather the most intrusive inspections regime upon which we have ever agreed.

We did not trust the Soviet Union, especially when we negotiated an arms reduction treaty with them as we fought in devastating proxy wars around the world.

□ 2030

Today we are not debating whether to trust Iran. We are debating whether and how we should enhance monitoring of its nuclear program.

I remain committed to working with the administration and my colleagues here in Congress to contain Iran's conventional capabilities that threaten stability in the region and throughout the world, but know that this deal is the best option to take the nuclear issue out of the equation.

I urge my colleagues to approve this agreement.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

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

Mr. Speaker, in terms of viewing this as the most intrusive regime, I remember South Africa. We put the kinds of sanctions on South Africa that we tried to get the administration to put on Iran.

We had legislation here by a vote of 400-20 to do that, and the administration blocked that legislation in the Senate. That would have given us real leverage.

Why do I think so? Because in South Africa, when we put those sanctions on, it actually gave the regime a choice between compromise on its nuclear program and dropping apartheid and changing its system or economic collapse.

The choice was made in South Africa to turn over their nuclear bomb to the international inspectors. Now, I would consider that an intrusive regime. I wouldn't consider this one.

In the case of Libya, they turned over their weapons programs to international inspectors, allowed them in, allowed them to take them out.

I don't know why we say this is the most intrusive regime. It seems to me that, clearly, in cases where we actually forced the issue, where we actually in South Africa put the totality of sanctions in place, that Congress both in the House and the Senate in a bipartisan way felt were mandatory to force the South African hand.

In that case, yes, we got them to give up their nuclear capabilities and their right to enrich and all of that. I don't see that here.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, for months now, the President has made promises that we have heard that would prohibit Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons through strict oversight.

Unfortunately, we see now that this deal does not do that at all. The Iranian regime has done nothing to earn the trust of the international community, yet this agreement rewards Iran with sanctions relief.

I was a member of the Iran Sanctions Conference Committee, and I support tough, strict sanctions against this regime.

You see, the Iran sanctions were designed to force a peaceful resolution to this ongoing situation. It was clear to many that the sanctions were working.

Iran had an inflation rate of 35 percent, the value of its currency was falling, and its monetary reserves were dwindling.

Iran had no choice but to come to the negotiation table. So the U.S. was in a position of power to negotiate a good deal.

Instead, we have a deal which allows Iran to continue to use centrifuges, a deal that allows them to continue to enrich uranium, a deal where, after 15 years, it will be unclear what, if any, access the inspectors will have to their facilities, and a deal where Iran can dispute inspections and delay for 24 days.

This is not, by the way, "anytime, anywhere" inspections that the administration also promised us.

The President may claim that this deal is built on verifications. That is simply not true. We now know that

Congress hasn't even received all the details related to the deal. There are side deals as well.

So what makes us believe that Iran will abide by the agreement that we see, let alone by the side deals that we have not seen?

This deal asks us to trust a country that holds American hostages, that tortures its own people, and that has called for the destruction of the United States and its allies. It is not a surprise that Iran and its allies are celebrating.

However, it is obvious that this deal does little to advance U.S. security. We can still reject this severely flawed deal. There are still alternatives. The U.S. can use sanctions, sanctions that have worked to negotiate a good deal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 10 seconds.

Mr. GARRETT. We can use those sanctions, those sanctions from the very committee that I was on, to negotiate a good deal.

I urge my colleagues to join me in protecting the security of the United States and protecting the security of our allies as well by rejecting this misguided deal.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 6½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank Chairman ROYCE. He has actually dealt with this and done this very honorably.

It has been powerful to watch. There has been amazing testimony given to us. There have been great speakers here. But I fear something very important has not gotten enough understanding and enough focus.

Who in this body is going to take responsibility when the Iranian regime is flush with cash and the death and destruction that is coming with that?

Who here is going to take responsibility for the displaced people around the region?

Who here is going to take responsibility for what some of the experts have told us, the potential financing of a Sunni-Shia war in the region, the amount of death, whether it be the \$59 billion the administration talks about or the \$150 billion that sits in accounts around the world that is about to be handed back to the regime?

I hold up this board next to me so you can see this is more. This is so much more than just the neighbors around Iran.

The bad acts have been happening all over the world. Tell me why there is Iranian Revolutionary Guard money,

Quds Force money showing up in our hemisphere.

Earlier this year I was at a series of meetings in Panama. We had parliamentarians from the region speaking to us, telling us that they are actually seeing Iranian money moving through their banks, financing bad actors in their region, creating death and destruction, trying to finance the overthrows of their governments. That is in our own hemisphere.

Are we prepared as a body, particularly those who will vote for this, to step up and take responsibility for the lives that are about to be lost, for the governments that are going to be overthrown and the destruction and displaced people, the refugees, the cascades that are going to come from that?

We are about to hand billions and billions of dollars to a regime that is committed to destroying our way of life, but also to destroying their own neighbors.

That is what is on the line right now. We are about to execute a vote here that is going to kill, maim, destabilize not only the region; the world.

Those who are about to vote for this, I expect you to step up and be responsible for what you have done.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have heard a lot in these debates that have gone on today. I would like to take this opportunity to try to reinforce the tremendous support that we have for this deal.

I would like to also debunk the idea that somehow this administration is not concerned enough about the security of this country.

Let me just share with you the tremendous support that this deal has. I will do that by reading some excerpts from and insert into the RECORD an open letter signed by 36 retired U.S. generals and admirals who make the case that addressing the risk of a nuclear conflict with Iran diplomatically is far superior than trying to do it militarily.

In their letter, these retired military leaders say about the nuclear agreement with Iran, "There is no better option to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon," "If the Iranians cheat, our advanced technology, intelligence and the inspections will reveal it, and U.S. military options remain on the table. And if the deal is rejected by America, the Iranians could have a nuclear weapon within a year. The choice is that stark."

Recognizing the importance of strong multilateral coordination and action, the retired military leaders go on to say, "If at some point it becomes necessary to consider military action against Iran, gathering sufficient international support for such an effort would only be possible if we have first given the diplomatic path a chance. We must exhaust diplomatic options before moving to military ones."

Mr. Speaker and Members, while I have great respect for all of the Members of this House, for the most part, I do not accept the notion that Members who have not served in the way that these generals and admirals have served this country would know better about our security.

So I would like to insert that letter into the RECORD.

THE IRAN DEAL BENEFITS U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY—AN OPEN LETTER FROM RETIRED GENERALS AND ADMIRALS

On July 14, 2015, after two years of intense international negotiations, an agreement was announced by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, China and Russia to contain Iran's nuclear program. We, the undersigned retired military officers, support the agreement as the most effective means currently available to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

The international deal blocks the potential pathways to a nuclear bomb, provides for intrusive verification, and strengthens American national security. America and our allies, in the Middle East and around the world, will be safer when this agreement is fully implemented. It is not based on trust; the deal requires verification and tough sanctions for failure to comply.

There is no better option to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon. Military action would be less effective than the deal, assuming it is fully implemented. If the Iranian's cheat, our advanced technology, intelligence and the inspections will reveal it, and U.S. military options remain on the table. And if the deal is rejected by America, the Iranians could have a nuclear weapon within a year. The choice is that stark.

We agree with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, who said on July 29, 2015, "[r]elieving the risk of a nuclear conflict with Iran diplomatically is superior than trying to do that militarily."

If at some point it becomes necessary to consider military action against Iran, gathering sufficient international support for such an effort would only be possible if we have first given the diplomatic path a chance. We must exhaust diplomatic options before moving to military ones.

For these reasons, for the security of our Nation, we call upon Congress and the American people to support this agreement.

GEN James "Hoss" Cartwright, U.S. Marine Corps;

GEN Joseph P. Hoar, U.S. Marine Corps;
GEN Merrill "Tony" McPeak, U.S. Air Force;

GEN Lloyd W. "Fig" Newton, U.S. Air Force;

LGEN Robert G. Gard, Jr., U.S. Army;
LGEN Arlen D. Jameson, U.S. Air Force;
LGEN Frank Kearney, U.S. Army;

LGEN Claudia J. Kennedy, U.S. Army;
LGEN Donald L. Kerrick, U.S. Army;
LGEN Charles P. Otstott, U.S. Army;

LGEN Norman R. Seip, U.S. Air Force;
LGEN James M. Thompson, U.S. Army;
VADM Kevin P. Green, U.S. Navy;

VADM Lee F. Gunn, U.S. Navy;
MGEN George Buskirk, U.S. Army;
MGEN Paul D. Eaton, U.S. Army;
MGEN Marcelite J. Harris, U.S. Air Force;

MGEN Frederick H. Lawson, U.S. Army;
MGEN William L. Nash, U.S. Army;
MGEN Tony Taguba, U.S. Army;

RADM John Hutson, U.S. Navy;
RADM Malcolm MacKinnon III, U.S. Navy;

RADM Edward "Sonny" Masso, U.S. Navy;

RADM Joseph Sestak, U.S. Navy;
RADM Garland "Gar" P. Wright, U.S. Navy;

BGEN John Adams, U.S. Air Force;
BGEN Stephen A. Cheney, U.S. Marine Corps;

BGEN Patricia "Pat" Foote, U.S. Army;
BGEN Lawrence E. Gillespie, U.S. Army;
BGEN John Johns, U.S. Army;

BGEN David McGinnis, U.S. Army;
BGEN Stephen Xenakis, U.S. Army;
RDML James Arden "Jamie" Barnett, Jr., U.S. Navy;

RDML Jay A. DeLoach, U.S. Navy;
RDML Harold L. Robinson, U.S. Navy;

RDML Alan Steinman, U.S. Coast Guard.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. And, further, I would like to share with you something from someone that I came to know very well. It is a Washington Post article that I am going to quote from.

The quotes will be from Republican and former Treasury Secretary Paulson. He will not only make very strong statements about his support for this deal, he slams the naysayers of this Iranian deal.

Let me read from the Washington Post article from August 14 in which former Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson was asked what he thought about the viability of maintaining multilateral nuclear sanctions against Iran if the United States decided to walk away from the nuclear deal that has just been agreed to between Iran and the international community.

It is important to note that former Secretary Paulson, a Republican, was in charge of administering the administration's sanctions under President George W. Bush during the period when the international community was just beginning to enact the current regime of punitive sanctions over Iran's nuclear ambitions.

This was his response, "It's somewhere in between naive and unrealistic to assume that after we, the United States of America, has negotiated something like this, with the five other parties, and with the whole world community watching, that we could back away from that—and that the others would go with us, or even that our allies would go with us."

Paulson also viewed as far-fetched the idea that the United States could force other nations into lockstep on a more hard-line approach to Iran by threatening them with secondary sanctions.

Again, Mr. Paulson said:

"I think it's totally unrealistic to believe that if we backed out of this deal, that the multilateral sanctions would stay in place," Paulson said. "I'm just trying to envision us sanctioning European banks or enforcing them, or Japanese banks, or big Chinese banks."

□ 2045

In fact, the former Treasury Secretary could barely hide his disdain for those who think they could strike a path to a better deal than one that has been reached.

Further, he said: "I had a seat in Washington when we dealt with a big,

intractable, messy problem, where there weren't any neat, beautiful, elegant solutions."

He said: "You were deciding between doing something that objectionable or doing nothing at all, which could even be more objectionable. So I don't particularly like it when people criticize something that's big and important that's been done if they don't have a better idea."

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 14, 2015]

REPUBLICAN AND FORMER TREASURY SECRETARY PAULSON SLAMS NAYSAYER OF IRAN DEAL

(By Karoun Demirjian)

Not many high-profile Republicans have anything nice to say about the Iran deal.

But former Treasury secretary Hank Paulson—the guy who was in charge of the government's sanctions operation under President George W. Bush, when the international community was just setting up this regime of punitive measures over Iran's nuclear ambitions—thinks at this point, it would be pretty ill-advised to back away.

"It's somewhere in between naive and unrealistic to assume that after we've, the United States of America, has negotiated something like this with the five other, you know, parties and with the whole world community watching, that we could back away from that—and that the others would go with us, or even that our allies would go with us," Paulson said during a forum sponsored by the Aspen Institute on Thursday night to discuss his new book on China.

"And unilateral sanctions don't work, okay?" Paulson continued. "They really have to be multilateral."

Paulson was responding to a question from the moderator of the event, who had asked what Paulson thought about the viability of maintaining sanctions against Iran, should the United States walk away from the agreement struck in Vienna last month. Congress will vote on that very question next month, but naysayers need a veto-proof, two-thirds majority in both houses to kill the deal—a formidable hurdle to clear.

In Congress and on the campaign trail, the critics of the deal—many, though not all of them Republicans—have been advocating ripping up the agreement and either leaving the U.S. sanctions in place or stepping them up to make the point to Iran and the international community that the United States means business. Some lawmakers, including Sen. Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.), and candidates have even suggested that the United States could force other nations into lockstep on a more hardline approach to Iran by threatening them with secondary sanctions.

Paulson thinks that idea is farfetched.

"I think it's totally unrealistic to believe that if we backed out of this deal that the multilateral sanctions would stay in place," Paulson said. "I'm just trying to envision us sanctioning European banks or enforcing them, or Japanese banks, or big Chinese banks."

Sanctions against Iran have become far more extensive since Paulson left office. And Paulson's comments, delivered in a resort city in Colorado, may not carry that much weight among his GOP colleagues in Washington.

The former Goldman Sachs chief executive came to the Treasury Department in 2006 on the eve of a colossal financial crash and left as a controversial figure for the policies he spearheaded. Since leaving that post, he has broken from the mainstream GOP party line to advocate for more attention to issues like climate change.

Even others in the Bush administration probably wouldn't agree with Paulson: His former boss, George W., advised against lifting Iran sanctions this spring.

But Iran sanctions are Paulson's wheelhouse, and while he didn't direct any darts toward specific politicians or give his own point-by-point assessment of the merits of the deal, Paulson's disdain for those who think they can strike a path to a better solution than the one reached in Vienna was apparent.

"I had a seat in Washington when we dealt with a big, intractable, messy problem, where there weren't any neat, beautiful, elegant solutions," Paulson said. "You were deciding between doing something that was objectionable or doing nothing at all, which could even be more objectionable.

"So I don't particularly like it when people criticize something that's big and important that's been done if they don't have a better idea," Paulson said.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, having said that, I would like to discuss a point that I do not think has been given enough attention yet in this debate. Iran could move in any direction over the next 15 years and the postagreement dynamics in Iran would play out in a number of ways. We are aware of the less benign scenarios.

There is also the scenario in which the agreement helps to amplify the voices of those in Iran who want peace in regional and international accommodation. I have hope with respect to this latter possibility, and I will tell you why.

It is because more than half the population of Iran today—almost 55 percent—is under 30 years old, and the youth unemployment rate is somewhere between 27 and 40 percent. I hope that these young people, given the opportunity to work, to achieve prosperity, and to live peacefully, will, in fact, help animate the kind of change in Iran that will, indeed, move it to become a responsible member of the world community.

This is a possibility that I urge Members to keep in mind when they vote on the resolution before us today.

I have no more time, but I would just urge my colleagues to support this important deal and agreement, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, to begin with, I would like to also submit later for the RECORD a letter by 200 retired generals and flag officers and admirals in terms of why they are opposed to this deal and why they feel it would make the national security challenges for the United States more problematic.

The second point I would make is that Nasrallah, who is the head of Hezbollah, says this about this deal:

Iran will become richer and wealthier and will also become more influential under the deal reached this week. This will also reinforce the position of its allies. A stronger and wealthier Iran in the coming phase will be able to stand by its allies and especially the Palestinian resistance more than at any other time in history.

What does that mean? I can tell you what it means because, in 2006, when I

chaired the Terrorism Subcommittee, we were in Haifa when Nasrallah was firing off the Iranian-made rockets with 90,000 ball bearings in the warheads into the town of Haifa; there were 600 victims inside the trauma hospitals, and now, Iran has transferred over 80,000 missiles.

What is it Nasrallah wants that he doesn't have currently? He wants guidance systems so that those missiles will hit targets, such as individual buildings in Tel Aviv, the airport, Jerusalem. That is what he needs. That is what Iran is telling Nasrallah it will provide.

It needs the hard currency and with this agreement will come the hard currency. It is also committed to restock the inventory that Hamas used when it fired off its rockets into Israel from Gaza and to rebuild the tunnels; all of this is what the Iranians seek to fund, but to do that, they need the sanctions lifted.

When they lift those sanctions, who is going to be the primary beneficiary? It is going to be people such as the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps that will be strengthened.

Look, Mr. Speaker, if this agreement goes through, Iran gets a cash bonanza. It gets a boost to its international standing. It gets a lighted path toward nuclear weapons. With sweeping sanctions relief, we have lessened our ability to challenge Iran's conduct across the board. As Iran grows stronger, we will be weaker to respond.

The question before us today is whether temporary constraints on Iran's nuclear program are worth the price of permanent sanctions relief. When I say the Revolutionary Guard is going to be the beneficiary, I say that because they are the ones that have taken over so many of the major companies in Iran and they are working to destabilize the entire Middle East.

That organization fuels the Assad regime in Syria today. Those rockets are being launched by the Quds Force into Israel. They are going to provide them with more weapons and more military personnel. That organization backs the Houthi rebels. There were 200 Quds Forces that were on the vanguard when they overthrew our ally in Yemen, and they overran that country.

It is responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American troops in Iraq. The IRGC exports terrorism throughout that region. It holds sway over Iran's nuclear program. It brutally, brutally represses internal dissent, and as part of the Iranian agreement, the IRGC is going to be bolstered in a big way, and I will explain how else. It is going to have the funds to build up its tanks, its fighter jets, and the intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The European sanctions on the elite Quds Forces—this is the group that does the political assassinations, assassinations outside Iran, and does the terrorist work outside of Iran—that is going to be lifted on the European side.

The administration signed off on these concessions. The deal will allow

sales of aircraft and parts to Iranian airlines, which the Quds Force uses to move its people and weapons throughout the region. The IRGC controls key parts, as I said, of the Iranian economy—the largest construction companies, the telecom sector, shipping.

Ninety current and former IRGC officials and companies will be taken off the sanctions list as a result of this deal. Even sanctions on the head of Iran's elite Quds Force, General Soleimani, will be coming off. Soleimani had been involved in the plot to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador here in Washington, D.C.

While still under a UN travel ban, Soleimani traveled to Moscow on July 24, 10 days after the Iran nuclear agreement was announced, and he held meetings with the Russian Defense Minister and with President Vladimir Putin. Believe me, those meetings are about weapon systems, which the Russians want to sell to the Quds Force, to the Iranians.

The IRGC is the biggest sponsor of terror throughout the Middle East and even tried to carry out a terrorist attack here. Under the nuclear agreement, as Iran is reconnected to the global economy, the IRGC is going to be the biggest winner.

The agreement helps legitimize Soleimani and gives additional resources to the mastermind behind the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism and eyeing future weapon sales.

It was Russia that teamed up with Iran in the eleventh hour, after we thought this deal was done, to insist on one more thing, the lifting of the arms embargo. I just ask you: If they did that, whose side do you think Moscow is going to take when Iran tests this agreement?

Now, we talked a little bit about the younger generation in Iran. Yes, yes, 55 percent is under 30, but it is not those 55 percent under 30 that are going to be empowered. The ones holding the strings now—because of the way the Iranian economy works—are the generals, are the clerics. They are the ones that have taken over the companies.

When you have got \$60 billion to \$100 billion, depending upon whose figure you use, and you lift the escrow on that and that money goes back to Iran, it is their accounts that it is going to go into, and they are going to control the contracts going forward.

How is that going to liberalize the economy or work to the benefit of the next generation in Iran? No, it makes it more certain that the tyranny that this theocracy imposes is going to be strengthened.

We reverse decades of bipartisan U.S. policy; we remove the Security Council resolutions against Iran's illicit nuclear program, and we okay Iran as a nuclear threshold state. That is what has been done here.

You and I know that, once that process is underway, Iran is going to produce nuclear weapons on an industrial scale when they are at the end of

that process, unless they cheat before they get to the end of the process.

Secretary Kerry had previously said we do not recognize Iran's right to enrich and that there is no right to enrich in the NPT. However, this agreement legitimizes Iran's vast nuclear program, including its right to enriched uranium, which can be used to produce a nuclear warhead.

I guarantee you that everybody in the region is going to be looking at that and saying: We want the same agreement Iran had. We want that same exemption to the NPT.

After the agreement's temporary limits expire, Iran's nuclear program will be treated in the same manner as that of any other nonnuclear weapon state party to the NPT. Okay, so we are going to treat Iran like it is Holland, but it is not Holland. It has been caught cheating. That is why we are here. It has been caught cheating in the past, over and over, on their agreements.

Iran can have a peaceful nuclear program without the ability to enrich uranium. This is something we all understand. Many countries have this. It is this key bomb-making technology that is so objectionable.

We had no problem with the idea of letting them have a peaceful nuclear program; but why give up the right to enrich? Preventing the spread of this dangerous technology has been the foundation of our nonproliferation policy for decades.

As a result, over 20 countries have peaceful nuclear energy programs without a domestic enrichment program. In fact, buying fuel for nuclear power plants abroad from countries like Russia is much more cost effective than producing it domestically.

You have to ask: Why do they want to produce it domestically? If this agreement is allowed to go forward, the United States will recognize the ability of Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, to enrich uranium.

Despite claims to the contrary, this will set a dangerous precedent; it will greatly undermine longstanding U.S. efforts to restrict the spread of this key bomb-making technology. How can we tell our allies they can't have it if we do this?

If fully implemented, this agreement will destroy the Iran sanctions regime, which this Congress has built up over decades, despite opposition from several administrations. We did that in Congress. We pushed this. The billions in sanctions relief that Iran will get will support its terrorist activity, and those billions are just a downpayment.

Under this agreement, European sanctions on the Iranian Revolutionary Guard and the leader of its elite Quds Force—Soleimani, again—are removed, and their job is to export the revolution. That means their job is to export terrorism.

General Dempsey—I will close with this—testified that Iranian militias, such as those trained and equipped by

Soleimani, killed 500 U.S. soldiers in Iraq. Removing sanctions on Soleimani and the IRGC is so shocking that, when the deal was first announced, many thought that it was a mistake, thought that that was not the case.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, like my vote against the Iraq War, consideration of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) is one of the most consequential foreign policy votes I will take during my time in Congress. After careful consideration I have decided to support the JCPOA because it is the best way forward to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and advance the national security interests of the United States and our allies.

The intent of sanctions and these negotiations has always been to diplomatically cut off Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon and to verifiably increase transparency of their nuclear activities. After reviewing the agreement and its classified documents, participating in classified briefings with Secretaries Kerry, Moniz, and Lew, and listening to the insights of experts on all sides, it is clear that this deal achieves these goals.

The JCPOA will ensure that Iran will not have the materials or capability to build a nuclear weapon and extends the breakout time for building a nuclear bomb from two or three months as it currently stands to at least a year. And if Iran violates the agreement, unprecedented international inspections will ensure we know about it and can automatically reinstate international sanctions.

In contrast, blocking this deal would allow Iran to resume its nuclear program with no restrictions or oversight, increasing the likelihood of military conflict and a regional nuclear weapons race—precisely the scenario sanctions were designed to prevent. Another costly war in the Middle East would put American lives at risk and undermine the security of our nation and our allies, including Israel.

There are no decisions I take more seriously than those that involve potentially sending Americans into harm's way. This is undeniably one of those decisions.

Under the JCPOA, every option is—and will remain—on the table, including military force. But as a Member of Congress I have a solemn obligation to ensure every diplomatic avenue is exhausted before military action is taken. That is why I opposed authorizing the Iraq War and why I support the JCPOA.

This is a pivotal moment. We must certainly remain vigilant in the years and decades to come to ensure the deal is strictly enforced and that Iran upholds its end of the bargain, but the terms of this agreement are strong, verifiable, and long-lasting.

The JCPOA is certainly not perfect, but perfect is not an option. Those who are urging the defeat of this deal have a responsibility to propose a viable alternative—yet no such alternative has been put forward.

While the risks of a nuclear armed Iran are unquestionably dire, there is simply no scenario in which these risks are reduced by rejecting this deal. This agreement is the best option available and it has my full support.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am in strong opposition to House Resolution 3461, the to Approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna

on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran.

The President's failed legacy to execute a strategy of peace through strength has resulted in mass murders throughout the Middle East. We have seen his failure to take action after Syria violated the President's declared "red line" and used chemical weapons against its citizens. We have seen it in his failure to recognize ISIL/DAESH as a significant threat to Americans, not as the "JV" team. When it comes to Middle East policy, the President has been dangerously inaccurate, putting American families at risk.

In South Carolina's Second District, I hosted three town hall meetings on the deal, and the response from my constituents was overwhelming—the American people know this deal is dangerous in the tradition of Neville Chamberlain.

This week's vote on the Iranian nuclear deal is of historic proportions. If allowed, this deal would economically and militarily reenergize a regime bent on the destruction of democracy all over the world. It will put the young people of Iran who seek change at risk. We must act immediately to stop this deal and vote against the Resolution of Approval.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin with a couple quotes from the President about the agreement:

"There is nothing more important to our security and to the world's stability than preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles.

"It does not rely on trust. Compliance will be certified by the International Atomic Energy Agency."

Mr. Speaker, you would be forgiven if you thought I was quoting President Obama. However, I was quoting President Bill Clinton lauding his nuclear agreement with North Korea in 1994. Additionally he stated, "This agreement will help to achieve a longstanding and vital American objective: an end to the threat of nuclear proliferation on the Korean Peninsula."

Mr. Speaker, we now know that reality turned out to be very different. Despite assurances from President Clinton, the North Koreans violated the deal, began a clandestine program to enrich uranium and in 2006 conducted its first underground test of a nuclear weapon.

Once again we are told by a Democrat President that an agreement will prevent an adversarial country from acquiring a nuclear weapon. We would be fools to believe that they will not violate the Obama agreement just as North Korea violated the Clinton agreement. The stakes here are even higher. Iran is a regime that will not hesitate to use nuclear weapons to achieve its long-stated goals: the destruction of both Israel and America.

The Iran Nuclear Deal that was agreed to by President Obama is wholly inadequate and unacceptable. The deal gives up-front, permanent sanctions relief to the Iranian mullahs and allows Iran to have an internationally recognized nuclear program after 15 years that could quickly produce a nuclear weapon.

Most laughable are the "anytime, anywhere" inspections. In fact, the agreement grants the Iranians 24 days to allow the IAEA access to undeclared nuclear facilities. This gives Iran ample opportunity to cheat and continue its march toward a nuclear weapon. We have

also learned that the Iranians will be able to provide their own samples from their military base at Parchin to international inspectors. This is essentially asking the fox to guard the henhouse.

I also have great concerns about what happens once sanctions are lifted and billions of dollars are flowing back into Iran. While the UN Security Council resolutions allegedly prevent Iran from shipping arms to terrorist organizations such as Hamas and Hezbollah, and to Assad in Syria, nothing prevents them from sending money. In an incredibly dangerous concession, the U.S. even agreed to shorten the length of the arms embargo against Iran. There is no question that this will negatively impact regional stability as well as the U.S. Navy's access to the Persian Gulf. An article in the Washington Post pointed out that the funds available to Iran immediately upon implementation of this deal would equate to approximately 10% of its GDP. That would be equivalent to a \$1.7 trillion injection into our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this agreement will prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. I believe it will do just the opposite. In no way should a country that vows to wipe Israel off the map and chants "Death to America" be allowed nuclear capabilities. Today marks a turning point for the future of one of our greatest allies, Israel. If this deal goes through, President Obama and Democrats in Congress will own the consequences of allowing the Iranian regime to become a nuclear power.

We can and must have a better deal. A deal that truly allows for anytime/anywhere inspections. A deal that would keep restrictions on Iran's nuclear program for decades. A deal that forces Iran to end its missile development program. A deal that allows Iran truly limited enrichment capability. A deal that releases U.S. hostages in Iran. It is a catastrophic failure that President Obama did not insist on these provisions in the nuclear deal. We should be embarrassed that as the leader of the free world and the most powerful country on earth, this is the best deal President Obama could negotiate.

We have been presented with a false choice of accepting this deal or going to war. We should reject this deal and return to work, not to war. We cannot allow the sanctions to be lifted, we must reject approval of the deal and we must have all the information—including side agreements—before the clock can begin on the deal. I urge my colleagues to stand with our ally Israel and with the American people. The consequences of these votes are truly life and death.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, an Iran with a nuclear weapon would present an existential threat to Israel, destabilize the region and undermine U.S. security interests. This agreement is our best option for avoiding such a scenario. If Congress rejects this agreement, there is a high probability Iran will continue developing weapons grade plutonium and uranium.

That could result in American military action—something I believe we should avoid—and that the American people oppose. A U.S. strike would be costly, causing loss of life on both sides—and could lead to attacks on Israel. Yet, it would only postpone Iran's nuclear weapons development by a few years.

Clearly, a strong, enforceable diplomatic solution is superior. Let's be clear—this agree-

ment is enforceable. The monitoring and inspection provisions are more intrusive than any previous agreement. Most importantly, they will prevent Iran from producing fissionable material without the international community knowing.

There are some who suggest that even with this agreement Iran might still acquire nuclear weapons in the long term. While some provisions of this agreement are indeed time limited and the world will need to revisit this issue, this agreement remains our best chance of thwarting the immediate threat. Many estimates suggest Iran is two to three months away from acquiring a nuclear weapon—and this agreement addresses that very imminent threat.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard from constituents on all sides of the issue. I respect the opinions of those who do not support it. However, I believe this agreement is our best option.

Support the agreement. Vote yes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise after careful consideration and review of the Joint-Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) and would like to extend my full support of the deal negotiated between Iran and the P5+1 countries. This historical agreement between the United States, China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, plus Germany, is in the best interest of our country, our major ally in the Middle East, and the global community.

The agreement, which will face Congressional scrutiny, has won endorsement by more than one hundred former American diplomats. The group that contains Republicans and Democrats described the deal, negotiated by Secretary of State John Kerry and Secretary of Energy Dr. Ernest J. Moniz as a "landmark agreement." It would make no sense to reject this diplomatic movement towards stability and peace in the region.

Twenty-nine top American scientists have also endorsed the deal, noting that it will "advance the cause of peace and security in the Middle East, and can serve as a guidepost for future nonproliferation agreements." The group of scientists includes six Noble Laureates. In a letter to President Barack Obama, they pointed out that Iran was only "a few weeks away" from having fuel for nearby weapons. The agreement would stop Iran's nuclear program, the scientists wrote.

In the JCPOA, Iran agrees that it will not develop or acquire a nuclear weapon. The deal also includes a permanent ban on Iran's development of key nuclear weapon components and is based on four clear objectives; blocking the highly enriched uranium route, allowing no path to plutonium, intensive monitoring, and incentives for compliance.

Without the agreement, there will be no restraints on Iran's nuclear program. There will more than likely be an arms race to acquire and develop nuclear weapons by various nations in the Middle East. Such a climate would not be in the best interest of our country, and certainly not in the best interests of our ally, Israel, and the global community.

It is my firm belief that if this deal is not implemented due to a Congressional blockade, we risk devastating military conflict. I am hopeful that we can continue on this trajectory of peace and diplomacy as opposed to an unavoidable nuclear arms race and armed conflict in the region. As we move to the next phase and allow Congress to study and de-

bate this agreement, we must listen to the non-proliferation experts who have worked tirelessly to move the deal forward. I urge my Congressional colleagues to support the deal. It would be negligent to walk away from a nuclear deal at this point.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 2100

IN MEMORY OF ELANOR BENSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized as the designee of the majority leader for half of the time remaining before 10 p.m., approximately 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), my good friend.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

Mr. CARTER of Texas. I thank my friend from Arizona for recognizing me.

Mr. Speaker, we have been having a really great conversation here, and I hope that everyone who has the responsibility of casting a vote on this so-called deal that the President has brought us has been listening very closely.

Mr. Speaker, the President wants Congress to approve what I would call an absurd deal that eases the path for an avowed enemy of the United States of America's and our allies to unleash a nightmare on the world.

I want us to take a look—and I ask the supporters of this deal to take a look—at what Iran has done to merit our trust.

We first saw these guys way back in the Carter administration when they stormed our American Embassy and took our people hostage and held those people for, I believe it was, 42 days. They abused them in every way they could think of. Quite honestly, they finally released them after pressure was placed on them. Since that time, I cannot think of a single instance where dealing with Iran has been a positive thing. In fact, let's look at the public face they put on.

They still chant “death to America.” I heard them chant “death to America” last night on television and “death to Israel,” one of our allies. They still support terror groups, and we just heard from the chairman of the committee of all of the terror groups that they will be able to support after this deal is done. They are still governed by cabal fanatics who are hell-bent on spreading their perverted view of their faith.

Now, is this a nation we should choose to strike a deal with—to make a nuclear deal?

To those people who say they support this, I would like you to make sure you have confidence in the people we are making a deal with. I don’t know what the rest of the world calls a deal, but, generally, when you are making a deal, both sides have some kind of benefit. I can see all kinds of things that we are giving to these folks, to Iran, including a big bucketful of money—billions of dollars. Basically, we have given them everything that they desired as far as going forward. Our inspections are questionable.

My question is: What is the United States of America getting out of this deal?

We are getting a promise from a regime that has a long history—almost 50 years—of lying whenever it serves their purpose. We are taking their word that they are going to do certain things, and we are getting nothing else from this bill but their word.

Think about the cost if this is not the right deal. Those of you who are really thinking about America, think about the cost. To make a mistake on this vote is, quite honestly, catastrophic. Then there is the horror that would come to pass if they actually were to detonate a nuclear device if, for some reason, our failure to do the right thing caused them to get on the fast track to get their hands on it. The blood will be on the hands of those who didn’t take the time to decide: Are these trustworthy people for us to be dealing with? I would argue, they have no track record by which to argue that they are trustworthy.

Tomorrow’s vote is probably as important a vote as anyone in this Chamber will ever take because it is a vote that could unleash nuclear war in the Middle East as a result of our failure to cut a real deal. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to think about this—to stand with America, to stand with Israel, to stand with those who oppose state sponsors of terrorism, and to oppose President Obama’s irresponsible and dangerous Iran agreement.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I thank Judge CARTER.

Mr. Speaker, this is something I, actually, have never done; but have you ever had one of those moments in your life when you want to come to the microphone and share it with whom-ever is willing to listen?

This has been a tough few days here. Many of us, as we come to these micro-

phones, have these heavy hearts because we are fearful that what is going on around us may be one of those momentous moments where we remember this for the rest of our lives, where it is one of those votes—one of those debates—where you affect the world. There is another side to this on a personal basis where you realize how incredibly honored, lucky, blessed you are to get to be behind this microphone.

Last week, a woman from my community passed away. We all in our lives have those handfuls of people who actually make a difference and affect our lives. She is partially responsible for my being behind this microphone.

A woman named Elanor Benson, from Fountain Hills, died last week—I believe at age 95—and she changed my life. I was a 20-, 21-, maybe 22-year-old kid. I was selling real estate in our little town as a way to finance my way through Arizona State University at night. She, in her retirement at that age, decided to take on another job at our little office.

She sat me down, and she knew I had an interest in conservative politics. I still to this day remember her looking at me and saying: “DAVID, I like you. You are going to be the next president of the local Republican club.” I tried to explain to her there was no way I would have time for such a thing, and she looked at me and said: “Don’t worry. I will help.”

This is a woman who moved to our little community on the side of Scottsdale, I believe, in the late seventies, and had such an impact. For years, I used to believe maybe a third of the town—half the town—had become involved in politics, mostly Republican politics, because of her passion, her energy. You could not stop her.

She got me to be president of the local club and stood by me when I did dumb things and applauded me when I did good things and scolded me when I didn’t say the right things and walked me through how to be more sensitive instead of being so caffeinated, which is a family problem.

I realized, in the chaos of doing this job, that I failed to tell her how much I loved her and how much she affected my life, because I don’t believe I would be here today if it weren’t for Elanor Benson, who not only changed my life but who, actually, I believe—with her work at the Fountain Hill Chamber of Commerce, her work for so many causes, her work for her church—made my community a much, much better place. We are all better in our part of Arizona because of her life. It was a life well lived. It was a long life. She was beautiful to the day she passed, and I wish I had let her know how much we cared.

So, Elanor, if you are out there, thank you. Thank you for changing my life. Thank you for making my community a better one.

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

IN MEMORY OF HELEN BURNS JACKSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, Scripture says that you shall know the tree by the fruit that it bears. A good tree bears good fruit. Strong trees bring forth strong fruit. Loving trees bear loving fruit.

Mr. Speaker, what then is to be said about a tree whose fruit is a respected and courageous freedom fighter?

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of a great woman of distinction, Helen Burns Jackson, the mother of renowned Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson, Sr., who is the founder of the Rainbow PUSH Coalition that is based in the First Congressional District of Illinois.

□ 2115

Mother Burns Jackson, Mr. Speaker, was the epitome of a strong, good, fruit-bearing tree.

She made her transition from life to eternity on September 7, 2015, after a lengthy illness. She was surrounded by her loving family and her friends.

A native of Greenville, South Carolina, Ms. Burns Jackson instilled in her children a sense of dignity, self-respect, and loving justice in the face of the inhumane treatment of African Americans in the segregated South.

Born in 1925, she endured the hardships of poverty, the hardships of racism, to raise two sons of great accomplishment, great distinction, an American hero and civil rights legend, the Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson, Senior, and the Motown music phenomenon Charles Jackson. A gifted singer of world renowned.

Mrs. Burns Jackson herself was a singer and dancer, and she passed on a scholarship to a great college to raise her two sons.

Her life, Mr. Speaker, was the quintessential American story of overcoming the odds with an unbreakable will and a deep, abiding faith.

She planted the seeds of courage, the seeds of perseverance, and the seeds of hope in Reverend Jackson and in his brother, Charles.

Reverend Jackson would go on to not only free American hostages, but became the freedom fighter for those who are oppressed and those who are poor all around this globe.

It is on this very day, September 10, 2015, that I rise before the House of Representatives to pay tribute to this beautiful and extraordinary Movement mother.

Mrs. Jackson was a cosmetologist by profession, and she was known as a towering pillar of her community. Her home became the central station of the civil rights movement.

Mr. Speaker, she often provided me with great encouragement when she traveled to Chicago to visit her son and his family.

As a young activist, I certainly was inspired by her words of wisdom. As a young activist, she inspired me to commit myself to serving others.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that trees are the Earth's endless efforts to nurture life. Mrs. Helen Burns Jackson was a beautiful tall tree among all of us who has returned to the heavenly glory of her God, our God Almighty.

Her spirit lives not only in her children, her grandchildren, and in her great-grandchildren, but her spirit also lives in the righteous fruits that may be found in those of us who were touched by the endless love, the great kindness, the great grace, and the tremendous wisdom of Ms. Helen Burns Jackson.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of the First Congressional District and on behalf of my loving wife, Carolyn, we pay tribute to this remarkable and special woman, this great tree, this inspiration to all of us, Ms. Helen Burns Jackson. She is indeed a mother of the movement.

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

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, a wonderful tribute from a man that knows courage. He has it, he has shown it, and he knows what it is to stand up for what he believes in.

A lot of great examples have served in this body, and that is what we need right now. We face as important an issue as we have had, certainly since I have been here, and possibly decades.

A deal with the devil is what it comes down to, a deal with what Ronald Reagan would say is evil. It makes the evil empire of the Soviet Union pale in comparison to the evil that Iran's leaders have perpetuated, and this administration has done a deal with them.

Chairman ED ROYCE has eloquently pointed out that Iran has violated every international agreement they have entered since 1979.

So wouldn't it fill the definition of insanity if another deal is entered by what used to be the lone superpower with the one and only country in existence right now in the world that has broken every agreement it has entered since 1979?

If someone were standing back as a historian and looking at what is going on right now and were totally objective, he or she would probably say: Well, it looks like the fools running the United States are going to get what they deserve. They have made a deal with sheer evil. These evil leaders have lied. They have broken every agreement they have ever entered, and these fools running the United States are going to get what they deserve. It is

going to happen again. People are going to die in greater numbers than ever before.

What grieves me more than anything is what seems to be the idea of some in the House and Senate that: Gee, since Iran is going to get nuclear weapons, surely they are going to cheat. They are going to get them. They are going to get them sooner rather than later. This deal is not going to allow anybody to stop them.

So what is important here is to provide political cover to Republicans. We can do that by acting like we are fighting real hard in the House, acting like we are fighting real hard in the Senate. Then we lose.

Then when Iran gets nukes and kills hundreds of thousands or millions of people, you say: See, we told you. We did what we could. But the trouble is that is not good enough because lives in this country and in the nation of Israel are all at stake here.

We have been told that: Gee, the 15 nations heading up the U.N. Security Council, they have agreed; so, it should be binding against the United States.

That argument was attempted to be made by the Secretary of State and the President himself, that: Gee, we have to go along because the U.N. has already voted.

Well, yeah, that would be true if there were not something called the United States Constitution under which our first President under the Constitution took office in 1789.

And since this has been in effect—our U.S. Constitution, Article II, Section 2, second paragraph, has been in effect, he, talking about the President, shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treatise, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. It is very clear.

And we also know it is very clear that you cannot have a treaty like the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The international agreement that was lauded by so many over such a long period of time—you cannot amend an international treaty like that unless it is with another treaty. You cannot amend that with an executive agreement. You cannot amend that with an agreement that is nonbinding.

Therefore, it is exceedingly clear that what the President and Secretary Kerry and Wendy Sherman that did such a good job helping with the North Korea deal so they got nuclear weapons—they say it is not a treaty. But absolutely it is a treaty.

So if we are going to uphold our oath of office, we have to acknowledge that this is a treaty and implore the Senate to announce that, even though the President has not submitted this treaty to them for ratification under Article II, since it is a treaty, they had the power to bring it up.

And, yes, there is a convenient Senate rule called cloture that HARRY REID actually suspended numerous times in the matter of some confirmations so they could get judges on the bench that

would uphold whatever interpretation of the Constitution this administration cared to bring before them.

But there is a time when the Republicans in the Senate must say: You know what. This is too important to let a gaggle of minority Senators from the minority party keep us from voting on the most important bill of our time. We are not going to let a rule that we make, that we put in place, that we can suspend, keep us from having a vote on the most important bill of our time, the treaty with Iran.

So the Senate can suspend, as HARRY REID did, the cloture rule with a vote of 51 Senators. Once they have the 51 that suspend cloture in this Iranian treaty, then bring the treaty to the floor for a ratification vote, it will not get two-thirds.

And then, once and for all time, it will be clear to everyone, except perhaps the President and Secretary Kerry—it will be very clear, as it is to constitutional law professors I have talked to—that we are not bound by the Iranian treaty with the only country in the world that has broken every international agreement they have had since 1979.

□ 2130

The resolution that I had filed with numerous great cosponsors, it points out that the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015—that is the Corker-Cardin bill—does not apply to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action regarding Iran—that is the Iran treaty—submitted to Congress on July 19, 2015, because the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is a treaty, and pursuant to article II of the United States Constitution, the Senate must give its advice and consent to ratification if the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is to be effective and binding upon the United States.

It also states—because it is a fact—on March 11, 2015, Secretary of State John Kerry, in describing the administration's nuclear negotiations with Iran, clearly stated that it was “not negotiating a legally binding plan” with Iran, and therefore, it does not have to be submitted to Congress.

If it were not legally binding, then, no, Secretary Kerry and the President do not have to submit it to Congress; but the President and the Secretary of State have already given this facade, this charade away because they have already said: Well, gee, if Congress doesn't go along with it, we will be in breach of the agreement because the U.N. has already voted on it.

A-ha. You said it wasn't legally binding what you were negotiating, and now, you are telling us that is not true.

I mean, it conjures up memories of other statements like: “If you like your insurance, you can keep it. If you like your doctor, you can keep it.” It conjures up sermons by this administration and this President how we had to take out Qadhafi out of Libya for stability of the area, that it would

make the place so much better in North Africa.

We saw what happened. Qadhafi would not have been removed without President Obama bombing on behalf of the rebels that were infused with al Qaeda that would end up ultimately attacking our consulate in Benghazi and killing four Americans.

We now see, as I did last week when I was in north Africa, this President, this State Department have created massive instability across north Africa. It has put tens of millions of people in fear. What do you think this crazy migration started from?

It started from the policies of this President in declaring that something that they love calling the Arab Spring but ended up becoming a cold, harsh killer of a winter was going to be helped along by the United States.

Some in north Africa reminded me of our President's statement that President Mubarak had to go. The President declared he has to go. He interfered with what was going on in Egypt. He interfered with an ally, not a great guy at all. He created massive instability that allowed the Muslim Brother Morsi to take over. Yes, he was elected. Yes, as confirmed again this past week, there were plenty of fraudulent votes. He alleged to have 12 million or so votes.

After a year as President of usurping the power under the Constitution, totally disregarding the Constitution, taking powers that weren't his, moving to become dictator, over 30 million Egyptians rose up, went to the street. These were moderate Muslims; these were secularists, Christians, Jews that came to the streets and said, with one accord, one heart, one voice: We don't want radical Islamists running Egypt.

Our Muslim friends in Afghanistan in the Northern Alliance said the same thing. We don't want radical Islamists running Afghanistan, but the Egyptian people did it on their own. It may have been the greatest peaceful—it was the greatest peaceful uprising in the history of man. There have never been that many people peacefully demonstrating.

What was not peaceful was the Muslim Brotherhood because they want the world caliphate. They thought they were on the way with the help of President Obama. They were taking Libya. They felt like they were taking Algeria, Tunisia, and come on around north Africa and the Middle East, they were on their way to that world caliphate they were promising they would have, the same world caliphate that the former adviser to the Secretary of Homeland Security here in the United States tweeted out after another American had his head cut off that the international caliphate was inevitable, Americans just needed to get used to the idea, a man that I had been warning was a Muslim Brother and was a top adviser in this administration and needed to be out.

Finally, after he made it clear to even the most dense in this administra-

tion that he was in favor of an international caliphate, finally, they had to let him finish his term and let him go by retiring.

Well, the President is still getting that kind of advice, and the truth is that it is a disaster. It has done so much damage to this country. Those who say this is a great deal are the same people that said we had to remove Qadhafi. It created massive instability. It created a situation where you have so many deaths as people try to flee from north Africa.

Where do you think they are coming from? What do you think laid the groundwork for this? It was this President's intervention in Libya, this President's meddling in Egypt.

We heard the President himself say on national television—international television because ISIS heard it, that ISIS is junior varsity, they are JV. I played on the JV, and I played on the varsity, and there is a vast difference. ISIS knew there was a difference. This President did not.

He said, if we could just arm the vetted moderate Syrian rebels, that everything would be fine in Syria. We have seen that he has created more chaos. He has created tens of thousands of more refugees because of his failed policies born out of massive ignorance—or somebody that is advising him is not ignorant, they know what they are doing—but it is setting the Middle East and north Africa, figuratively speaking, on fire and, in many cases, literally speaking.

We heard over and over of instances where the President's vetted moderate Syrian rebels that we spent millions and millions and millions of dollars training and arming, they kept having all that incredibly upgraded equipment taken over by ISIS. I have been over there. I met with the Kurdish commanders. They are begging for up-armored equipment so they can at least have some way to stay on the battlefield with ISIS that this President has armed through the so-called vetted Syrian moderate rebels.

Well, we heard tonight that Madeleine Albright thinks this is a good deal. Well, wow, I feel so much better that Secretary Albright that said, along with Wendy Sherman, that helped negotiate the deal with Iran, that, Gee, the key to keeping North Korea from having nuclear weapons is to give them nuclear power plants, give them the nuclear material they need because they are willing to promise, in writing, that they won't develop nuclear material or nuclear weapons if we will do all that for them. Well, that didn't work out so well.

People advising this President that were part of the advice—and we hear Madeleine Albright thinks that is a good deal? Then if there was any doubt in any Republican's mind—I don't think there is—but any doubt in any Republican's mind just how horrendous this deal is, that had to be completely dispelled tonight when we heard from

our friend on the Democratic side that Hank Paulson, the former Secretary of the Treasury, thinks this is the thing to do.

This is the guy that gave us TARP. This is the guy that said when we asked, Well, if you don't know how much mortgage-backed securities are worth, how do you know you need \$700 billion, and in our conference call with other Republicans, the answer to that question was, Well, we just needed a really big number.

That is the guy that we are told, tonight, is assuring us that this deal with Iran is the way to go.

On August 6, 2015, White House press secretary Josh Earnest, at a White House press briefing, stated: "We don't need Congress to approve this Iran nuclear deal."

On July 28, 2015, Secretary Kerry, at a hearing before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, stated the reason why the Iran nuclear agreement is not considered a treaty is because it has become physically impossible to pass a treaty through the United States Senate anymore. It has become impossible to schedule. It has become impossible to pass.

Two days after Secretary Kerry testified to that, that that was the reason he didn't bring this treaty as a treaty, well, the United States formally ratified the amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material when Henry S. Ensher, the Department of State's Ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Agency, delivered the United States' instruments of ratification to the IAEA. Whoops—it turns out Secretary Kerry's testimony was not true. I don't think he lied. I just think he was that ignorant.

On June 4, 2015, less than 2 months before Secretary Kerry testified it had become physically impossible for the Senate to ratify treaties, he stated the Department of State is "preparing the instruments of ratification of several important treaties" and that he wants "to personally thank the U.S. Congress for their efforts on the implementing legislation for the nuclear securities treaties."

Well, I don't think he was lying or ignorant. I just think he forgot that he had just thanked us for passing these treaties—or at least the Senate for ratifying these treaties. He forgot that he had just done that when he said it is physically impossible to ratify a treaty anymore.

May 7, 2015, the Senate held a vote on the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, commonly referred to as the Corker-Cardin bill, in which every Senator voted on that bill with the understanding that the Iran nuclear agreement was an executive agreement, not a treaty, and the United States' sanctions on Iran's ballistic missile program would remain in place.

The Corker-Cardin bill actually states:

It is the sense of Congress that United States sanctions on Iran for ballistic missiles will remain in place under an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States.

The Corker-Cardin bill was intended as a review of the application of statutory sanctions against only Iran's nuclear program. The Corker-Cardin bill prescribes a process for congressional review only of "agreements with Iran related to the nuclear program of Iran."

Under subsection (b) and (c) of section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as added by the Corker-Cardin bill, lawmakers may resolve to approve, disapprove, or take no action on nuclear agreements with Iran.

Under section 135(d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as added by the Corker-Cardin bill, it calls for "congressional oversight of Iranian compliance with nuclear agreements."

It is pretty easy to recall for those of us with a half-decent memory that actually, under the bill, the treaty being proposed by this administration, the Iran treaty actually doesn't allow Congress oversight.

□ 2145

Not only does it not allow Congress the oversight, it says the IAEA is going to have oversight, not Congress, and we don't even know the arrangement that has been negotiated or is being negotiated between the IAEA and Iran.

But we do know this. My friends across the aisle said in debate today—and I was amazed that this statement would be made—that if Iran cheats, we will know it. That was a quote from one of my friends across the aisle.

Well, if Iran cheats, we won't know it. We don't even know if the IAEA has a decent agreement. But we know this. Iran has made clear they will not allow the IAEA inspectors to go to their military sites. They made that clear in every communication they have had since this treaty came forward. And then we find out, actually, Iran has said: We are going to provide samples to you.

Oh, so, as my Democratic friend said, if Iran cheats, we will know it. What that means is when Iran cheats, they are going to bring samples from the area they won't let the IAEA inspect and say: Here are the samples that let you know we cheated, because our Democratic friends in Congress knew if we cheated, we would let you know we are cheating.

Seriously? Is that how naive this government has gotten?

We were told in debate by a Democratic friend that it would have been a mistake to demand the release of U.S. hostages. Oh, yeah, that would have been a mistake, that before we enter any negotiation, they have to show good faith by releasing the hostages so that we know that they are a country with whom we can deal? Of course that was the right thing to do.

And \$100 billion to \$150 billion going to Iran under this deal is more money

than we have given or used to help Israel with since Israel came into being again in the late 1940s. And yet we are going to give it not to our close ally Israel. We are going to give it to their worst enemy that has even said this past week that they were plotting to overthrow Israel. This week they have said that they are plotting to overthrow Israel, and they are coming for the United States.

I have heard people, I believe, Mr. Speaker, wrongly compare Neville Chamberlain to the current situation that the President and Secretary Kerry have proposed. I would submit that that is a grossly unfair comparison for Neville Chamberlain, because at the time Neville Chamberlain had that paper that he got Hitler to sign that caused him to say, "This is peace for our time"—a lot of papers messed it up and said "peace in our time"; he said "peace for our time"—at the time Chamberlain did that, Hitler had not violated every international agreement he had entered. He hadn't done that. Iran has.

At the time Neville Chamberlain said, "This is peace for our time," Hitler had not been saying, "Death to England"; "death to France"; "death to the countries in Europe." He had not been saying that. Iranian leaders have been, including the Ayatollah.

At the time Neville Chamberlain said this agreement means "peace for our time," Hitler had not publicly stated he was plotting the overthrow of any of the countries in the area. Iran has. They are plotting the overthrow of Israel and to take out the United States.

Our friend TOM COLE said in the Rules Committee this week that he was concerned that this agreement will cause an arms race, and he is exactly right. That was confirmed again this past week as I was over there talking to people that know in the Egyptian Government.

The Saudis are already working a deal to buy nukes. The Saudis know they have got to have them because Iran is going to have them under this Iranian treaty if we don't stop the treaty.

You stop the treaty by the Senate voting on it as a treaty and not getting to two-thirds. That means it is not binding against the United States. Other countries in the area—Jordan, Egypt, even Libya, Lebanon, and all these countries—know they are going to have to have nukes if they are going to survive the area.

It is going to create the proliferation of nuclear weapons like there has never been in the world. And as someone said, mutually assured destruction with Russia was a deterrent, but with Iran, it is an incentive.

This is such a dangerous time. But the Iranian treaty amends the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in several places. You can't amend a treaty unless you are amending it with another treaty.

This is a treaty the Senate needs to step up and say it is a treaty. And for heaven's sake, this is far more important a situation where we suspend the cloture rule so that we do not allow a small segment of radicals supporting Iran to keep us from voting on the most important bill of our time. And then vote, and when you don't get two-thirds it is not ratified.

What the House is doing this week is actually not a bad strategy for the House because, as a treaty, we don't get a vote. But if we stand idly by and let the President treat it as if it has been ratified, then Israel will have to defend itself. Under the Iranian treaty, we will have to defend Iran, not Israel, and the unthinkable will happen, and that is the United States and Iran will be on the same side against Israel. We have got to stop that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 349. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 1603. An act to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers; to the Committee on Homeland Security; in addition, to the Committee on Armed Services for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1359. An act to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 11, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2654. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Organization; Mergers, Consolidations, and Charter Amendments of Banks or Associations (RIN: 3052-AC72) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2655. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral David A. Dunaway, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2656. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General William M. Faulkner, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2657. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Douglas J. Robb, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2658. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Theodore C. Nicholas, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2659. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Mark F. Ramsay, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2660. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Limitations on Terms of Consumer Credit Extended to Service Members and Dependents [DOD-2013-OS-0133] (RIN: 0790-AJ10) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2661. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Richard P. Mills, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2662. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing two United States Navy officers, Captain Moises Deltoro III and Captain Cedric E. Pringle, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2663. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Brigadier General James C. Slife, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of major general and Colonel Paul E. Bauman, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2664. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Inventory of Contracted Services for Fiscal Year 2014 report for the Military Departments, De-

fense Agencies, and Department of Defense Field Activities, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2330a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2665. A letter from the Assistant, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's Major final rule — Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards [Regulation H, Docket No.: R-1498] (RIN: 7100-AE-22) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2666. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Updating Regulations Governing HUD Fees and the Financing of the Purchase and Installation of Fire Safety Equipment in FHA-Insured Healthcare Facilities [Docket No.: FR-5632-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AJ27) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2667. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2015-2017 Enterprise Housing Goals (RIN: 2590-AA65) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2668. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major final rule — Derivatives (RIN: 3133-AD90) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2669. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Chartering and Field of Membership Manual (RIN: 3133-AE31) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2670. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Department of Commerce, transmitting a letter stating that the National Telecommunications and Information Administration intends to exercise the first option in the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions contract to extend the period of performance for one year to September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2671. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification: Spirulina Extract [Docket No.: FDA-2014-C-1552] received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2672. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Twentieth Report to Congress on Progress Made in Licensing and Constructing the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline, pursuant to Sec. 1810 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2673. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's "2014/2015 Economic Dispatch and Technological Change" report to Congress, in response to Secs. 1234 and 1832 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2674. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of

Defense, transmitting Reports for the third quarter of FY 2015, April 1, 2015 — June 30, 2015, developed in accordance with Secs. 36(a) and 26(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; the March 24, 1979, Report by the Committee on Foreign Affairs (H. Rept. 96-70), and the July 31, 1981, Seventh Report by the Committee on Government Operations (H. Rept. 97-214) are provided by request; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2675. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a notice of Proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the United Kingdom for defense articles and services, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Pub. L. 94-329, Transmittal No.: 15-50; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2676. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to the Export Administration Regulations: Removal of Special Comprehensive License Provisions [Docket No.: 140613501-5698-02] (RIN: 0694-AG13) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2677. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updated Statements of Legal Authority for the Export Administration Regulations to Include August 7, 2015 Extension of Emergency Declared in Executive Order 13222 [Docket No.: 150813713-5713-01] (RIN: 0694-AG71) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2678. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report as required by Sec. 181 of the 1992-93 Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Pub. L. 102-138, concerning Employment of U.S. Citizens by Certain International Organizations in 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2679. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2680. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Recreational Fishing Restrictions for Pacific Bluefin Tuna [Docket No.: 150305219-5619-02] (RIN: 0648-BE78) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2681. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Bigeye Tuna Catch Limits in Longline Fisheries for 2015 [Docket No.: 150619537-5615-01] (RIN: 0648-BF19) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2682. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 120328229-4949-02] (RIN: 0648-XE007) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2683. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan; Revision to Prohibited Species Regulations [Docket No.: 150112035-5658-02] (RIN: 0648-BE80) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2684. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; 2015 Management Measures; Correction [Docket No.: 150316270-5662-02] (RIN: 0648-XD843) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2685. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's emergency rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Prohibited Species Catch; Emergency Rule [Docket No.: 150629564-5564-01] (RIN: 0648-BF24) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2686. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the report "Tribal Crime Data Collection Activities, 2015", as required by Sec. 302(g) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Street Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. 3732(g), as added by Sec. 251(b)(5) of the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 (Title II of Pub. L. 111-211); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2687. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Denied Access to NASA Facilities (2015-N002) (RIN: 2700-AE14) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2688. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Office of Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (RIN: 2700-AE18) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2689. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final and temporary regulations — Allocation of W-2 Wages in a Short Taxable Year and in an Acquisition or Disposition [TD 9731] (RIN: 1545-BM11) received September 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law

104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2690. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Mission Support Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Duty Free Entry of Space Articles [Docket No.: NASA-2015-0006] (RIN: 2700-AD99) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2691. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's "2015 Annual Report of the Supplemental Security Income Program", pursuant to Sec. 231 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 511. A bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act; with an amendment (Rept. 114-260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 3470. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, Armed Services, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BARR, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida):

H.R. 3471. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the provision of automobiles and adaptive equipment by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. COLE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. BRAT):

H.R. 3472. A bill to amend the provisions of title 40, United States Code, commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act, to raise the threshold dollar amount of contracts subject to the prevailing wage requirements of such provisions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 3473. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit limitations on certain grants due to standards for covered farm vehicles and drivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 3474. A bill to establish additional protections and disclosures for students and co-signers with respect to student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 3475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to assist in the support of children living in poverty by allowing a refundable credit to grandparents of those children for the purchase household items for the benefit of those children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 3476. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to provide for an increase in the discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 3477. A bill to enhance and integrate Native American tourism, empower Native American communities, increase coordination and collaboration between Federal tourism assets, and expand heritage and cultural tourism opportunities in the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 3478. A bill to release wilderness study areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management in Luna and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico that are not suitable for wilderness designation from continued management as de facto wilderness areas; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 3479. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for developing and implementing plans to address non-point source pollution affecting nationally significant estuaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 3480. A bill to expand the boundary of Fort Frederica National Monument in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 3481. A bill to require States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding shooting incidents involving law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3482. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to implement various reforms to the social security disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

H.R. 3483. A bill to foster bilateral engagement and scientific analysis of storing nuclear waste in permanent repositories in the Great Lakes Basin; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 3484. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into certain leases at the Department of Veterans Affairs West Los Angeles Campus in Los Angeles, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3485. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit 501(c)(4) entities from participating in, or intervening in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3486. A bill to reauthorize and amend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3487. A bill to make the antitrust laws applicable to professional sports leagues that use, or promote or allow member teams or franchisees to use, the term "Redskins" or the term "Redskin"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 3488. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to vehicle weight limitations applicable to the Interstate System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 3489. A bill to eliminate mandatory minimum sentences for all drug offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 414. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2015 as "Campus Fire Safety Month"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 415. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that regular order should be restored in the House and Senate; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. HARPER):

H. Res. 416. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives recog-

nizing community water fluoridation as one of the great public health initiatives on its 70th anniversary; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

120. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a resolution requesting the U.S. State Department and the U.S. Secretary of State to pursue a multilateral approach to promptly address the potential crisis in the Dominican Republic that could render tens of thousands of Dominicans of Haitian descent stateless; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

121. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a resolution reaffirming the friendship between the Commonwealth and Taiwan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 3471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because this legislation adjusts the formula the federal government uses to spend money on federal contracts, it is authorized by the Constitution under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress its spending power.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 3473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 3474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 3475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 3476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 3477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 3478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 3479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 3480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 3481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION
ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS
CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

" . . . and provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States . . ."

" . . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers . . ."

This legislation seeks to reform the Social Security Disability Insurance program. Therefore, it will affect the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 3484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3485.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3486.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 3488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 3489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the 7 Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 167: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. KNIGHT.
 H.R. 169: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 191: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 192: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 205: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 206: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 228: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 232: Mr. ISSA.
 H.R. 239: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 248: Mr. RATCLIFFE.
 H.R. 282: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 300: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 304: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 342: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 407: Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 437: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 448: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 511: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota and Mrs. ROBY.
 H.R. 538: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 540: Mr. MULVANEY.
 H.R. 546: Mr. HURD of Texas.
 H.R. 556: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 563: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
 H.R. 572: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 583: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 592: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 602: Mr. KNIGHT.
 H.R. 605: Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 619: Mr. PASCARELL.
 H.R. 680: Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 691: Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 692: Mr. GUTHRIE and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
 H.R. 702: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 703: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 748: Mr. JOLLY.
 H.R. 771: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H.R. 775: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Miss RICE of New York, and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 799: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 815: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 828: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 829: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 841: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 863: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H.R.
 H.R. 865: Mr. WENSTRUP.
 H.R. 879: Mr. WOMACK and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
 H.R. 885: Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 912: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 928: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
 H.R. 932: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 940: Mr. MCHENRY.
 H.R. 969: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. VELA, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 985: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. PEARCE.
 H.R. 990: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 1016: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H.R. 1057: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H.R. 1062: Mr. TURNER and Mr. WESTERMAN.
 H.R. 1101: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 1120: Mr. GUINTA.
 H.R. 1185: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. YODER.
 H.R. 1188: Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 1192: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. GUINTA.
 H.R. 1209: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
 H.R. 1218: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 1248: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 1258: Mr. POCAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. EDWARDS.
 H.R. 1274: Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 1282: Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 1343: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 1358: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 1384: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 1399: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1401: Mr. CARNEY.
 H.R. 1439: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 1475: Mr. DONOVAN.
 H.R. 1478: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
 H.R. 1490: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 1505: Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 1528: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 1559: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 1586: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 1602: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1635: Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 1669: Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 1684: Mr. GRAYSON.
 H.R. 1686: Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 1692: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 1718: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H.R. 1737: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. ZELDIN.
 H.R. 1752: Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 1779: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 1786: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. VELA, and Mr. HURD of Texas.
 H.R. 1846: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 1849: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1856: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 1859: Mr. CHABOT.
 H.R. 1901: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 1942: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. GRAYSON.
 H.R. 1943: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. ESTY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MENG, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 2043: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. NEAL, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 2050: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 2067: Mr. JONES, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. TAKAI.
 H.R. 2077: Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
 H.R. 2096: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
 H.R. 2142: Mr. REED.
 H.R. 2145: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 2221: Ms. HAHN and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 2254: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 2264: Mr. KILMER, Mr. COLE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 2278: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 2280: Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 2293: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 2313: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 2403: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 2404: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 2412: Mr. TAKAI.
 H.R. 2417: Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 2477: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 2521: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 2602: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 2653: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 2675: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 2694: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 2698: Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 2710: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 2713: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 2715: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 2744: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 2764: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 2844: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 2848: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 2850: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 2858: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 2893: Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H.R. 2903: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 2904: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 2911: Mr. WALZ, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
 H.R. 2940: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 2948: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2972: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 3011: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 3013: Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 3036: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
 H.R. 3051: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 3061: Ms. DELAULO, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 3064: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 3065: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 3095: Mr. KILMER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 3119: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 3123: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 3134: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. COOK, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 3135: Mr. POMPEO.
 H.R. 3150: Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 3151: Mr. ADERHOLT.
 H.R. 3160: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 3165: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 3173: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 3183: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 3184: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 3185: Mr. VISCLOSKY and Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 3189: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 3216: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 3229: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 3250: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 3258: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 3261: Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 3268: Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
 H.R. 3293: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 3294: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H.R. 3296: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 3301: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 3316: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3337: Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 3338: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
 H.R. 3341: Ms. PELOSI, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. FARR, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 3381: Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 3412: Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 3423: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 3429: Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 3431: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 3437: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 3439: Mr. ROYCE.
 H.R. 3442: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. FOX, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
 H.R. 3444: Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H.R. 3455: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 3457: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DENT, Mr. BARR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 3460: Mr. ZELDIN.
 H.J. Res. 49: Mr. MULVANEY.
 H.J. Res. 59: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. PALMER.
 H. Con. Res. 17: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. HOLDING.

H. Con. Res. 65: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 14: Mr. NOLAN.

H. Res. 54: Mr. CUELLAR.

H. Res. 245: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 371: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H. Res. 383: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H. Res. 386: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H. Res. 393: Mr. HOYER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. TITUS.

H. Res. 394: Ms. JACKSON Lee, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. WELCH.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

The provisions of H.R. 3460, To suspend until January 21, 2017, the authority of the President to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran, that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of House rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 3460 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The provisions in H.R. 3460 that warranted a referral to the Committee on Financial Services do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in H.R. 3460 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 3460, "To suspend until January 21, 2017, the authority of the President to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions pursuant

to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

The provisions of H.R. 3461, To approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran, that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of House rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 3461 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The provisions in H.R. 3461 that warranted a referral to the Committee on Financial Services do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in H.R. 3461 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 3461, "To approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H. Res. 411, "Finding that the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3443: Ms. MCSALLY.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2015

No. 130

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our rock, we trust You to guide our Nation. We find consolation in remembering how You have led us in the past.

Lord, our lawmakers need Your wisdom to make decisions that will reflect Your will. They can only guess about the future, but You comprehend the destiny of our world at a glance. The hearts of Kings, Presidents, and potentates are in Your hands, and You choreograph circumstances as You desire. So save us from ourselves by guiding our Senators with the might of Your prevailing providence.

Lord, let Your will be done on Earth as it is done in Heaven.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.J. RES. 61

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, September 10, at 3 p.m., the substitute amendment to H.J. Res. 61 be agreed to; the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time; and the Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.J. RES. 61

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motions with respect to the McConnell substitute amendment No. 2640 and H.J. Res. 61 be withdrawn; that the pending amendments and the motion to commit, with the exception of the McConnell substitute amendment, be withdrawn; that no other amendments, points of order, or motions be in order to the joint resolution or the McConnell substitute prior to the vote on the McConnell substitute amendment; that at 3:45 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to vote on the McConnell substitute amendment; that the amendment be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; further, that if the McConnell amendment is agreed to, H.J. Res. 61, as amended, be read a third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.J. RES. 61

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the substitute amendment to H.J. Res. 61 occur at 3 p.m. today, with the time until 3:45 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the majority leader clarify the time of the vote?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I withdraw that consent and propound another one.

I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the substitute amendment to H.J. Res. 61 occur at 3:45 p.m. today, with the time until 3:45 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have a few brief remarks, and then I will respond to my friend.

By the end of the day, the Senate will have spent 3 days debating one of the most critical national security issues of our time—and that is probably an understatement—whether to support the agreement to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

From the beginning of this process, Democrats have done everything within our power to support this debate. We allowed the Senate to begin important debate without any procedural hurdles—none whatsoever. Democrats understand the severity of the urgent national security issue that is before this body, and that is why we offered a consent agreement at the beginning of the week to eliminate all procedural hurdles and move straight to the final passage vote after the debate. I did that again this morning, but the Republican leader did not take that offer. Instead,

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6543

he filed cloture on the debate. By rejecting our offer, the Republican leader has made the cloture vote the decisive and definitive vote on this issue. That is why I once again will put forward my consent to skip cloture and all procedural votes and move to a vote on final passage.

Every Senator in this body should understand that if they are forced to vote on cloture, it is because Senator MCCONNELL, not Democrats, wanted them to. The idea that Democrats are somehow trying to stop debate or keeping us from a final vote is foolish. It is simply untrue.

Let's be clear. Let's be clear who is moving to end debate. It is the Republican leader who is moving to end debate, not me, not us. It is the Republican leader who filed a procedural motion last night and today.

What Democrats are offering is an opportunity to continue debate and move straight to a vote on final passage. This is exactly what we have done on many policy issues in the past because of Republican demands. In fact, since 2007 the Senate has regularly held votes on passage at a 60-vote threshold on policy and national security issues—for example, on national security issues such as Iraq policy resolutions; the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA; United States-India nuclear cooperation; foreign aid prohibition for Pakistan, Egypt, Libya; FISA reauthorization; terrorism risk insurance, or TRIA. These are just a few of the many votes we have taken at the 60-vote threshold demanded by our Republican friends.

Actions speak louder than words. Democrats acted to get this bill to the floor and debate it. Democrats are ready to vote on final passage. But if we are forced to vote on cloture, all Senators should understand that the cloture vote would then become the defining vote that determines whether the resolution of disapproval moves forward to the President's desk. A vote against cloture is a vote for the Iran agreement, plain and simple.

Mr. President, may I have the consent agreement restated? I think I understand it, but basically we would have a cloture vote and move immediately to a vote? No, just a cloture vote. I am sorry.

The question before the body—and they are waiting for me to respond—is, we would have a cloture vote on this matter because the leader has objected to my consent request, and we would have it at 3:45 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding.

Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Please wait. Staff is conferring here.

No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, just a few short months ago, Senators of both parties came together to pass a bipartisan bill based on an important principle: that the American people through the Congress they elect deserve a say on one of the most important issues of our time. We rallied around that principle, voting 98 to 1 to ensure the American people would have a real say on any deal with Iran. What a tragedy it would be, then, if at the very last moment some of those same Senators decided to filibuster to prevent the American people from having a real say on this incredibly important issue.

I know some of our colleagues are currently under immense pressure to shut down the voice of the people. But I would ask colleagues to reflect on the gravely serious nature of the issue before us. I would ask colleagues to consider the expectations they set with their constituents when they voted for the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. I would ask colleagues to consider something else as well. This is a deal that will far outlast one administration. The President may have the luxury of vacating office in a few months, but many of our responsibilities extend beyond that time. The American people will remember. They will remember where we stand today. Let's stand on their side.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 61) amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

McConnell amendment No. 2640, of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2641 (to amendment No. 2640), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2642 (to amendment No. 2641), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2643 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2640), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2644 (to amendment No. 2643), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 2645, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2646 (to the instructions) amendment No. 2645), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2647 (to amendment No. 2646), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3:45 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I understand we are moving back to the incredibly important debate on Iran. I will come back and address that a little bit later.

REMEMBERING ALISON PARKER AND ADAM WARD AND PAYING TRIBUTE TO VICKI GARDNER

Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to pay tribute to the victims of another horrific act of gun violence.

On August 26, a gunman opened fire during a live television interview at Smith Mountain Lake in Virginia. By now, I think everyone in this Chamber and all across the country saw that event on live television. The gunfire killed WDBJ News 7 reporter Alison Parker, News 7 photographer Adam Ward, and the shooting severely wounded Vicki Gardner, a local chamber of commerce official who was being interviewed. I know my colleague Senator Kaine has already spoken on this, but I speak for everyone in the Commonwealth when I say our hearts go out to the Parker family and the Ward family. We are all pleased to hear that Vicki Gardner was released from the hospital on Monday, and she is on the road to recovery.

So Smith Mountain Lake in Virginia is now added to the all-too-familiar, heartbreaking litany—Charleston, Aurora, Sandy Hook, Tucson, and Virginia Tech. It became clear in the days following the 26th that Alison Parker and Adam Ward represented the best of their community. The outpouring of love and support for them and their families was remarkable. I had a number of conversations with Alison's father Andy, whom I knew from local government, and I will be meeting with him later today. Vicki Gardner, who was released from the hospital, will soon, hopefully, be getting back to her job at the chamber of commerce.

We feel—particularly those of us in Virginia—as if we knew Alison, Adam, and Vicki because the crime committed against them was so horrible and the details were reported so widely.

How many more parents must lose their children to gun violence? How many more anxious families must maintain a lonely vigil at the hospital before all of us here in Congress move on commonsense gun legislation?

More than 30,000 people are killed by firearms in this country every year. The last time Congress meaningfully engaged in a debate about gun reform was more than 2 years ago, after Sandy Hook. Even after the horrific loss of 20 children and 6 adults in Newtown at Sandy Hook, the Senate was still unable to pass responsible, commonsense

reforms, such as closing the gun show loophole. Since Sandy Hook, there have been at least 136 school shootings in America. That is an average of one every week.

Probably like most of us, there are a lot of meetings we take in the Senate that kind of blur before our eyes. I will never forget the meeting with the Newtown families after that tragedy. I would have thought and would have expected with their grief that these families would have come in and asked for a whole array of legislative solutions, but they didn't. The families I met with came in and simply had one very reasonable, commonsense request of Congress: universal background checks to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and those with serious mental illness. Let me acknowledge that won't prevent every shooting. It is not a magical fix for violent, disturbed people who are determined to do harm, but it is a start at tackling the epidemic of gun violence.

I am a supporter of the Second Amendment—for many years I had an "A" rating from the NRA—but I believe background checks do not infringe on the Second Amendment. As a matter of fact, gun owners understand this. In fact, a greater proportion of gun owners support requiring background checks for all gun sales than do non-gun owners. In a recent survey, 85 percent of gun owners and 83 percent of non-gun owners—so gun owners more than non-gun owners—supported requiring background checks for all gun sales.

Reasonable people can disagree about what additional steps might need to be taken, but the facts are not up for debate. Background checks do work, and they keep guns out of the hands of those who shouldn't have them.

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the Brady law has blocked almost 2.4 million gun purchases since its enactment in 1994. Almost 200,000 purchases were blocked in the most recent year in which we have records. But, as we know, background checks aren't performed on every purchase. In fact, a significant number of transfers are done with no check whatsoever to determine whether a prospective buyer can legally possess a gun.

There is no reason why we shouldn't have a comprehensive background check system on all firearms sales. The Senate came close to making progress on this in the weeks following Sandy Hook. I want to particularly cite two colleagues, Senator MANCHIN and Senator TOOMEY, who both have strong records of support for the Second Amendment, who introduced and fought for bipartisan legislation that would have expanded background checks for many private gun sales, while still allowing families to appropriately transfer firearms within their family. However, this responsible and commonsense proposal fell short.

The cycle of tragedy followed by outrage followed by inaction has become

all too familiar. These tragic events are not isolated in any one part of the country—Charleston, Aurora, Tucson, Roanoke. Each of them breaks our hearts. We should not and cannot simply acknowledge and accept them as the status quo. We must not be content, and we must recognize that Congress, those of us in this body, have an ability to act. Thoughts and prayers for victims are not enough; we need to take responsible action. We can debate and should debate how far reform measures should go, but at the very least, we should look at a way to renew a push for more meaningful background checks. We must do more to make sure criminals and those who are dangerously mentally ill cannot purchase guns. We must work together to make sure local and State governments have the resources and place an appropriate priority on inputting the correct data into the national background check system.

As recently as the end of June, Senators TOOMEY and MANCHIN indicated they were considering ways to renew their efforts at meaningful background checks. I want to state clearly today that they will have my full support in this effort. I call on my colleagues to work with us to get legislation expanding meaningful background checks to the floor of the Senate before the end of this year. I can think of no better way to honor the lives of Alison Parker and Adam Ward and the thousands of other American families touched by gun violence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I intend to support the resolution of disapproval of the comprehensive plan of action negotiated by the Obama administration with the Islamic Republic of Iran. The agreement falls woefully short of the international goal to improve global security by stopping Iran's nuclear weapons ambitions.

The American people and Congress were promised an inspections regime providing anywhere, anytime access to facilities where tests were conducted. Instead, Iran can delay access to facilities for up to 24 days. This is inconsistent with the Obama administration's claims that no part of this agreement is based on trusting Iran at its word. A credible agreement would include stronger verification measures to ensure that the Iranians play by the rules, particularly given that government's well-documented efforts to conceal its nuclear activities and ambitions.

We are also concerned about the consequence of lifting the economic sanctions that forced Iran to the negotiating table. This agreement is an issue of long-term significance. Our country and our allies will be forced to deal with the repercussions of a strengthened Iran for the foreseeable future. This agreement is a bad deal for us and our allies, and I will not support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have been a Member of this body for nearly four decades. During that time, I have had the honor of participating in numerous debates that shaped the course of our future, but I can think of none more important than the one in which we are now engaged.

The Iranian regime is one of our most dangerous foes. It has declared the United States to be the "Great Satan." It has repeatedly claimed its intent to "wipe Israel off the map." It has perpetrated violence against American servicemen and civilians alike. It has sown conflict across the most volatile region of the world. And it has repressed its people by some of the most ghastly methods imaginable.

Indeed, we should remember throughout this debate that our quarrel is not with the Iranian people. The Iranian people are our friends. We should remember throughout our plight and their desire for a cooperative relationship with the United States and the rest of the world. Instead, it is the dictatorial and fanatical regime that seeks to build and even use nuclear weapons, to destabilize the entire region, and to kill Americans and Israelis. Given the threat posed by this rogue regime, preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability is absolutely critical. It is a goal shared across party lines as well as among many of our friends and allies abroad.

All of us here prefer to prevent Iran from acquiring this capability by diplomatic means if possible rather than by armed conflict. In light of this shared desire to resolve the Iranian threat without a war, I examined the Obama administration's proposed agreement hopeful, if skeptical, that I could support the agreement. Nevertheless, the duty incumbent upon us as Senators is not to accept or reject this deal based upon knee-jerk reactions or blind partisan loyalty but rather to determine our stances based on thorough examination and reasoned judgment.

Regrettably, after much study, I have concluded that this is a catastrophically bad deal that I must strongly oppose.

Now, at the outset, I should note that the media is reporting that President Obama has gathered the votes to support his Iran deal. In reality, he has done no such thing. Were this a treaty, it would fall well short of the two-thirds requirement. It won't—and it can't—even muster a majority in either the House or Senate. There is nothing bipartisan about support for this deal. Only the opposition is bipartisan, and only the opposition is a majority. The deal lacks the most important kind of support—that of the American people. A strong majority of Americans oppose this deal, and they are right to do so.

Far from blocking the Iranian regime's path to nuclear weapons capability, this agreement actually secures

what Mark Dubowitz, the executive director of the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, calls a “patient pathway” to nuclear weapons capability.

Consider the timeline. From day one, the Iranian regime will be allowed to enrich uranium using thousands of centrifuges and to conduct nuclear research and development. After 8 years, the regime will be allowed to begin building hundreds of new advanced centrifuges annually and will be allowed to expand its ballistic missile program.

After 15 years, it will be permitted to use advanced centrifuges to enrich uranium on an industrial scale, to stockpile significant quantities of enriched uranium, and to build heavy water reactors, according to the State Department’s own fact sheet. After only 10 years, Iran’s breakout time to rush for a nuclear weapon drops “almost down to zero,” as President Obama himself admitted.

In the words of former Deputy National Security Advisor Juan Zarate, this deal “stalls, [then] enables, and then validates an Iranian nuclear program.” All that the Iranian regime has to do is abide by the terms of the agreement to achieve threshold nuclear status—with an expanded infrastructure for the production of nuclear materials and a visible means of delivering a nuclear weapon to targets as far away as the United States.

Moreover, the deal’s means of verifying the Iranian regime’s compliance with these temporary limits on its nuclear programs are, frankly, pathetic. Our only peaceful means of recourse under the deal, the so-called snapback mechanism, involves an incredibly cumbersome process.

It allows the Iranian regime to delay international inspections for up to 24 days without recourse, a critical gap that experts such as former International Atomic Energy Agency Deputy Director General for Safeguards Olli Heinonen and former National Nuclear Security Administration Deputy Administrator for Defense William Tobey assert could allow Iran to hide evidence of illicit nuclear activities.

Other parties’ intransigence could also drag out the snapback mechanism more than 2 months before reimposing U.N. sanctions, approximately the same length of time as Iran’s current breakout timetable, according to President Obama.

Furthermore, the deal only makes the snapback mechanism available for instances of “significant nonperformance,” leaving no mechanism to respond to the kind of incremental cheating that has characterized the Iranian nuclear program thus far.

Perhaps most troubling, it remains unclear whether weapons inspectors will even have access to all Iranian nuclear facilities in the first place. Senior officials of the Iranian regime have repeatedly claimed that the deal does not allow access to military sites. The agreement’s language appears to have been left deliberately vague on this

point, hardly an encouraging development.

Moreover, press accounts of an IAEA side deal with Iran indicate that the international watchdog has already agreed to rely on the Iranian regime to conduct its own inspections at the Parchin weapons testing site, providing the IAEA with only photographs, videos, and environmental samples. Former IAEA Deputy Director General Heinonen may have put it best when he observed:

If the reporting is accurate, these procedures appear to be departing significantly from well-established and proven safeguards practices. At a broader level, if verification standards have been diluted for Parchin or elsewhere and limits imposed, the ramifications are significant as it will affect the IAEA’s ability to draw definitive conclusions with the requisite level of assurances and without undue hampering of the verification process.

Regarding these troubling reports, I have a number of outstanding questions and concerns that have only been amplified by the Obama administration’s steadfast refusal to share the text of the agreement with Congress. This intransigence amounts to an evasion of the spirit and possibly the text of the bipartisan Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, a development that rightfully sows doubt and concern about what else the Obama administration might be hiding.

In light of these incredible concessions to the Iranian regime, I am also deeply troubled by the great benefit the Iranian regime stands to enjoy from this deal. To use the succinct words of one scholar, “President Obama is agreeing to dismantle the sanctions regime permanently. In return, Tehran is agreeing to slow the development of its nuclear program temporarily.”

The current sanctions regime has imposed heavy costs on the Iranian economy. Oil exports have dropped by 60 percent. The inflation rate has risen to 40 percent. And foreign companies, deterred by harsh penalties, have avoided investing in Iran, thereby isolating Iran from the global economy. Along with the threat of military action, these sanctions played a critical role in bringing the Iranian regime to the negotiating table, and we should thus be very careful before sacrificing this leverage.

In exchange for these minimal, temporary concessions, the Iranian regime stands to reap enormous rewards in sanctions relief. According to figures cited by President Obama, the Iranian regime will regain control of more than \$150 billion currently frozen in the world’s financial institutions. Sanctions relief will also allow an influx of international businesses into Iran, bringing about greater revenue for the regime.

Where should we expect this money to be spent? Will it go to the long-suffering Iranian people who are the victims of this regime, a people who have long contributed to the advancement of civilization and the good of mankind, a

people whose true spirit has been continually repressed for almost 40 years, a people who have paid a high price because of the radical fundamentalism of their leaders, and a people who look to us for strength in the defense of our ideals, not capitulation to this heinous regime?

Unfortunately, we cannot expect such an outcome. If history is any guide, we should expect the Iranian regime to use sanctions relief to pursue its dangerous aims, including: to support its terrorist proxies that represent a dire threat to the stability of the whole region, such as Hamas in Gaza, Hezbollah in Lebanon, the Houthis in Yemen, and the murderous Assad regime in Syria; to encourage the “swarming of [foreign] businesses to Iran,” which the Iranian foreign minister believes will make it “impossible to reconstruct” broad international sanctions; to take advantage of the lifting of the U.N. arms embargo after 5 years to purchase sophisticated weapons systems such as the Russian S-300 air defense system, which would make American or Israeli military action against the Iranian nuclear program even more difficult than it already would be; and to shore up the political and financial standing of the most radical elements of the Iranian regime, reducing the likelihood of internal reform and a more constructive Iranian foreign policy.

If the Iranian regime suddenly becomes flush with cash, what incentive will it have to change priorities 15 years from now?

Doesn’t this deal reward what the Obama administration called “bad behavior” in one of the most astonishing understatements that I have ever heard?

And in the words of one expert, “when in the course of human history did getting \$100 billion [or \$150 billion] at the stroke of a pen ever convince anyone that they have been wrong all along?”

For a deal built on the unfounded hope that the Iranian regime would change its ways, I see very little reason to expect success. And for an agreement that would supposedly reinforce the position of the Iranian moderates and bring relief to the Iranian people, I see only the prospect of strengthening the hand of the hard-liners and of sanctions relief diverted for more violent misadventures, rather than for the benefit of the Iranian people.

Reflecting on this spectacularly bad deal, I can only conclude that Obama administration officials proved to be weak negotiators because of an absolute desperation for a deal—almost any deal. These massive concessions to the Iranian regime for so little in return were produced by this administration’s knee-jerk aversion to the prospect of using military force, a preoccupation demonstrated by the constant rhetoric that we hear from the White House that the only alternative to this deal is war.

That claim is patently false. We can and should go back to the negotiating table. While reassembling the sanctions coalition that this agreement throws away will not be easy and may not even be fully possible, a nation as strong as ours still has plenty of tools at our disposal. Our unparalleled economic and military might give us significant leverage to get a better deal, and we should not be misled by overly simplistic rhetoric to conclude otherwise.

War is never a happy matter to contemplate, especially from a position of responsibility such as in the Senate. In this body, we are saddled all too often with the sorts of decisions in which real people's lives hang in the balance: those of our friends and neighbors; our fellow countrymen; our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines; and even those in faraway distant places who look to America as a guardian of freedom and peace, what Abraham Lincoln called the last, best hope of Earth.

None of us relish the prospect of war, especially in an age in which our weapons have a power almost too terrible to contemplate. In particular, neither I nor any of my colleagues seek a war with Iran; as I stated before, the Iranian people are not our enemies. They are our friends. No people have paid a higher price for the regime's record of terrorism, mass murder, corruption, and duplicity than the Iranians. The prospect of inflicting collateral damage on our long-suffering friends further counsels against any course of action that leads to war.

It is not a cavalier attitude about war that leads me to oppose this deal; it is my unwavering judgment that this deal makes war much more likely that leads me to oppose it.

Let there be no doubt. A deal that paves rather than precludes Iran's path to a nuclear weapons capability makes war more likely. A deal that makes the Iranian regime more confident of its ability to protect its nuclear program from international pressure and military action makes war more likely. A deal that funnels tens of billions of dollars to terrorists bent on destabilizing the Middle East makes war more likely. A deal that provokes a nuclear arms race in the most volatile region on the globe makes war more likely. A deal that surrounds Israel not only with a nuclear Iran but also eventually with numerous other regimes with nuclear weapons capability and a genocidal attitude toward the Jewish State makes war more likely. And a deal that puts the Iranian regime and its terrorist allies one turn of a screwdriver away from a nuclear weapon and a means of delivering it anywhere across the world makes war more likely.

War may come, but it is not inevitable. As Members of "the world's greatest deliberative body," it is our duty to discern the wisest course of action that preserves the security of the United States and our allies—that reduces the risk of war but does not let

the strong desire for peace we all share cloud our judgment about how we best preserve that peace.

In this solemn debate, it is my hope that the voice of reason will have the power to change minds and overcome the pressures of our politics that have the power to lead us astray. I am encouraged in my hope by the fact that almost every Member to come out in support of this deal has noted its significant flaws. The opposition to it has been unambiguous, strong, and bipartisan, and it constitutes a strong majority in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. I want to pay tribute to four of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have bucked significant political pressure to vote their consciences against this bad deal.

We still have a chance to change course. All that is required is the bravery and good judgment to lead our Nation and the world to an agreement that can actually preserve the long-term peace. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in opposing this disastrous deal and in supporting a better way forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, first, I thank our honored President pro tempore for his outstanding comments.

But while my distinguished friend from Illinois is on the floor, I thought I would walk through a unanimous consent request, if that is OK. I think it has been cleared with him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be further divided as follows: from 10 a.m. to 11 a.m. would be Republican time, from 11 a.m. to 12 p.m. would be Democratic time, from 12 p.m. to 1 p.m. would be Republican time, from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. would be Democratic time, from 2 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. would be Republican time, from 2:30 p.m. to 3 p.m. would be Democratic time, from 3 p.m. to 3:45 p.m. it be equally divided between the leaders or their designees, and that Senator MENENDEZ be given 15 minutes of the Republican time and 15 minutes of the Democrat time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. If I might ask the Senator from Tennessee to clarify, would the last part of his request relate to the period between 3 p.m. and 3:45 p.m.?

Mr. CORKER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. Thank you.

Mr. President, so our side knows what will occur between now and the end of our time, the next 15 minutes will be for Senator GRAHAM, then 10 minutes to Senator BARRASSO, and then 10 minutes to Senator FLAKE.

With that, I yield the floor to one of the best national security voices in the United States of America, Senator GRAHAM of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I just want to make sure people understand what we are trying to do here this morning. Our Democratic colleagues are filibustering an attempt to have a debate and an up-or-down vote on the most consequential foreign policy decision in modern history. That is what you are doing.

Senator CORKER, in good faith, got us here in a bipartisan manner. And Senator REID has come out of nowhere to change what was the common understanding of how we would proceed—get 60 votes, a simple majority, and let the President act as he wishes.

But, no, we couldn't do that. They are more worried about protecting Barack Obama from having to veto this than they are about having a debate on the floor of the Senate.

Now, let me tell you a little about who you are dealing with here, folks. If I hear one more comment from my Democratic friends about how much they love Israel—with friends like this, you don't need an enemy. This is who you are dealing with. This was yesterday:

Iran's supreme leader predicted Wednesday that Israel would not exist in 25 years, and ruled out any new negotiations with the "Satan," the United States, beyond the recently completed nuclear accord.

In remarks published Wednesday on his personal website—

At least the Ayatollah has gotten into modern times—

and in posts on Twitter, the supreme leader—

Do you know why they call him the Supreme Leader? Because he is—

Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, responded to what he said were claims that Israel would be safe for that period. . . .

Where did those claims come from? It came from this administration, my colleagues on the other side. You are telling the world that this is the best deal for Israel. Guess what. Nobody in Israel who is in the current government agrees with you. It is just not Bibi. Everybody who is in the current coalition government understands this is not a good deal for Israel.

Why don't you listen to them? You want it to be a good deal for Israel. Well, it is not, and your wanting it doesn't change it.

So let's finish what he said.

[The Ayatollah] responded to what he said were claims that Israel would be safe for that period under the nuclear agreement reached in July.

"After nuclear negotiations, the Zionist regime said that they will not be worried about Iran in the next 25 years."

I repeat.

"After nuclear negotiations, the Zionist regime said that they will not be worried about Iran in the next 25 years."

Israel didn't say that. People over here said that.

The Ayatollah wrote:

"I am telling you, first, you will not be around in 25 years' time, and God willing, there will be no Zionist regime in 25 years. Second, during this period, the spirit of

fighting, heroism and jihad will keep you worried every moment.”

Clearly, somebody who is on the course of change, somebody we should give \$100 billion to, create a pathway to a nuclear bomb in 15 years and let him buy more weapons in 5 years and build an intercontinental ballistic missile in 8 years—clearly, this is the man who has changed course and you have empowered him.

At least—at least—Chamberlain can say Hitler lied. At least Chamberlain can say: I negotiated with the Fuhrer. He told me to my face: If you give me this, I am done.

Well, we all know Chamberlain was a chump, and Hitler actually meant what he said when he wrote a book.

The question is, Does this man mean what he says when he tweets yesterday that the ink is not dry on the deal?

The one thing you can say about the old Ayatollah—who is crazy, who is a religious Nazi—is that at least he is honest. He doesn't want you to be confused as you vote as to what he wants to do to your friend Israel. See, he doesn't want you to misstate what this deal means to him. You obviously are writing him off. You obviously believe he doesn't mean it.

I guess he has a polling problem in Iran. He has to get his numbers up. He needs to say these things—because he doesn't mean it. But he has to keep his people happy because they like hearing this stuff. All I can tell you is his people tried to rise up against him in 2009, and our President sat on the sidelines and didn't do a damn thing. The biggest moment for change in Iran came in 2009, when young people and women took to the streets demanding a fair election that was stolen from them by the Ayatollah, and his response was to beat them, shoot them, put them in jail and torture them. This is the guy you are going to give \$100 billion to, a clear pathway to a bomb. He doesn't even have to cheat to get there and buy more weapons to attack us.

At least Chamberlain lied. This man is telling you what he is going to do as of yesterday, and between these times that negotiations have started until now, has he shown us a little leg about what will change? During the negotiations he has toppled four Arab capitals. During the negotiations he has supported the Houthis in Yemen, who destroyed a pro-American government, and we have lost eyes and ears on Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula—a Sunni extremist group that attacked Paris and will attack us.

During the negotiations they have done anything but be moderate. I cannot believe that you don't believe him. I cannot believe you made the biggest miscalculation in modern history by empowering a religious fanatic with the ability to attack our Nation, destroy our friends in Israel, and keep the Mideast on fire for 15 years. What are you all thinking over there?

All I can say is that on the last 9/11, 3,000 of us died because they couldn't

get weapons to kill 3 million of us. If you let this deal go forward, before too long the most radical regime on the planet will have the most lethal weapons available to mankind. They will share that technology with terrorists and they will come here. Why do they need an ICBM, folks? What are they going to do with it? They are not going to send people to space. What are you thinking? What are you all thinking over there? You are taking the most radical regime on the planet, a theocracy—this is not a democracy. The moderates were shot down in the streets. They were begging: Are you with us or are you with him, President Obama?

President Obama is absolutely the poorest champion of freedom and the weakest opponent of evil in history. Evil is flourishing on his watch. President Obama said you would have to be crazy not to support this deal. Let's walk through whether we should follow his advice about radical Islam.

This is the President who was told to leave troops in Iraq to make sure our gains would be maintained, and he pulled everybody out because he wanted to get to zero. He turned down every commander's advice to get to zero because he made a campaign promise. This is the President who was told by his entire national security team 3 years ago to establish a no-fly zone and help the Free Syrian Army because Assad was on the ropes, at a time when it would have mattered, when there was a Free Syrian Army to help and Assad was about to fall. Obama said: No thanks. This is the President who drew a redline against Assad, after he backed off, and said: If you use chemical weapons and you cross that redline, there will be a price.

Here are the facts. Assad is going to be in power and Obama is going to be gone. The last man standing is going to be Assad. So all I can tell you is this is the man who said: Don't worry about ISIL. They are the JV team. I killed bin Laden; Al Qaeda is decimated.

At what point in time do you realize President Obama has no idea what he is talking about? At what point in time is it obvious to anybody in the world who is paying attention that when it comes to radical Islam he has no clue?

So this is the guy we are going to send in to negotiate with a radical ayatollah—a guy who, in the eyes of the world, is a complete weak defender of freedom and a very poor adversary of evil. If that is not enough, the Iranians are rubbing this in John Kerry and Barack Obama's face by tweeting this out hours before you vote on this deal.

Just to remind you that no matter what you say on this floor about Israel, nothing has changed in his mind about Israel. When you claim Israel is safe, he is telling you: No, they are not. But you are not listening because you don't think he really means it. Well, I can tell you right now, you better be right. How about this idea. When it comes to the Ayatollah, assume the worst, not the best.

To our friends in Russia, John Kerry said one of the big benefits of this deal is that we will bring Russia in and Iran will be a better partner in the Mideast, and we will have a major breakthrough where Iran begins to help us with problems like Syria. Well, here is Russia's response, before you vote. They are sending Russian troops—maybe fighter planes—into Syria to prop up Assad before you vote. They are taking everything John Kerry said about what would happen if you do this deal and rubbing it in his face.

Tell me how you fix Syria with Assad in power? What the Russians are doing is ensuring he will stay in power longer, and the longer he stays in power, the more refugees the world will have to deal with and the more Hell on Earth will occur in Syria.

The Syrian people want two things; they want to destroy ISIL and they want Assad gone because he has destroyed their families. So Secretary Kerry, how well is this working, with this new engagement of Iran and Russia. Things are really changing. Look at the tweet yesterday. What are you going to tell the American people this means? Interpret the Ayatollah for me. This is just all talk? He has to say these things? He doesn't get elected. He doesn't have to worry about the next election. He says these things because he believes them. He is a religious fanatic, compelled by his version of Islam to destroy everything in his religion that he doesn't agree with—to destroy the one and only Jewish State and attack democracies such as ours, and you are giving him more to do that with. This is, over time, a death sentence for Israel, if it is not changed.

If I had \$100 billion to negotiate with, for God's sake, could I get four people out of jail? I could get people out of jail here with \$100 billion. Who is negotiating with Iran? This idea we are going to separate all of their bad behavior from their nuclear program was the biggest miscalculation in modern foreign policy history.

To suggest we don't need to look at Iran as a whole unit; that we are going to ignore the fact that they have four hostages, U.S. personnel held in sham trials, a Washington Post reporter; that they are the largest State sponsor of terrorism; that they destabilize the region; that they have driven our friends out of Yemen; that they are supporting Hezbollah, a mortal enemy of Israel; and that they have taken over the Lebanese Government—we are not going to worry about all that? What do you think they are going to do with the \$100 billion? Do you really think they are going to build roads and bridges?

The best indication of the next 15 years is the last 35. When you separated their nuclear ambitions from their destructive behavior, giving them access to more weapons and \$100 billion, you made a huge mistake because you are damning the Mideast to holy hell for the next 15 years, and you are

giving the largest state sponsor of terrorism more money and more weapons to attack us—and you couldn't get four people out of jail.

The only reason they are not dancing in Iran is the Ayatollah just doesn't believe in dancing. I have friends over there whom I respect and admire. I have no idea what you are thinking. I have no idea why you believe the Ayatollah doesn't mean what he says, given the way he has behaved. If they would shoot their own children down in the streets to keep power, what do you think they will do to ours? And the only reason 3,000 people died on 9/11 is because they couldn't get the weapons to kill 3 million of us, and they are on course to do it now.

I have never been more disappointed in the body than I am today, a body known to be the most deliberative body in democracy in the history of the world. Yet you will not let us have a vote. You will not let us have a debate.

Please stop saying this deal makes Israel safer. That is cruel. Your response to this deal is to give them more weapons because you know they are not safer. I find it a bit odd that in response to this deal we are selling the Arabs every kind of weapon known to man and we are promising Israel every kind of weapon we have. If you truly thought this was such a good deal, why do you have to arm everybody who is in the crosshairs of the Ayatollah?

When they write the history of these times, they are going to look back and say that President Obama was a weak opponent of evil and a poor champion of freedom. They are going to look and say that the United States Senate refused to debate the most consequential foreign policy agreement in modern times, and the people in Israel are going to wonder where did America go.

Has it ever crossed your mind that everybody in Israel who is in power, who is running the government today, objects to this agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Senator CORKER, thank you for trying to have the debate we need. To my Democratic friends: You own this. You own every "i" and every "t" and every bullet, and you own everything that is to follow and it is going to be holy hell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I am so proud of my colleague from South Carolina for the remarkable speech he just gave to this Senate about his concerns about this President's deal with Iran—the President's nuclear deal with Iran. That is what the Senate is debating right now—a deal President Obama negotiated with Iran and whether that deal should stand or fall.

This agreement could affect American foreign policy in the Middle East and beyond for this generation as well as the next. It will affect America's relationship with our allies as well as with our enemies. Other countries are

wondering whether America will accept a flawed agreement that gives Iran almost everything it has asked for or will we, as the United States of America, stand strong against outlaw nations with nuclear ambitions and dreams.

As Senators prepare to vote on this legislation we should ask: Does this agreement do enough to stop Iran's nuclear weapons program? Does this agreement do enough to protect the security of the American people and our friends around the world? I believe the answer is no. It would be irresponsible to support such a weak, such a naive, and such a dangerous deal.

The original goal of ending Iran's nuclear weapons program was a good one, and I wish the President had actually stuck with that goal. I wish the President had done a better job of negotiating with the Iranians. He did not. During the negotiations this administration was far too willing to make concessions, concessions that put our own national security at risk.

We were in a very strong position during these negotiations from the start, and the Obama administration squandered the advantage. The President badly wanted to strike a deal with Iran, and that is the problem because President Obama has shown once again that if you want a deal badly enough, you will end up with a bad deal. The President fell in love with this deal, even though it is deeply flawed. And deeply flawed is a description our Democratic colleagues continue to make about this deal. The President cannot see the flaws that our colleagues on the Senate floor can see because I believe the President is blinded by deal euphoria. He is in love with the deal.

The agreement President Obama has negotiated will legitimize Iran's nuclear program. It will accept Iran as a nuclear threshold state. To me, this is inexcusable. It is not the deal the President should have signed. It is not the deal the President could have signed. It is not the deal President Obama promised he would sign.

President Obama once said that Iran didn't need advanced centrifuges in order to have a limited, peaceful nuclear program, but under this agreement his administration did negotiate that Iran will not eliminate a single centrifuge. It will continue to research more advanced centrifuges, and it can even start building them.

So how did it happen? How did this happen? On the day the agreement was announced, the President of Iran bragged—bragged—about how he had gotten the Obama administration to surrender on this point. "To surrender," that is the language I am hearing around the State of Wyoming and certainly the language we are hearing from Iran: The President surrendered.

At the beginning, the President said Iran would only need 100 centrifuges. Then the number went to 1,000, then

4,000, then eventually allowed more than 6,000. When it mattered most, the Obama administration wanted a deal so badly that it was willing to concede on point after point after point. This proves if you want a deal bad enough, you will get a bad deal—and that is what we have here today.

The same thing happened with ballistic missiles. GEN Martin Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States military, told the Senate Armed Services Committee, "Under no circumstances should we relieve pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capabilities and arms trafficking." Under no circumstances.

Defense Secretary Ash Carter also testified at the same hearing. Now, this hearing, of course, was only 6 days before the final deal was announced by the President. Secretary of Defense said, "We want them to continue to be isolated as a military and limited in terms of the kinds of equipment and materials they are able to get." That was 6 days before the final deal was announced.

So what happened? What did the President of the United States surrender on? With this agreement, Iran will have access to ballistic missile technology in as little as 8 years, even though the Secretary of Defense said no; even though the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said, "Under no circumstances." That is when Russia and other countries are going to be able to start selling this deadly technology to Iran—and I believe that Iran will use it.

Now, this was a last-minute demand that Iran made, and it should have been easy for President Obama to reject it, but he did not. He surrendered. The President was so desperate to get a deal that he gave in once again. It is always the same story with the Obama administration: If you want a deal bad enough, you are going to get a bad deal—and they have. When the Obama administration is negotiating with countries that need a deal much more than we do, the President of the United States surrenders.

This administration has no red lines when it comes to negotiating. They will give away anything to get a deal. There have been too many concessions for anyone to be comfortable with this agreement. There are too many red flags. President Obama cannot see the defects that are obvious in this plan. He refuses to see what is so clear to the American people.

After this agreement, Iran will be a nuclear threshold state, and a military and an industrial power. It will have the money to support terrorists around the world—more money than it has had in the past. It will have the freedom to pursue its nuclear ambitions.

Even some Democrats who have said they support this deal are doing so with great reservations. They say they know it is not a good deal, but they say: It is the only option we have. Well,

that is not a good enough reason for me to accept all of the risks and all of the concessions that the Obama administration allowed in this agreement.

The President says: The choice is the Iran nuclear deal or war. He has said it time and time again. It is fear mongering. It is not true. There is an alternative. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said so.

General Dempsey was asked about that at a hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee. In answer to the question: Is it this or war, the general said, "I can tell you that we have a range of options, and I always present them"—present them to the President. "We have a range of options." It is not just a choice between this deal or war. It is a choice between accepting a bad deal or rejecting it. If the only choice is to take this deal or leave it, then we must leave it.

The Obama administration doesn't want us to have a vote here in the Senate. The Obama administration knows it signed a bad deal, and it wants the whole thing to disappear from the front pages before it causes them any more embarrassment.

So instead of having a full and honest debate on the floor of the Senate, the President and the Senate Democrat leader are trying to hide behind a filibuster. That is not how the Senate should handle this important resolution to disapprove the Iran deal. Every Member of the Senate should be willing to cast a vote up or down on this Iran deal. We should stand up, we should represent the people of our State and this Nation, and we should cast our votes.

The Obama administration has made its arguments, and it has failed to make its case. The President has not shown that America will be better off with this deal, and I believe we would be better off without it.

We have heard the administration's excuses. We have heard all of the ways the final deal fell short of their promises. America can't afford to let Iran have the nuclear program that this agreement will allow it to obtain. We should vote to disapprove the Iran deal. The President should drop his veto threat. The President should send his people back to the negotiating table because this deal poses too great a threat to America's national security for us to do anything else.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, as we continue the debate on one of the most important foreign policy matters this body has addressed in some time, I would be remiss if I didn't mention how honored I am to be a part of it.

It is not unusual for the Congress to engage in debate over matters like spending bills, bills to authorize various Federal agencies, executive branch and judicial nominations, or other business that we routinely attend to around here. But it is only on

occasion that this body gets to have the opportunity to weigh in on some of the more pressing foreign policy matters. When it does, the legislation it considers often has lasting consequences for the United States and for the rest of the world.

Take, for example, the Taiwan Relations Act. Passed by both chambers in 1979 in response to the normalization of relations between the United States and China, this piece of legislation remains the cornerstone of the U.S.-Taiwan relationship to this day.

Likewise, this body has considered a number of arms limitation treaties over the decades between the United States and Russia. The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, or START, was approved by this body in 1992 by a vote of 93 to 6. START II was approved in 1996 by a vote of 87 to 4. Most recently, the New START treaty with Russia was approved in 2010 by a vote of 71 to 26.

These bills address subject matter that was highly controversial. I am sure there was a fair amount of disagreement between Democrats and Republicans, and between the Congress and the White House. But in instances likely too numerous to count, Senate deliberation ended with a bipartisan vote that set the U.S. foreign policy into place for years, even decades, and signaled that America was speaking to the rest of the world with one voice.

I deeply regret the JCPOA will not build on this history. Unfortunately, the administration elected to negotiate this deal as an executive agreement rather than a treaty. That was the administration's call. It does mean, however, that the administration did not need to negotiate the JCPOA, mindful that it would need the support of 67 Senators. It also means the Senate does not have the opportunity to offer so-called RUDs—reservations, understandings, and declarations—that can accompany treaties and clarify its interpretation of the agreement.

To be sure, there are several troubling aspects of this agreement that could have been improved if the Senate had the opportunity to consider the JCPOA as a treaty. For example, the text of the agreement clearly states that any reimposition of the sanctions specified in Annex II would be viewed by Iran as a violation of the agreement and would likely prompt Iran to cease abiding by its obligations under the agreement. The sanctions in Annex II include all the influential sanctions, such as those on Iran's Central Bank. These have had a profound effect on Iran's economy.

In hearings and briefings by the administration, I have asked whether the United States could reimpose these powerful sanctions at some point later down the line for other, nonnuclear-related behavior by the Iranian government to penalize Iran for regional activities or for committing acts of terrorism. This regime, as we know, has made achieving regional hegemony its calling card since its inception in 1979.

Now, this administration has assured me that these sanctions would be available in the future, but, unfortunately, that simply does not square with the text of the agreement.

The question of reimposition of sanctions raises a further question of how this agreement might bind the hands of future Congresses and future administrations. As I previously mentioned, though the JCPOA has already been adopted by the United Nations, it will never be the supreme law of the land in the United States because it is not a treaty. A treaty that has been agreed to by at least 67 Senators gives the treaty the critical imprimatur that insulates it from political winds for the lifespan of the treaty. The JCPOA will benefit from no such imprimatur.

What if, for example, a future Congress or President wishes to reimpose sanctions against Iran or take some other action that might legitimately cause Iran to accuse us of violating the JCPOA? A future Congress or President could be put in the position of either having to preserve an agreement that neither had a hand in negotiating nor taking action that would result in Iran walking away from its nuclear obligations. It would be beneficial for U.S. foreign policy to steer clear of those lose-lose propositions.

The current administration has already expressed reluctance to push back against Iran's interpretation of the agreement even before it has been implemented. I have serious concerns that if there is reluctance to push back on Iran now, there will be even more reluctance to push back on Iran's regional behavior once the deal is in place. This gives Iran more leverage than it currently has moving forward, and that could have disastrous consequences on the Middle East. These are issues that could have been addressed in a positive manner by the Senate if the agreement had been submitted as a treaty.

Now, when this agreement was announced, I said I would take every opportunity to learn more about it, so I attended every hearing held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I commend Chairman CORKER and Ranking Member CARDIN for holding these hearings and going about this in such a deliberative and serious manner. I attended every classified congressional briefing and several other briefings, and had discussions with numerous experts and administration officials.

After these discussions, these hearings, these briefings, I believe it is a much closer call on this agreement than most want to admit. There are positive aspects on the nuclear side. Unfortunately, I think this deal suffers from significant shortcomings.

Hoping that Iran's nuclear ambitions might change after a 15-year sabbatical might be a bet worth making. Believing that Iran's regional behavior will change tomorrow while giving up tools to deter or modify such behavior is not a bet worth taking.

It is for these reasons that I reluctantly oppose the JCPOA.

I do hope that we can make up for this unfortunately partisan vote by working together, and with the President, to pass a regional security framework agreement that will not only reassure Israel and our allies in the region, but solidify this agreement throughout the duration of the JCPOA.

The United States is strongest when we speak with one voice on foreign policy matters.

BORDER JOBS FOR VETERANS ACT

Mr. President, yesterday, we were able to pass on a bipartisan basis—in fact, unanimously—a bipartisan bill to help put veterans back to work as Customs and Border Protection officers at understaffed U.S. ports of entry.

Earlier this week, Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson confirmed that the agency has not yet filled 1,200 of the 2,000 new CBP officer positions created by Congress in 2014 to improve security and reduce trade-stifling commercial traffic in ports. Secretary Johnson has attributed these shortfalls to delays associated with applicant background investigations. So we were able to pass legislation to force the Department of Defense and Department of Homeland Security to work together with this legislation. Now they will do so, and hopefully it will improve the condition of trade and the backlogs we have on the border.

I applaud my colleagues for making this happen—cosponsors JOHN MCCAIN, CHUCK SCHUMER, RICHARD BURR, TAMMY BALDWIN, RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, and others. Thank you for passing this legislation. It will improve the situation on the Arizona-Mexico border.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I know the time has ended. I know that Senator DAINES wants to speak very briefly. Senator DURBIN is allowing that as long as we give back some time at a later moment. If we might have 3 minutes.

Mr. DAINES. I wish to thank the Senator. I appreciate that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, if Iran's ultimate goal is to obtain a nuclear weapon, the deal reached by the Obama administration sets Iran on course to do so. From the time this deal is agreed to, Iran has 10 years to fill their coffers with tens of billions of dollars from newly unsanctioned oil sales and pursue the research and development of nuclear capabilities. As the world's leader of state-sponsored terrorism, it will only be a matter of time before Iran achieves its ultimate goal, and that is obtaining a nuclear weapon. These are bipartisan concerns.

This deal will not prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, and the American people deserve a better deal. This deal is stacked against transparency and accountability. It provides up to a 24-day delay before Iran is

forced to comply with inspections of nuclear sites on their military bases. This is a long way from “anywhere, anytime” the American people were promised. Can you imagine if the EPA or the FDA came knocking on a Montana farmer or business owner's door, and they said: Well, you can't come and inspect right now, but come back in 24 days. That is what we have set up right now with the Iranian Government through this deal.

Through this deal, the American people are being asked to enter into a binding trust agreement with the world's leading state sponsor of terror. In fact, just yesterday I looked at my Twitter feed, and the Supreme Leader of Iran—he is called the Supreme Leader for a reason—Ayatollah Ali Khamenei said: “I say that you [Israelis] will not see the coming 25 years and, God willing, there will not be something named the Zionist regime in [the] next 25 years.” And then he went on to reiterate in calling America the Great Satan. This is whom the United States is making this bad nuclear deal with. It is not a mistake to push for tougher sanctions.

The American people deserve a better option. Two nights ago, I had a tele-townhall meeting, calling into 100,000 Montana households. Overwhelmingly, by 3 to 1, Montanans opposed this deal.

As we close, let me say this: As I step back and look at the numbers today, if we look at the Senate, it looks as if about 69 Senators are opposed to this deal. There are 42 supporting it. Those 58 who oppose it are bipartisan. The House numbers are similar in ratios.

The point is this: There is bipartisan opposition to this deal, both Democrats and Republicans joining together. The only support is partisan. It is a mistake to not push for a better deal that can be supported by more than one segment of one political party.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, so that those who are following this debate understand where we are, this morning the Democratic leader, Senator HARRY REID of Nevada, for the second time offered to the Republican side the following: that we will bring this critically important, historic measure before the U.S. Senate for an up-or-down vote—a clean up-or-down vote—at a margin of 60 votes.

Sixty votes is the margin that is used for every major and, I might add, controversial measure before the Senate. So what we are asking is not out of line. In fact, the Republican side had supported the notion of a 60-vote margin until they didn't have 60 votes. Now they are calling for some other approach.

So here is what we face. This afternoon at about 3:45 p.m., we will have a rollcall vote. It will be on the procedural question of whether we end debate on one aspect of this issue. It is known as a cloture vote. We will see

how it turns out. But we have made a good-faith offer twice to the Republicans to finish this important debate and to bring this to a 60-vote close.

Every single Member of the Senate on both sides of the aisle has announced publicly in advance where they stand on the issue. No one is trying to avoid this tough vote, and it is a challenging vote. Everyone has faced it squarely and honestly, and that is where we should go. Senator MCCONNELL, on the Republican side, objected to this. We will face a procedural vote at 3:45 p.m.

What is troubling is that we are in disarray now in the Congress. This statute that brings us to the floor of the U.S. Senate, the resolution of disapproval on the Iran agreement, passed the Senate with a vote of 98 to 1—a strong bipartisan agreement that this is how we would approach it. This is what Senator MCCONNELL is working off of, the basic statute that brings us together. But look what is happening across the Rotunda. Yesterday the House of Representatives disassembled. When they were supposed to move forward procedurally to the same vote we are facing, they fell apart. There was a Republican caucus, and it was in disarray. Now they are proposing not the underlying statute which we are considering but three brandnew, different approaches to this. This is no way to run a Congress. It is no way to address a serious foreign policy issue, one of the more serious issues of our time.

My colleagues are here to speak. I am going to yield the floor to them. I have spoken from time to time, but I will say this: Understand what we are trying to achieve here. We are not putting a seal of approval on Iran and their conduct and their activity. That will never happen. Instead, what we are saying is we have one goal in mind, shared by many nations around the world: to stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. That is the goal. I believe this agreement comes as close to achieving that as we can hope for at this moment.

I wish it were stronger and better, but in the course of negotiation, we don't always get everything we want. But think of what happened here. We met in Switzerland at the table with five other nations—China, Russia, the United Kingdom, Germany, and France. The European Union, I might add, joined the United States in this effort to negotiate this agreement and walked away. All nations involved in the negotiations said this is a good agreement and should move forward. In addition to that, we have had support from the Security Council of the United Nations. Over 100 countries have endorsed this.

Yet it has been categorically rejected by the Republicans in both the House and the Senate. The first evidence of their rejection was March 9 of this year while the negotiations were underway. Forty-seven Republican Senators sent a letter to the Supreme Leader in Iran,

the Ayatollah, saying to him basically: Don't waste your time negotiating with the United States of America. That has never happened in the history of the United States—never. I asked the historians to check it. Never have we had Members of Congress sending a letter in the midst of negotiations telling the other side: Don't pay attention to our President; don't pay any attention to our Nation. It never happened before. So 47 of them made it clear even before the agreement was reached that they were rejecting it. That doesn't show good faith. That doesn't show an effort to try to be objective and honest about this.

Here we stand today with the first procedural vote this afternoon. There are two things we want to achieve with this vote and with this agreement: No. 1, stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. We do that by shutting down their production facilities, by closing down their centrifuges, and by sending in scores of international inspectors, who will be roaming through Iran during the entire pendency of this agreement, looking for violations that could trigger the sanctions being returned. No. 2, our goal is to bring peace and stability as best we can when it comes to the nuclear issue in the Middle East, particularly in support of our friend and ally, the nation of Israel. I think the President's good-faith effort here reaches that goal.

I support this, and I will be voting on the procedural side this afternoon to support the President's Iran agreement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, my dear friend and colleague and I disagree, but I very much respect the way he has conducted himself throughout this entire debate.

Every several years or so, a legislator is called upon to cast a momentous vote in which the stakes are high, and both sides of the issue feel very strongly about their views. Such is the case with the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran. It demands reasoned and serious debate.

Over the years, I have learned that the best way to treat big decisions is to study the issue carefully, hear the full explanation of those for and against, and then, without regard to pressure, politics, or party, make a decision based on the merits. That is what I did with the Iran deal. I carefully studied the JCPOA, read and reread the agreement and its annexes, questioned dozens of proponents and opponents, and sought answers to questions that went beyond the text of the agreement. After deep study and considerable soul-searching, I announced that I would oppose the agreement and vote yes on the motion of disapproval.

While we have come to different conclusions, I want to give tremendous credit to President Obama for his work on this issue. The President, Secretary

Kerry, and their team spent painstaking months and years pushing Iran to come to an agreement and, years before, assembling the international sanctions regime that brought Iran to the table in the first place. It was the President's farsightedness that led our Nation to accelerate development of the Massive Ordnance Penetrator, the MOP, the best military deterrent and antidote to a nuclear Iran. Regardless of how one feels about the agreement, all fairminded Americans should acknowledge the President's strong achievements in combating and containing Iran.

I also have a great deal of respect for the careful thought and deliberation my colleagues went through before making their final decisions. While I came to a different conclusion than many in my own caucus, I recognize for them that this is a vote of conscience, just as it is for me.

I wish to recount my reasoning here on the floor before a vote is taken. I examined this deal in three parts: nuclear restrictions on Iran in the first 10 years, nuclear restrictions on Iran after 10 years, and nonnuclear components and consequences of a deal. In each case, I didn't ask what is the ideal agreement. We are not in that world. I asked, are we better off with the agreement that we have before us or without it?

In the first 10 years of the deal, there are serious weaknesses in the agreement. First, inspections are not "anywhere, anytime." The potential delay of as many as 24 days before we can inspect undeclared, suspicious sites is troubling. It is true that declared sites will be monitored. That is one of the positives of this deal. But if Iran is going to cheat, it will not be at a declared site with the eyes of the world watching, it will be at a nondesignated site. If Iran is trying to cheat, it will certainly delay the inspection process as long as possible.

Even more troubling is the fact that the United States cannot demand inspections unilaterally. We require a majority of the eight-member joint commission. Assuming that China, Russia, and Iran will not cooperate, inspections would require the votes of all three European members of the P5+1 as well as the EU representative. It is a reasonable fear that once the Europeans become entangled in lucrative economic relations with Iran, they may not want to rock the boat by voting to allow inspections.

Additionally, the snapback provisions in the agreement seem cumbersome and difficult to use. While the United States could unilaterally cause snapback of all sanctions, there will be instances where it is more appropriate to snap back some but not all of the sanctions. A partial snapback of multilateral sanctions could be difficult to obtain because the United States would require the cooperation of other nations.

If the U.S. insists on snapback of all provisions, which it can do unilaterally,

the Europeans, Russians or Chinese might feel it is too severe a punishment and might not comply.

Those who argue for the agreement say it is better to have an imperfect deal than nothing. When you consider only this portion of the deal, it is indeed better to have inspections and sanctions snapback than nothing, but even for this part of the agreement, the weaknesses with both of those processes make this argument less compelling.

Second, we must evaluate how this deal would restrict Iran's nuclear development after 10 years. In my view, if Iran's true intent is to get a nuclear weapon, under this agreement it simply must exercise patience. After 10 years, it can be very close to achieving that goal. Iran would be stronger financially, better able to advance a robust nuclear program. Unlike its current unsanctioned pursuit of a nuclear weapon, Iran's nuclear program would be codified in an agreement signed by the United States and other nations.

Finally, we must consider the non-nuclear elements of the agreement. This aspect of the deal gives me the most pause. For years Iran has used military force and terrorism to expand its influence in the Middle East by actively supporting military or terrorist actions in Israel, Syria, Lebanon, Yemen, Iraq, and Gaza.

Under this agreement, Iran would receive at least \$50 billion in the future and would undoubtedly use some of that money to create even more trouble in the Middle East and perhaps beyond. The hardliners could use these funds to pursue an ICBM as soon as sanctions are lifted and then augment their ICBM capabilities in 8 years after the ban on importing ballistic weaponry is lifted. Restrictions should have been put in place limiting how Iran could use its new resources.

Using the proponents' overall standard, not whether the agreement is ideal or whether it is better to have it or not have it, it seems to me, when it comes to the nuclear aspects of the agreement, within 10 years we might be slightly better off with it. However, when it comes to nuclear aspects after 10 years and nonnuclear aspects, we would be better off without it.

Ultimately, in my view, whether one opposes or supports the resolution of disapproval depends on how one thinks Iran will behave under this agreement—whether contact with the West and a decrease in economic and political isolation will soften Iran's hardline positions or whether the current autocratic regime views this deal as a way to get relief from onerous sanctions while still retaining their designs on nuclear arms and regional hegemony.

No one has a crystal ball. No one can tell with certainty which way Iran will go. It is true, Iran has a large number of people who want their government to decrease its isolation from the world and focus on economic advancement at

home, but this desire has been evident for 35 years. Yet Iranian leaders have held a tight and undiminished grip on Iran with little threat.

Who is to say that this same dictatorship will not prevail for another 10, 20 or 30 years? To me, the very real risk that Iran will not moderate and will instead use the agreement to pursue its nefarious goals is too great; therefore, I will vote to disapprove the agreement, not because I believe war is a viable or desirable option, nor to challenge the path of diplomacy, it is because it is far too likely that Iran will not change, and under this agreement it will be able to achieve its dual goals of eliminating sanctions while ultimately retaining nuclear and non-nuclear power. It is better to keep U.S. sanctions in place, strengthen them, enforce the secondary sanctions on other nations, and pursue the hard, trident path of diplomacy once more, difficult as it may be.

For all of these reasons, I believe the vote to disapprove is the right one.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I thank the Democratic whip for yielding time to me and for his extraordinary leadership on this issue and tell him how proud I am of him and my other colleagues, no matter where we come down on this issue.

I have a little bit of a different approach to the serious matter that is before us. During the first week or two of the August recess, I did something that I suspect none of my colleagues did; I actually read the Iran deal and a lot of the materials that relate to the agreement. After putting it down, my mind wandered back to another time and place where there was an intense effort to end years of hostility and mistrust in the Middle East.

As Governor of Delaware and chairman of the National Governors Association, I led a trade delegation in 1999 of business leaders, government officials, and citizens mostly from Delaware, many of them Jewish, and we went to Israel in the summer of 1999. We went looking to strengthen economic and cultural relations between Delaware and Israel.

Briefed by U.S. Department of State officials before departing on our mission, I also went looking for an opportunity to encourage Israeli and Palestinian leaders to seize the day and change the leadership in Israel in order to try and negotiate the two-state solution that always seemed just out of reach.

Those opportunities came sooner than I ever expected. Shortly after we landed there, we were whisked off in Israel to a sprawling outdoor Fourth of July celebration that was hosted by the U.S. Ambassador to Israel. Among the guests there that day were former

General Ehud Barak, who was about to become Prime Minister of the country, and Bibi Netanyahu, the man he defeated. The other guests included the widow and daughter of the late Yitzhak Rabin, Labor Party leader Shimon Peres, former Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, General Ariel Sharon, and a remarkable assemblage of who's who in Israel.

I spoke briefly that day with Ehud Barak and at length with him several days in his office after he had officially assumed his new duties as Prime Minister. The second conversation focused on the negotiations which lay ahead with Yasser Arafat, shepherded by the Clinton administration, to try to reach a land-for-peace deal once and for all with the Palestinians.

Ironically, a few days later, our delegation was invited to Ramallah to join Arafat and members of his leadership team for an extended lunch. Over that meal, I sat with Arafat and I shared with him the new Prime Minister's earnest desire to complete the work begun by former Prime Minister Rabin before his assassination. I urged Arafat to set aside generations of conflict and distrust in an effort to find common ground with the Israelis that would ultimately provide greater security for Israel and better relations with its neighbors in return for Palestinian statehood. The conversation seemed to go well. A few days later back in the States, I shared as much with the Clinton administration.

The negotiations that ensued over the course of the next year ultimately presented Arafat with the best land-for-peace proposal the Palestinians would ever receive. In the end, they turned it down. Dennis Ross, who played a key role in the negotiations for the administration, would later tell me that "Arafat simply could not take yes for an answer."

Sixteen years have passed since then. Another transformative opportunity has presented itself, and this time to America and to our five negotiating partners—the British, the French, the Germans, the Russians, and the Chinese as well as the people of Iran. We have a chance to ensure that the Iranian hopes of developing a nuclear weapon are put on the shelf for years—maybe forever.

The Iranians have a chance to bring to an end the crippling economic sanctions that the coalition we lead has imposed on Iran for years, and the Iranians have another opportunity; that is, to shed their status as a pariah among the nations of this world and assume a position worthy of their history and their culture.

Over the past 2 years, I have had countless meetings with people from Delaware and beyond our borders who fall on both sides of this issue. Some are vehemently opposed to any deal with Iran and others believe we absolutely must have a deal in order to avoid a war.

I came to support this agreement only after considering all of these

points of view, reviewing the text of the deal again and again, hundreds of additional pages of supporting documents, and taking in dozens of briefings from experts on Iran and nuclear proliferation.

Two years of negotiations have produced an agreement that Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu and most of our Republican colleagues denounced almost as soon as the ink was dry on it and well before they ever read it. They said America should reject the deal and negotiate a better one. Well, to that I think you say: Good luck.

Last month, along with a number of my colleagues, I met here in Washington with ambassadors and representatives of the five nations that were our negotiating partners. To a person they argued—persuasively I thought—that this is a deal we should not reject. In effect, they urged us to learn from Arafat's mistake and this time take yes for an answer.

They are not the only ones who believe we should support this deal. There are dozens of former Israeli national security and military officials, including retired Israeli Navy Admiral Ami Ayalon. He is pictured here. He was effectively the CNO of the Israeli Navy—the person in charge of the Navy in the last decade. I am an old Navy guy. I am a retired Navy captain. I spent 23 years in the Navy. I was interested in what he had to say when he came to my State.

Here is what he said, among other things: "The Iran deal is the best possible alternative from Israel's point of view given the other available alternatives."

Now, look, he is one significant Israeli leader who believes this is the right thing for Israel. As it turns out, there are dozens, and actually scores, of former Israeli military leaders and intelligence leaders who agree with him—not all but a lot, and we should listen to their voices. I have certainly listened to him.

To those who think there are dangerous people in Iran who want this deal so they can exploit it, I remind them that the Revolutionary Guard is vehemently opposed to this deal. A lot of people I have talked to in Delaware in recent weeks think that, well, the Revolutionary Guard, the bad guys and hardliners in Iran, if you will, are for it. As it turns out, they are not for it. It is quite the opposite.

Here is a photograph of Major General Mohammad Ali Jafari, commander of Iran's Revolutionary Guard. He said: "We'll never accept it." That is not exactly a voice of endorsement for this agreement. I think this is all the more reason we should vigorously enforce this agreement through the intrusive inspections regime it mandates for the International Atomic Energy Agency to make for years to come, in order to ensure that the Iranians comply with every element required of them by this deal.

This deal blocks four pathways to a bomb. I will mention what they are:

first of all, the uranium facility in Natanz, blocked; the uranium facility at Fordow, blocked; weapons-grade plutonium, blocked; covert attempts to make a bomb, blocked; intrusive and uncomfortable inspections; sanctions relief only after Iran meets its obligations. If they cheat, the harsh economic sanctions snap back. Who can snap them back like that? We can, the United States, and any of our negotiating partners as well. We don't need their concurrence. We can do it alone.

Iran currently has 10,000 kilograms of enriched uranium and nearly 20,000 centrifuges, that puts them 2 or 3 months away with a nuclear bomb. Without a deal, it stays that way. With a deal, however, that enriched uranium stockpile must shrink to 300 kilograms and Iran must cut their number of centrifuges by two-thirds. And the ones they end up with are not the advanced centrifuges, they are actually the most elementary centrifuges. That change blocks their pathway to a bomb, keeping them at least 1 year away for the next 15 years or maybe longer.

Our negotiating partners also made the following critical points repeatedly. If at the end of the day the agreement is implemented and the Iranians violate its provisions later on, we will know it. We will know it by virtue of our own intelligence, the intelligence of our partner nations, and the intelligence of the Israelis as well. If it becomes apparent that the Iranians have cheated, any of the six of our nations can mandate the reimposition of an international economic sanctions regime against Iran, the same crippling sanctions that brought them to the table 2 years ago and to this hard-fought agreement today.

Madam President, 35 years ago, the United States imposed sanctions against Iran that were largely unilateral. It was just us. Then we began ratcheting it up over time.

Unilateral sanctions by the United States were clearly a nuisance to Iran, but they did not bring Iran to the table. Only sustained, multilateral sanctions, joined in by our five negotiating partners and others around the world, succeeded in bringing Iran to the table in a mood to talk. In fact, under the agreement that has been negotiated, if necessary, they could be set up by the United States in their entirety at our request—our request—if we are convinced the Iranians are cheating. This agreement guarantees that if they are ever needed again, any of the six of us could pull the trigger and reimpose them. Conversely, if the United States rejects this agreement, we not only lose the ability to know that the Iranians are pursuing the development of a nuclear weapons capability, we will also lose the support of the rest of the world in reimposing sanctions in the event that a future government in Iran elects to pursue a nuclear weapons program. I don't know about my colleagues, but that makes no sense to me—no sense. It also makes no sense to our negotiating partners.

Almost every American who was alive on 9/11, which we will commemorate tomorrow, remembers the horrifying images of that tragedy. To make matters worse, we had to endure the spectacle throughout the day and night of tens of thousands of Arabs across the world taking to the streets to celebrate the death of thousands of Americans. Lost among those images, however, was a remarkably different gathering that took place in another nation. It took place in, of all places, Tehran, the capital of Iran. There that night, thousands of Iranians came together in a candlelight vigil in solidarity with the United States. Most Americans have no idea that ever happened. I have never forgotten it.

A half-dozen years later in New York City, I would meet an Iranian leader named Javad Zarif, living there with his family. He was the Iranian ambassador to the U.N. We didn't have relations with them and we still don't. But the Iranians have for some time had an ambassador there to the U.N. and he lives in New York City.

Zarif was educated, it turns out, at San Francisco State University and the University of Denver. I remember thinking when I met him that he spoke flawless English—better than I—and he knew more about Americans than most Americans. I think his kids were educated here as well.

Impressed, later on, after I came back to Washington, DC, I spoke to him and I said: Why don't you come to Washington and meet some of our colleagues to give them a chance to get to know you and to have a dialogue.

He said: The George W. Bush administration won't let me come. They won't let me leave New York City.

So I said: Well, that is easy to fix, and I met with the Bush administration. Well, it wasn't easy to fix, and they wouldn't relax their travel ban.

So I later would ask Zarif in a conversation we had—this is when Ahmadinejad was the President of Iran, saying the holocaust was a figment of the imagination and the leaders of Israel should be blown off the face of the Earth. I said to Zarif: How do you get along with your President Ahmadinejad, and his response was: Not good.

He said: Ahmadinejad doesn't trust me. I am not going to be here much longer.

And he was right. The next time I reached out to him, he was gone. He was gone, seemingly without a trace. I found out years later he had been recalled to Iran and had returned to private life writing, lecturing, and largely staying out of sight.

As Ahmadinejad's second and final term began to wind down, a campaign to determine who would replace him ensued. A reformer named Rohani put his hat in the ring. Most people had never heard of him, at least not here. And most people in Iran said he would never have a chance to even get elected or run. Well, he got to run, and not

only did he get to run, he won more votes than the other five candidates combined. In the end, he did serve.

Later on, the question was what kind of cabinet would he put together to surround himself as the leader of Iran. And what he did—we were watching to see who would be minister of this or that over there. So when Rohani submitted the names of the Iranian parliament, his submission for Foreign Minister was my friend, Zarif. You could have knocked me over with a feather. I never saw it coming, never imagined it would come. The man who had gone on to lead the Iranians in negotiations with our five negotiating partners over the past 2 years is a man I have known for a half a dozen years or more.

Our negotiating team has been led superbly by Secretary of State John Kerry. By his side, however, for much of the past year has been a less well-known Cabinet Secretary, our Energy Secretary Ernie Moniz, who would end up playing a key role among all of the members of a very talented and dedicated team.

Dr. Moniz has never sought elected office. I first met him almost a decade ago at MIT where he was a leader and a professor in physics. He was regarded as one of the world's experts on all things nuclear. He testified one day at a field hearing I held at MIT focusing on spent fuel rods from nuclear plants. Later, I came back and people said: What is he like? And I said: This guy Moniz is a genius. And by God he is.

It turns out he is not just a genius; he leads a bunch of these national labs where people who are just as smart as he is know all kinds of information, including all things nuclear—more so than any other country in the world. As it turns out, they were harnessed to help us in this negotiation—the national labs—led by Ernie Moniz.

As it turned out, ironically, among the graduate students at MIT during Dr. Moniz's distinguished career, there was a young Iranian named Akbar Salehi. Later Salehi would return to his country and, as fate would have it, ultimately become Dr. Moniz's Iranian counterpart in the negotiations with the U.S.-led team. As it turns out, Salehi's thesis adviser at MIT was one of Ernie Moniz's closest friends at MIT, and thus was created maybe not a bond, but a connection, and a shared trust that went back to both Ernie Moniz, a former professor at MIT, and a former graduate student, Salehi at MIT.

It didn't take long for Secretary Moniz to make a profound impression during the negotiations. Shortly after he joined the team earlier this year, he gave the Iranians what several members of the U.S. team would later describe to me as a tutorial in all things nuclear, making it clear that the Iranians had "more than met their match." Adding Ernie Moniz to our team was I think a stroke of genius, not only bringing him here, but the national labs as well. In the countless

meetings he has participated in with House and Senate Members, he has bolstered the credibility, probably as much as anybody, of the agreement—and the confidence of many in it—in ways that almost no other American could do.

Much has been made of whether we can trust the Iranians to do what they have committed to do. John Kerry, Ernie Moniz, and the other members of our team have made clear that the agreement they and our five partners from the other nations have hammered out with Iran is not based on trust. Let me say that again: It is not based on trust. It is based, as we have already heard on this floor, on mistrust. We realize that some future Iranian regime may well ponder whether to violate the agreement and launch another pilot program to develop another nonpeaceful nuclear capability. If they actually attempt to do that, the key questions are these: Will we know it? Are the consequences for Iran severe enough to deter them from going forward with it? I am convinced the answer to both those questions is yes.

Today, Iran has much more than the hardline Revolutionary Guard whose influence has begun to wane. Iran today is a nation of 78 million people. Their average age is 25. Most of them were not alive in 1979 during the Iranian revolution. They don't remember the brutal Shah we propped up for years and allowed to come to our country when his regime fell. This new generation of Iranians is ready to take yes for an answer. I think we should too. This is a good deal for America and our allies, and that certainly includes Israel, one of our closest allies. I think it beats the likely alternative that there could well be war with Iran, hands down.

I will close with this brief conversation. About a year and a half ago I was up in New York in a house that Senator DURBIN had actually visited with me, as well as a couple of others where Zarif used to live. We had the opportunity to talk about the upcoming negotiations. I said: Zarif, you and Iran have a choice. You can have a strong, vibrant economy for your country again, or you can have a nuclear weapons program. You cannot have both. And we are not going to accept a nuclear weapons program.

We have the ability to know if they cheat. If they cheat, we have the ability to put right back in place these same crippling economic sanctions. If that doesn't do the job, we have other alternatives at our disposal. Nothing is off the table.

Sometimes around here we talk about voting our fears or voting our hopes. I am prepared to vote my hopes, for our Nation and the Iranians as well. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I wish to thank my colleague, the Senator from Delaware. That was a very

thoughtful presentation. The Senator from Delaware has a personal interest in and has made a personal commitment to this issue. I thank him for his insight.

I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, earlier this week I announced that I will reluctantly support the Comprehensive Joint Plan of Action and oppose the resolution of disapproval, despite some very serious reservations.

I did not reach this position easily or quickly. Although there are many positive aspects to this deal, this agreement also has flaws that I believe need to be addressed in the months and years ahead.

The congressional review period has served a very useful purpose. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle have raised very important points about this deal as we were briefed by experts and administration negotiators. I commend Senators CARDIN and CORKER for their bipartisan efforts to establish this review and for affirming Congress's role in shaping our Nation's foreign policy.

After this debate is over, it is my hope that moving forward the Senate will forge bipartisan consensus and act with unity of purpose. We must work together and take action against Iran if they fail to live up to their obligations under this agreement, and we must work on legislation and multinational and lateral efforts to combat Iran's sponsorship of terrorist activities, arms smuggling, and hegemonic ambitions.

We need to look no further than the humanitarian crisis emanating from Syria to see the havoc and chaos that Iran and its proxies are wreaking on an already troubled region.

We need to provide robust oversight and work together to stem the proliferation of nuclear material, especially from nascent nuclear states and from Iran in particular. Nearly 20 countries produce safe nuclear power without domestic enrichment. America's longstanding policy is that the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty does not provide the right to enrich uranium.

While in the short term this agreement helps reduce Iran's capacity to enrich and eliminates the vast majority of their Iranian stockpile, I am concerned that in the long term other nations will view this agreement as a precedent that will lead to increased proliferation of nuclear enrichment and the potential for other nations to emerge as threshold nuclear states.

Just a few years ago, the United States signed and ratified a 123 Agreement with the United Arab Emirates that would help them build nuclear power capabilities while explicitly preventing them from enriching uranium on their soil.

The United States must take a leadership role in setting a threshold of acceptable levels of enrichment of ura-

nium for the safe production of nuclear energy. As more nations look to meet growing energy needs while minimizing carbon output, a comprehensive policy to ensure only safe levels of uranium enrichment with strong international safeguards is critical to global security.

No nation faces a more severe threat than Iran's nuclear ambitions than the State of Israel. For decades, the Iranian regime has made it their mandate to eliminate the Jewish State. We must be united in ensuring that this never happens. We must always be ready to act to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and smuggling arms to its proxies in the region.

As the Middle East falls deeper into chaos, our alliance with Israel, a nation that shares so many of our values, has never been more important. America must reaffirm our longstanding commitment to Israel's security by renewing our memorandum of understanding, providing Israel with defense capabilities in order to cement its qualitative military edge in the region, and bolstering Israel's ability to initiate deterrence against Iran.

The JCPOA is not the end of our multilateral efforts against Iran and its illicit behavior. America must work with our allies to initiate multilateral sanctions against Iran for its terrorist activities, especially its funding of Hezbollah and Hamas.

We also need to set clear understandings of how Iran will be sanctioned for minor violations of this agreement that will not initiate the snapback of full sanctions. We must continue working in a coordinated fashion to ensure unity in purpose against Iran's nuclear ambitions, terrorist activities, and efforts to destabilize the region. We must also continue pressing for the release of all U.S. hostages currently imprisoned in Iran, including Amir Hekmati. Congress must address these issues.

In 2009 Congress debated whether to pursue sanctions or diplomacy with Iran first, with military force always being the last resort but a necessary final deterrent. I was proud to cosponsor the effort to pass sanctions in 2009 and help pass additional sanctions in the years since. As a new Member of the Senate, I joined a group of bipartisan Senators ready to pass additional sanctions against Iran as they continued to drag out negotiations. Iran needed to know that the patience of the United States was not limitless.

The JCPOA is a product of complex negotiations and painstaking compromises. But let's be clear. Either rejecting or accepting this deal comes with a set of distinct risks. However, those who oppose this deal have been accused of supporting war over diplomacy, and those who support this deal have been likewise portrayed as supporting containment and capitulation. Foreign policy is rarely so simple, and it is certainly not so simple in this case.

As leaders of this great Nation, we owe it to our citizens and the men and women in uniform to never let ourselves become so fractured by partisan politics on issues of such importance to national security. I look forward to working with Senators on both sides of the aisle to protect the interests of our allies and the safety and security of this great Nation and to ensure that the United States of America remains both united in our goals and indivisible in our purpose.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Madam President, I want to talk about this arrangement and agreement with Iran and cover several points and what I think are important realities that have not been emphasized in this debate, but first I would like to address the issue of the 60-vote margin.

First, I think it should be on the record that the minority leader offered to the majority leader a unanimous consent agreement that there would be no filibuster on the motion to proceed and there would be a 60-vote threshold required for final passage of the bill. As I understand it, that offer was rejected. That means the only alternative is to go the technical rule of the filibuster in order to require a 60-vote margin.

It is absolutely clear from the legislative record of the Corker-Cardin bill that everyone involved in that discussion, including the Senator from Tennessee, understood that a 60-vote margin would be required in the passage of this legislation. There is no question about it. There are quotes in the RECORD. Everyone understood that from the beginning of the consideration of the Corker-Cardin bill.

Finally, every major issue that has come before this bill since I have been here has required 60 votes, whether it was immigration or background checks or extension of unemployment benefits or the minimum wage. All of those have required a 60-vote threshold. That has been the standard in this body. We could debate whether that should or should not be the standard, but it is, it has been, and this is not a time to decide we are going to arbitrarily abandon that.

I must say I am sort of amazed to hear people discussing this as if this is some kind of new imposition of a rule, and it reminds me of "Casablanca": I am shocked—shocked—to understand that there might be a 60-vote requirement on this piece of legislation.

That has been the standard for this body certainly for as long as I have been here and for some time longer. As I say, we can discuss whether that should be the standard, but that is what it is, and no one should be surprised that is the way we are proceeding here today.

OK. Let's talk about the agreement—five quick realities.

No. 1, Iran is a nuclear threshold state today. There is a lot of argument. I sat through the long debate yesterday afternoon about what happens in 2030, what happens in 15 years, and would Iran be somehow a legitimized nuclear threshold state. They are a nuclear threshold state today. The risk to the world is imminent. It is not in 15 years; it is today. That is why this agreement is so important—because basically it freezes and rolls back Iran's nuclear capabilities for at least the next 15 years and probably longer.

The No. 2 reality: Iran is a rogue nation. It foments terrorism around the world. It is a state sponsor of terrorism. Everyone knows that. Under this agreement, as has been pointed out, because of the nature of the negotiations, which were "roll back your nuclear program in exchange for relief from the sanctions," they will indeed receive relief from the sanctions, and that will give them additional funds for their economy and possibly for their nefarious purposes. But I would submit that the only thing worse than a rogue Iran is a rogue Iran armed with nuclear weapons. That is the essence of this deal. It prevents their opportunity to gain nuclear weapons, to create sufficient fissile material. It rolls back what they already have.

I should point out that they became a nuclear threshold state during the imposition of various sanctions regimes. So it is clear that sanctions in and of themselves are never going to prevent their achievement of becoming a nuclear weapons state.

No. 3, this is a multilateral agreement. All the discussion around here acts as if it is the United States and Iran, Obama and the Ayatollah. It indeed involves the world's major powers. It involves Great Britain, France, Germany, China, Russia, and other countries that have helped to enforce those sanctions and make them effective. If we walk away from this deal, we are doing so alone.

We had an extraordinary meeting before the recess with Ambassadors from the P5+1 countries. They made it clear that they had accepted this agreement and that if we rejected it, their willingness to go back to the table, reimpose the sanctions, reinforce the sanctions—I believe one of the Ambassadors used the term "far-fetched"—it is not going to happen.

The sanctions are going to erode starting now, no matter what we do in this Congress. I can't figure out any way that a weaker sanctions regime—which is inevitable because other countries involved in the sanctions have already started to make moves toward doing business with Iran—I don't see how a weaker sanctions regime is ever going to bring Iran back to the table to get a better deal.

Reality No. 4: This agreement is flawed. It is not the agreement I would prefer. There are elements that I think

could be improved. I wish the 15 years was 20 or 30 years. I wish the 24 days was 12 days or 8 days or 1 day. But this is the agreement that is before us. And the analysis could not be strictly of the agreement itself and within its four corners, but compared to what? That is really the basic question here—not whether this a good deal or a bad deal. The question is, How does this deal, no matter what its flaws, compare with the alternatives that are out there? In all of the drama and all of the argument and all of the speeches and rallies that we have heard, no one has yet come up with a credible alternative. I have not yet heard a credible alternative. The only thing I hear is this: We will reimpose sanctions and bring them back to the table and get a better deal. It is going to be very hard to reimpose those sanctions without the support of our international partners. If we enter into the deal and Iran cheats, then we can bring the international partners back with us, but to do so—to try to think that we could do so now is just unrealistic. I wish there were a better alternative. I also wish I could play tight end for the New England Patriots, but it is not going to happen. It is simply not realistic. There is no credible alternative.

Finally, we have to talk about what happens after the deal. Congress has a responsibility. The administration has a responsibility. We cannot trust Iran. Everyone knows that. No one argues that.

There has been a lot of discussion about the IAEA. I serve on the Intelligence Committee. We had a briefing just yesterday morning with the heads of our intelligence agencies. It is not just the IAEA that is going to be watching this agreement, it is the world's intelligence community, and we have significant capability to know if they are cheating over and above and in addition to anything the IAEA brings to the table. This is not trust; this is verification based upon the IAEA's worldwide experience but also based upon the considerable intelligence assets of the United States and other countries that are supporting us in this effort.

Finally, there are risks. I understand that. There are risks on both sides. There are severe risks. This is not an easy call. It is one of the hardest decisions I have ever had to make. But if you analyze the alternatives and weigh the risks, I believe the risks of not going forward with this agreement are significantly greater than the risks of giving diplomacy a chance going forward with this agreement, which can be verified. If there is cheating, it can be caught, No. 1, and punished, No. 2, and if the agreement doesn't work, we have the same options we have today.

This is a difficult decision. It is one that has weighed on this body and on this country. But I think this is a tremendous opportunity for us to avoid a nuclear-armed Iran and secure at least that part of a peaceful Middle East and more secure world.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, let me thank my colleague from Maine for his thoughtful presentation.

I would like to ask how much time remains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I am going to yield to the Senator from Ohio. I hope 7 minutes is adequate. If it is not, I would ask unanimous consent to extend that and offer time to the other side or whatever is necessary.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I thank you, Madam President, and I thank the assistant Democratic leader.

Madam President, I rise in support of the international agreement designed to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. No one in this body trusts Iran. No one in this body disputes that Iran is the leading state sponsor of terrorism, that it denies Israel's right to exist, and that it destabilizes the Middle East and violates the human rights of its people. That is why we need to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran, which would pose an exponentially greater danger to the security of the United States, to our long-time important ally Israel, and to the entire world. This is the only viable option.

As Senator KING said, no one has answered the question of what happens if we reject this agreement. Well, of the hundreds of calls I have made and the dozens of briefings and discussions I have had with people on both sides of the agreement—from Israeli officials, to American security people, to activists, engaged citizens on both sides of this—nobody has answered the question: What do we do if this agreement is killed in the Congress? What would follow? What is the alternative?

I am incredibly proud of the diligent work my Democratic colleagues have done over the last 6 weeks in researching, examining, and questioning this deal. There was no knee-jerk reaction on our side where people all went the same way almost immediately when the agreement came out. People on the Democratic side of the aisle listened to experts, and they listened to stakeholders. We came to thoughtful, informed decisions.

I made my decision after serious study of the agreement's contents, after listening to Ohioans on all sides of this, after consulting with nuclear experts, such as the Energy Secretary and Nobel Prize-winning physicist Secretary Moniz. I attended hours of briefings from the President, from the Energy Secretary, from Treasury Secretary Lew, from Secretary of State Kerry, and other administration officials. I consulted U.S. intelligence officials, outside arms control experts, and

met for over an hour with Israel's Ambassador to the United States. I met with all five of the Ambassadors from the P5+1 countries; those who have been long-time allies of ours from France, England, and Germany; those from China, and from Russia, who are allies on this issue, if not a number of others. All—every one of them individually, collectively, warned that the United States—it would be the United States which would be isolated internationally if Congress rejects this agreement.

Many of my colleagues talk about Iran's sponsorship of terrorism, its human rights abuses, and its pursuit of ballistic missiles. These are legitimate concerns, but they are not the focus of this agreement. Of course we would love to solve those issues. Sanctions on those issues will remain in place, but that was not the focus of this nuclear agreement.

Let's be clear. When I hear opponents say that Iran 10, 15 years from now would be a threshold nuclear state—maybe they will, maybe they will not. That is certainly debatable. It is not debatable that Iran is a nuclear threshold state right now. They are 2 to 3 months away from being able to produce enough fissile material for a bomb. That is a fact. They are 2 to 3 months away from being able to produce enough fissile material for a nuclear weapon.

The agreement provides for comprehensive restrictions today—beginning when Congress allows this agreement to move forward, to block Iran's pathway to a bomb. They include reducing Iran's installed centrifuges by two-thirds for at least 10 years, cutting its stockpile of enriched uranium by 98 percent for 15 years, reconfiguring its plutonium reactor to render it inoperable and deny Iran a source of weapons-grade plutonium.

To verify Iran's compliance, the deal requires 24/7 access to all declared nuclear sites. The United Nations inspectors will say that of the 120 country inspections they have done, this is the most comprehensive and the most intrusive. The deal provides time-certain access to all suspicious sites in Iran. It provides for a permanent prohibition on Iran acquiring or developing a nuclear weapon. It provides a permanent ban on nuclear weapons research and a permanent inspection regime for their nuclear program.

If Iran violates the deal, the agreement gives the United States extraordinary power to snap back both U.S. and international sanctions without fear of veto by other nations. The President made clear that if 10 or 15 or 20 years from now Iran tries to build a bomb, this agreement ensures the United States will have better tools to target it. Americans fundamentally don't want another war in the Middle East. Americans strongly prefer a diplomatic solution, which this agreement is all about, that ensures that Iran cannot obtain a nuclear weapon.

At the beginning of my remarks, I spoke about the serious way, with

great gravitas, that Democratic after Democratic Senator—the serious way we pursued coming to a decision on this. Let me contrast for a moment on this, one of the most significant national security issues Congress will face in a generation. I have been in the House and Senate for 20 years now. This will be one of the two most important decisions I have made on foreign policy. The first was my vote against the war in Iraq. It was clearly the right vote, even though at the time there was public support for it.

We know that the information we were presented was not exactly right in the end, even though there was huge support in Congress and a lot of public support for going into war with Iraq. I thought about that a lot. I made a decision that I thought the Iraq war would be disastrous for our country. That decision clearly was right. It was not so partisan back then, although we had a President that certainly pushed us and a Vice President, especially, that pushed us into that war.

But this agreement should not be subject to the kind of reflexive partisan attacks we have seen in recent months. Just a few months ago, 47 of my Republican colleagues signed a letter signaling their opposition to the emerging deal—not just that, they signed a letter to the Ayatollah—to the leader of the enemy, Iran—suggesting that the deal was not quite on the up-and-up because of the President of the United States. They signed a letter that was teaching the Ayatollah, if you will, some American civic lessons. Imagine, if Democrats in the Senate in the early 1980s had written a letter to President Gorbachev saying: Don't negotiate with Ronald Reagan. Imagine if we had done that.

I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Imagine if that had happened. So we start off with 47 Republicans writing to the Ayatollah, saying, fundamentally: Don't negotiate with President Obama. We have seen now not a single one of my colleagues is in support of this agreement, even though Secretary Powell supports it, even though former Senator Lugar, who was as respected as anybody in this country as a former Republican Senator, supports it. It is not just disappointing that not a single one of my Republican colleagues supports this, but the first day the agreement came out, I heard talk radio saying: Read the agreement. Read the bill. The first day this agreement came out, 19 Republicans—on that first day—came out in opposition to this agreement. There is no way they could have read it. I know how complicated this agreement is. I have read it. I assume that every one of my Democratic colleagues, in an arduous, focused, difficult, persistent way, studied this issue. Then I see what happened on the other side of the aisle

when it was—as Timothy Crouse said the press does in the “Boys on the Bus”—“if one of them flies off the telephone wire, they all fly off the telephone wire.”

That is what happened. I was just so disappointed. Senator CORKER is here, one of the people who did not sign that letter and one of the people who thought about this issue. But what I saw in the contrast of the way we looked at this, it was pretty disturbing.

I will conclude. My time is running out. This agreement will matter for our country. It is clearly in our national interests. I think there has been no good answer offered on what happens if we walk away. That is why I ask my colleagues to vote no on the next vote coming in front of us.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I want to thank the Senator for his comments. Just so we know how we are organized on this side for the next hour—and I think we are about evened up on the time, maybe 3 minutes more needs to come our way but roughly even. For the next 30 minutes, we have Senator COATS, one of our outstanding foreign policy, national security Senators, who served as an ambassador; 15 minutes for Senator GRASSLEY; and 15 minutes for Senator ROBERTS.

I thank you so much for being here and your incredibly responsible way of facing this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I thank my colleague Senator CORKER for his diligent efforts, as it consumed literally hundreds, if not thousands, of hours as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in helping guide us through this very important, very difficult process.

I was on this floor earlier saying this is an issue that rises above partisan politics. This is something that each of us as a Senator has to weigh carefully. I don't know how many hours and how much time I have spent reading through, parsing through, trying to analyze and understand this agreement, its side annexes and everything connected with it. I would like to now say to my colleagues, perhaps with an appeal that they at least, at the very least, set aside: The deal is done. You lost. Therefore, we are not even going to allow a vote on this matter.

This is one of the most historic, consequential measures that anyone in this Chamber will ever be confronted with. I know for me it is one of the most historic because of the consequences that may occur if we don't get this right. It is important that we debate this, have ample time to go through every bit of this, and have each Member weigh carefully what we hear from each other and what we come to understand on the basis of our own personal examination. I hope that

will be the case. To deny us the opportunity to even let our yes be yes or our no be no before the public I think would be a tragic mistake.

I would like to go back a little bit and talk about my history with all of this. When I returned from my ambassadorship to Germany and actually had to deal with this as one of many different issues—because even back then there was great concern among both the United States and the German Government over Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons capability. I engaged in a number of discussions and diplomatic efforts there in working with our allied country Germany on this issue. But when I did come back, I suppose partly because of my engagement there, I was asked by the Bipartisan Policy Center that had just been formed to chair a task force on this very issue, the Iranian pursuit of nuclear weapons.

We obviously wanted this to be bipartisan, so I recruited my fellow Senate colleague Chuck Robb, then a retired Senator from Virginia. Together we co-chaired that effort. Later we were joined by retired 4-star General and Deputy Supreme Allied Commander of Europe Chuck Wall. We put together a who's who of experts on the Middle East and experts on nuclear capabilities. We had renowned experts from across the spectrum come and present to us.

All of that resulted in three major reports titled: “Meeting the Challenge, U.S. Policy Towards Iranian Nuclear Development”; the second one, “Meeting the Challenge, Time is Running Out”; the third, “Meeting the Challenge When Time Runs Out.”

There is a treasure trove of information here about how Iran has violated U.N. treaty resolutions, violated the nonproliferation treaty agreement. We have talked about the consequences of all of this and made recommendations to the administration, whatever administration that would be. As it turns out, these recommendations went both to a Republican administration under President George W. Bush and to the Obama administration under our current President.

Clearly, we have outlined—and in the interest of time I will not be able to go back through all of this. But let me just state a couple of the conclusions here relative to all of this. Absent necessary leverage, we believe it unlikely that Supreme Leader Khamenei will reciprocate President Obama's conciliatory gestures in a meaningful way.

First of all, we endorsed diplomacy to its ultimate, but we recognized that diplomacy has its limits. You can sit at a table and not come to agreement for decades. We had been trying diplomatic efforts with Iran and they were not succeeding. So then we talked about the necessity of having sanctions, ever-ratcheting, tightening sanctions, to bring Iran to the table. Included in that was the threat of the use of force if all else failed.

None on that committee were warmongers. We wanted to do everything

possible to prevent conflict in this in solving this problem. So we laid out a long framework. Perhaps if this continues into next week, I will be able to go through some of this framework, but the key on this is stated here somewhere. The key to this was that you had to have a combination of tough diplomacy, which we had years of, and we were going to continue that, backed up by ever-ratcheting sanctions, to show Iran that there was a price to pay for not coming to agreement, and then backed up ultimately by the threat of force if we could not secure an agreement, which would reach the goal.

The goal was to prevent Iran from having nuclear weapon capability, knowing the destabilization that would take place in the Middle East, the historic impact this would have, and consequences this would have if we allowed that to happen.

Let me move on to what I believe are major problems with this deal. We know Iran's misbehavior, its violation of six U.N. treaties that it agreed to, its violation of the nonproliferation treaty, its support for terrorism. It is a bad actor, perhaps the world's worst bad actor, engaging in weaponization that killed American troops. We are dealing with a rogue nation here.

I don't know how my colleagues react to this, but when they cut a deal with the United States, they are cheering on the streets of Tehran. And the Supreme Leader came out yesterday and basically said: Well, don't worry, Israel won't be around in the next 25 years. They will be wiped off the map. We have already said “Death to Israel” and also “Death to the Great Satan, the United States.” This is the party that we just negotiated an agreement with.

Now, if we had negotiated an agreement that achieved our goals, I would say good for us. Finally, the sanctions worked. We came up with a good agreement. But I have read through this document and parsed over every word, tried to find every meaning. I serve on the Senate Intelligence Committee, and earlier I served on the Armed Services Committee. I have had more than a decade of experience in this.

I spent almost the entire weekend carefully reading this, hoping that we had achieved, if not all, at least some of the most important goals we had.

But to my dismay, we ended up not achieving any of those goals. The goal was to prevent Iran from having nuclear weapons capability that could break out and totally destabilize the Middle East. What we have come up with is an agreement that puts them on a path to do exactly that, justified now by this agreement, justified by the Security Council at the U.N.

I said there were two major things that needed to be talked about before we talk about some of the specifics: First is the false claim that we must choose between accepting this failed agreement or war, and the second is

that the agreement prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability.

This is the sales pitch from the White House. This is the sales pitch that is being made to the American people, and neither of these is true.

It has to be a desperate administration that has chosen to force this agreement on us by arguing that it is a choice between this deal and war. I am disgusted by the administration's sales strategy for this agreement and those who are led down the path of belief that the only option here is war, and therefore, no matter what we gave away, this deal is better than the alternative.

This false choice is among the most infamous, cynical, and blatantly false manipulations the Obama administration has used to distort this important debate, and they ought to be ashamed of themselves for using this tactic.

In fact, the false argument masks a far more valid argument that this deal makes future war far more likely, not less. By abandoning the tool of economic sanctions, in giving away a strong, principled negotiating position, the administration's desperate tactic is reducing our options when Iran does go nuclear, as we have put them on the path to do.

President Obama and Secretary Kerry have repeatedly said over the past year: No deal is better than a bad deal. They never argued that any deal is better than no deal, yet that is what they ended up conceding.

We had the strength of the six most powerful countries in the world—the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, China, and Russia—sitting at one side of the negotiating table. On the other side of the negotiating table was Iran, crippled by sanctions and oil falling into the range of \$40 a barrel, costing more to extract and sell than they could get back. They were desperate to achieve some kind of relief from these sanctions.

We had the negotiating leverage. We gave away that leverage in these negotiations, desperate to conclude any deal whatsoever so that we could avoid making some difficult decisions down the line in terms of what we had said we must do.

Four Presidents—including this President, two Democrats, two Republicans—said it is unacceptable for Iran to achieve nuclear capability. We gave that away just to get them at the table. Just to get them at the table, we took off the use of any force, any leverage or additional sanctions or continuing sanctions in order to get to the table—not negotiating to get what we needed, but just to get to the table.

The administration has accepted, in my opinion, a deeply flawed deal and then set it in motion with a U.N. Security Council resolution on the next day, well before Congress could even respond to it.

Thank goodness Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN were able to convince

their colleagues on a 98-to-1 vote to give Congress the right to have a say in this issue. Had that not happened, the President, by not declaring this a treaty, by declaring this simply an executive agreement, the President would have locked this thing in even before we had a chance to read it, before the American people even had a chance to know what it was except for what the President told them it was or the Secretary of State told them that it was.

So we are having this debate thanks to these two men, these two leaders—one a Republican and one a Democrat—who had the courage to stand up to this President and say: No, the American people deserve to have a say.

And, boy, what a say it is. I don't know about others. My mail is running 10 to 1 against this. Maybe I am talking to the wrong people, I don't know, but the more they learn about this agreement, the more they say: Are you crazy? We gave up that? For what? What did we get back?

I want to go over some of that, trying to move through this because I know time is of the essence here, but this idea that war is the only alternative—and then the sales pitch that I have heard so many of my colleagues and others who support the deal say: You know, I am for this because this prevents Iran from having a nuclear bomb. It is just the opposite. It gives Iran the pathway to have a nuclear bomb. This has a sunset clause in it, and it releases all the sanctions. It has a sunset clause that says after 15 years they can do whatever they want to do. We cannot reimpose sanctions. What kind of a deal is that? But the false narrative that this will not allow that—the agreement, even the annexes say we have to help Iran achieve nuclear research, nuclear research that can help them move toward this.

I looked at the annex and said: Surely, I am reading this wrong. We are committed to help them? And if other nations, say Israel, want to take action against this because they think they are going to be extinguished from the face of the Earth—as the Iranians have told them that is going to happen—if they want to take action, we actually are required to convince the Israelis not to do that. We side with the Iranians.

I mean, you can't write this script. This is beyond comprehension. So those two false narratives alone ought to be reason to say: Wait a minute. Let's not go forward with this deal. Surely we can find a way to negotiate a better deal for us.

Our Bipartisan Policy Center committee—I want to read from this because we looked into this very question, and this was the conclusion: Even if Iran were to honor all of its obligations and fully comply with all the restrictions in the agreement—JCPOA—the deal would not prevent a nuclear Iran indefinitely. Starting in year 13, Iran will be able to break out, produce enough fissile material for a nuclear

weapon in about 10 weeks, down from 1 year. In year 16 Iran would obtain nuclear weapons capabilities in a breakout time of less than 3 weeks.

That was the conclusion—not of Republicans—that was the conclusion of a bipartisan group of experts, chaired by a Republican and a Democratic former Senator at the time.

And what we have said actually has come true. The sunset clause should, by itself, be enough to persuade, hopefully, a majority of us to reject this deal. This doesn't make sense.

If President Bush in 2001 had presented to the American people this same deal with Iran and secured the votes to pass this deal, today Iran would be having breakout—unrestricted breakout, assisted by the agreement. And we are going to call that a diplomatic victory?

Fifteen years is going to go by very fast. They are going to have breakout capability much earlier than that and could easily—if you read the agreement—easily declare that we have breached the agreement, they are pulling back, and therefore they are going forward. And they will have well over \$100 billion to achieve that effort. They will have sanctions relief—total sanctions relief. They will be able to export all of the oil that they want, and Iran wins.

There are some particular problems with this, and they have been listed by people on the right, Charles Krauthammer, and on the left or at least in the middle, David Brooks. The New York Times is not exactly a Republican rag, and David Brooks is not necessarily far rightwing. They are basically saying: Every single major goal that we had going into this agreement has been given away in a desperate attempt to achieve any agreement so that we don't have to deal with this. What we have to deal with can be pushed down the road.

So on that basis I went through the agreement and looked at some of these areas. I would like to identify for the record those that we had the leverage to achieve—a goal, a stated goal by the administration and by others negotiating to achieve—and we caved on every one of them.

First, verification inspections. Most people understand that anytime, anywhere means anytime, anywhere. Actually, now it means—well, a minimum of 24 days if Iran agrees with us initially that we should go through this convoluted process where Iran helps make the decisions. It is like giving Tom Brady and the Patriots the right to determine whether or not the footballs were deflated. I am from Indiana, it is the Colts, and they whipped us in the Super Bowl. I am probably biased in that statement.

On the other hand, just to simplify it for people, if you have an adversary that you don't trust and you want to have an ability to find out if whether or not what they do and say is true, you don't say: Go ahead, check it yourself, then tell me what you think, and

we will take that for an answer. So, talk about caving anytime, anywhere on inspections.

The administration also argued this principle of short notice. Secretary Kerry, when asked this at one of our meetings here, basically said: No, we never pursued such a goal; and, indeed, we never heard of it.

I, along with every one of us here was relieved when the administration announced—I don't know if it was Secretary Kerry or one of his team supporters—announced inspections anytime, anywhere, and everybody said: Oh, OK, at least we have that.

Now we learn no American can be part of the inspection team. Now we learn that a U.N. independent agency will do inspections, and now we have learned that military and former weapon manufacturing and research facilities are off limits, and we are not even allowed to inspect them.

So anywhere, anytime has become a farce. How can you possibly—that in and of itself would be reason not to vote for this agreement. How go do you go home and say to people: Anytime, anywhere is a scrubbed version of 24 hours a day at a minimum as long as Iran agrees.

It doesn't take somebody with a Ph.D. or a law degree—or even a Senator or a Congressman who has delved into these issues—for people to say, are you nuts? Who would sign a deal like that?

Uranium enrichment—we caved there. Then talk about one of the key weaknesses is the agreement that the centrifuges are to be disconnected and only stored feet from their original position. They can be reintroduced into the enrichment system when the earlier expiration dates of the deal occur, whenever the Iranians choose to move quickly toward nuclear capability.

This involves some highly technical stuff, but the bottom line is almost all aspects of these enrichment details in dispute are in dispute by experts who understand the technical application of all of this, and they are not persuaded by the misleading leadership coming out of the administration—once again another cave.

Fordow. What is Fordow? Fordow is a facility at which some nuclear technology pursuit was being undertaken, and we wanted to be able to shut that down.

But the Iranians said: No, no, I don't think so.

So we said: OK, let's cave on that; let's move onto something else.

The same applied to military dimensions and undisclosed military facilities. So Secretary Kerry is faced again with Iranian intransigence and explained his new position now. He no longer was fixated on the past: That was something that we talked about months ago. I am not fixated on that anymore. So scratch that one off. Don't worry. Keep Fordow. Keep Fordow open, no problem. What is next?

Sanctions relief. This agreement does not generally relieve sanctions pressure as originally intended. Rather it abandons the sanctions regime entirely all at once. Indeed, the multilateral sanctions are now already gone. European nations and others are flocking into Tehran to sign long-term agreements that will never be subject to sanctions if they are snapped back. We lost again. So the re-imposition of sanctions, if we find out something is wrong here, is a farce. It is not implementable.

I talked about snap-back here, so I am going to move forward from that. This is one I mentioned before, but I still can't comprehend it.

The deal obligates the P5+1—that is the six of us, the six nations that were negotiating—to actually help Iran build up its nuclear infrastructure during the 15 years before they achieve a 3-week breakout. So we are actually helping them construct their nuclear infrastructure, which then can easily be converted to breaking out for a nuclear weapon. And in return for altering their timetable for nuclear industrial development, the Iranians secured not just international acceptance of that activity but actual assistance in pursuing it.

That is incredible. We are actually helping Iran get to the bomb? As we hear from some of our colleagues and others who support this agreement, they say: I am voting for this because this prevents Iran from getting the bomb. Read the agreement. It is not easy to read. It is not fun to read. But it is alarming to read.

I was in the Senate during the 1990s and the negotiations with North Korea, and actually, Wendy Sherman, the principal negotiator along with Senator Kerry of this agreement, was the principal negotiator in the North Korea agreement. I remember being told on this floor through the President of the United States, then President Clinton and his Secretary of State and others: Don't worry; we have total verification procedures in place. If they cheat on us, we are going to know it. And when we know it, we are going to stop it. Well, here it is 2015, and North Korea has somewhere between 20 and 40 nuclear weapons sitting on top of ballistic missiles, and we didn't know it.

That made me a skeptic going into this thing because it is like *deja vu* here. We are being told the same thing: Don't worry; we will know if they cheat. We will be able to do something to stop them.

This is the assurance that this is a good deal. So that is a hard sale for me. It is a no sale for me. I didn't end up voting for that because I had some real suspicions about whether that would take place. But that actually ought to be a lesson for all of us here—that something that is promised by the President of the United States and his Secretary of State and his negotiating team won't necessarily come true and be the case. So the promises that have

been made about what this agreement is and what it isn't and what we will be able to do I measure by what didn't work out really well in North Korea, and yet the same negotiator that negotiated that helped negotiate on this.

I don't know if my colleague from Tennessee is standing because I am running long on this, but I have a lot more I would like to say. I am going to try to move to a couple of last things here.

Some prominent people have been noted here as favoring the deal. Well, I think Henry Kissinger is someone who probably has some experience, at the age of 90-some years and a lifetime in diplomacy. I don't have to give his credentials. And George Shultz also has some credibility on this. So if you want to listen to one side on this, you ought to listen to the other. These individuals have said:

Previous thinking on nuclear strategy assumed the existence of stable state actors. . . . How will these doctrines translate into a region where sponsorship of nonstate proxies is common, the state structure is under assault, and death on behalf of jihad is a kind of fulfillment?

Sadly, their views have been largely ignored and not mentioned by anybody else. So if they are going to mention their guys, we are going to mention our guys.

Look, the last thing I want to say here before I conclude is there hasn't been much discussion about the consequences for Israel, our democratic ally in the region, which I think should be a core issue. Prime Minister Netanyahu was here and spoke to a joint assembly of Congress. He received standing ovations for standing tall and standing hard and saying the very future existence of my nation is at risk here. He made the point that a bad deal is not better than no deal, that a bad deal could be worse than no deal, and that there are ways around this.

We cannot ignore the major risk that Iran will follow through with their often-repeated threats of obliterating the State of Israel—a threat that was just repeated by the Supreme Leader yesterday.

I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute to conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. I thank my colleagues.

In conclusion, with this agreement, we have paid too much and gained too little. The risks are not adequately acknowledged and not effectively addressed. I cannot support this agreement. I cannot approve the misguided desperation that led to it.

I cannot understand those who claim this is a great victory for diplomacy nor those who turn a blind eye to its obvious failings because of the appeal of party discipline nor those who have fallen prey to the Obama administration's manipulation of the deal with the U.N. prior to Congress having any say in this.

When I read about the gloating, the boastful joy in Iran—in Tehran, their capital—that all their needs were met and none of their redlines were crossed, I despaired. I despaired because this misadventure has been a failure of vision, a failure of will, and a historic failure of leadership. I fear these failures will lead to great suffering.

We have seen this before. Peace at any price is not peace. Peace at any price sometimes leads to tragic consequences. In the last century we saw the loss of tens of millions of lives because the goal was to seek peace at any price. We cannot make that mistake again.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CORKER. Again, Madam President, I thank my colleague very much for his passionate comments and his concern from day one about this agreement.

I think we ran over a little bit. I know Senator BROWN of Ohio ran over. If I can ask how much time remains on our side, I think we maybe go to 1:04 p.m., at least, or something like that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-eight minutes for the majority.

Mr. CORKER. So I know you all each asked for 15. If we could make it, instead, 14 each, so it is equally divided, Senator ROBERTS will enjoy that. This will be equally divided between our distinguished Senator GRASSLEY and Senator ROBERTS, and I thank them for letting me intervene and thank them both for being here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, this is a critically important debate on a nuclear deal that is going to have long-lasting impacts on our national security and the security of our friends and our allies. This debate is happening because 98 Senators expressed the desire to have a say on this agreement. This process will allow the American people to speak through their elected representatives, and I can say the American people overwhelmingly oppose this agreement. New public opinion polls released in just the last few days indicate that Americans in general are opposed to this deal by a margin of 2 to 1. Only 21 percent support it.

I participated in meetings with constituents in 25 of Iowa's 99 counties during the August work period. The message I received was overwhelmingly in opposition to this agreement. That is the same message I am hearing from Iowans who have written or called since the deal was announced in July.

After many weeks of studying the terms of the Iranian deal, also hearing from experts and attending classified briefings, and engaging in dialogue with my constituents, my initial skepticism has been confirmed. I have come to the conclusion this agreement presented to us is a bad deal that will not increase our national security or the security of our friends and allies and should be rejected.

The United States began the negotiations from a position of very real

strength. The international sanctions were obviously hurting Iran, and Iran wanted out from under those sanctions. The sanctions regime that Congress put in place over the objections of President Obama drove Iran to the negotiating table.

The administration, leading up to the negotiations and throughout the entire process, outlined the conditions for a good deal. President Obama and Secretary Kerry both made important statements about the goals of the negotiations. The goal was, of course, to dismantle Iran's nuclear program. Secretary Kerry himself said in the fall of 2013 that Iran has "no right to enrich," and that a good deal with Iran would "help Iran dismantle its nuclear program."

Despite all these assurances that negotiations would include "anytime, anywhere" inspections, the deal falls real short. President Obama negotiated away from these positions over the course of these negotiations.

This agreement accepts and legitimizes Iran as a nuclear threshold state. Iran will not dismantle many important parts of its uranium enrichment infrastructure, contrary to past U.S. policies that Iran not be allowed to enrich.

Iran also is permitted to continue a vast research and development program. Many of the significant limitations expire after 10 short years, leaving Iran an internationally legitimate nuclear program.

Iran could fully abide by this deal and be a nuclear threshold state, contrary to what we were promised by this administration and the initial goals that were announced by the President.

Now, with respect to inspections, international inspectors will not have anytime, anywhere access. They will have what is termed "managed access." In fact, the deal provides Iran with a 24-day process to further delay—we know what will happen—and hide prohibited activities. Iran has a track record of cheating, otherwise I couldn't say those things. They have cheated on past agreements. This deal allows Iran to stonewall the inspectors for up to 24 days.

The agreement also includes side agreements between Iran and the International Atomic Energy Agency that we can't review. Even the administration has not seen them. And people in this country expect us to read before we vote.

Of course, we can read the agreement, but we can't read side agreements that the law requires be given to the Congress to read under this special law. So we are going to be voting on things which we haven't seen and which the law says we should see.

The Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, which passed the Senate 98 to 1, requires the administration to provide to Congress access to all "annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing material, documents, and guidance, technical or other under-

standings and any related agreements" as part of our agreement with the President. It seems in this case we are being asked to put our faith in the Iranian regime to not cheat, contrary to what we know about them.

Iran has not provided details on the past military dimensions of its nuclear program even though the U.S. position was, very simply, that Iran had to come clean about that history before any sanctions relief. It is critical, for a robust verification regime to work, that the International Atomic Energy Agency have a full accounting of Iran's past efforts and stockpiles. Yet it appears that Iran will be allowed to supervise itself by conducting its own inspections and collect samples from its secretive military facility in Parchin, where much of the military dimensions of its nuclear program had been carried out.

I also oppose the last-minute decision to lift the embargo on conventional arms and ballistic missiles. GEN Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee in July that "we should under no circumstances relieve pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capabilities and arms trafficking."

They didn't listen to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. So under this agreement, after just 5 years the conventional arms embargo will be lifted. After just 8 years the ballistic missile embargo will be lifted. Iran has long sought the technology to develop intercontinental ballistic missiles, which would be a direct threat to the United States and our allies. And Iran's past arms trafficking to the Hezbollah, Hamas, and other terrorist organizations has long threatened the State of Israel and other Middle Eastern allies as well, and it of course threatens stability—very much so—in the region.

Once Iran has complied with the initial restraints on its nuclear program, many sanctions will be lifted. This will release somewhere around \$100 billion of frozen Iranian assets. The lifting of sanctions and release of these funds will only exacerbate Iran's support for terror and tradition of terror, with Iran having access to tens of billions of frozen assets to bolster its conventional military and further support global terrorism.

Even Obama administration officials have said that Iran is likely to use some of the funds to purchase weapons and fund terrorism that would threaten Americans and Israelis. Now, isn't that something—this administration negotiating an agreement where it is assumed that we are going to give them further resources to support efforts to kill Americans and Western Europeans.

The concept of "snapping back" these sanctions is another issue that has been discussed. These sanctions also appear less effective on the issue of snapping back than originally claimed. The complicated process to reimpose sanctions is unlikely to work

even if Iran fails to comply with the agreement. Iran views snapback sanctions as grounds to walk away from the agreement, so any effort to reimpose sanctions will be regarded by all parties as to whether or not to dissolve the agreement and impose sanctions.

I support a robust diplomatic effort that will prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapons capability, but I also strongly disagree with proponents of this agreement who argue that the only alternative to this deal is war. That, of course, is a false choice and intellectually dishonest.

Iran came to the negotiation table because it desperately sought sanctions relief. If this deal were rejected, we could impose even tougher sanctions, allowing our diplomats to negotiate a better deal that would more adequately safeguard our Nation's security interests and that of our allies. A better deal would not legitimize Iran as a nuclear threshold state, it would not trade massive sanctions relief for limited temporary constraints, and it would not provide concessions that will trigger a regional nuclear arms race.

If we reject this deal, we could push for an international agreement that would truly dismantle Iran's nuclear program and verifiably prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability.

A better deal would not ignore Iran's past bad behavior. Iran has for many years been the most active state sponsor of terrorism. Iran has an egregious record of human rights violations and the persecution of religious minorities. It continues to imprison U.S. citizens. At least 500 U.S. military deaths in Iraq and Afghanistan are directly linked to Iran and its support for anti-American militants.

This agreement will free up tens of billions of dollars in frozen Iranian assets without addressing any of these issues. We know Iran will use some of that money to support terrorist activities throughout the Middle East, and those are extended into the United States and Western Europe. Iran provides support for the brutal Assad regime in Syria, the Houthi rebels in Yemen, and provides weapons, funding, and support to Hamas and Hezbollah.

This deal appears to be the result of desperation on our side for a deal—any deal—and the Iranians knew that and took advantage of our weakness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will put the remainder in the RECORD.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, he may conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. This deal is a result of President Obama's philosophy of leading from behind. As a result of this philosophy, we now have enemies who don't fear us and friends and allies who don't follow us because they question our credibility and they question our leadership. We have a more dangerous world because of it.

President Obama himself said that it is better to have no deal than a bad deal. This deal has far too many shortcomings and will fail to make America and our allies safer. It will not prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons, while providing a windfall that will allow them to ramp up their bad behavior.

Obviously I oppose this deal, and I hope we can send a signal to the administration and Iran that we need a deal that improves our national security and the security of our friends and allies in the region and responds to the common sense of the American people who, through the polls, have shown they know this to be a bad deal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, we all come here to make a difference, and we have on the floor two Senators who have done just that—Senator CORKER and his counterpart on the Democrat side, Senator CARDIN, who is a good friend of mine. Both are good friends of mine. History will note in salutary terms what both of them have contributed in regard to leadership, perseverance, and trying to make a bad situation much better. I thank them for that.

I rise today concerned, disheartened, and fearful about the vote—or, to be more accurate, not even having a vote—regarding the issue before us that affects our national security and that of others worldwide.

We have before us the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, an Executive agreement whose original goal was to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear-armed state. In keeping with our constitutional responsibility and Senate tradition, what we should have before us is a treaty, but we do not. Were the Senate taking up a treaty, we could be having debate on rational, commonsense, and effective amendments that would protect our country and reduce the flames of turmoil in the Middle East and in Europe, but we are not. We are voting on a resolution of disapproval, and we may well end up voting not to vote at all—a probability I find inexplicable and outrageous. In the Senate's 226-year history, it has taken up almost 1,900 treaties and only rejected 22, many of which have dealt with subjects of much less consequence.

I deeply regret that the administration would not even consider the Senate allowing a vote on this crucial foreign policy and national security issue as a treaty. During debate on the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act in April, I voted in favor of Senator JOHNSON's amendment to do just that. We had the opportunity. The Senate failed to seize it.

I believe this agreement to be deeply flawed, and our failure to truly debate and fix what is in it represents an abrogation of our responsibilities—this in the face of an agreement or a “deal”

that is already adversely affecting the daily lives and well-being of individuals all around the world. Refugees throughout the Middle East recognize the United States is yielding both power and persuasion to Iran, and they are fleeing for their lives.

As if failure to consider this agreement is not enough, now consider the fact that there are those in this distinguished body who will try to block cloture and in doing so prevent even a simple yes-or-no vote on the resolution. Talk about an upside down, “Alice in Wonderland” exercise.

The Senate has already voted 98 to 2 to have a vote, and yet we stand here today ready to abrogate that vote.

So, my colleagues, what are we doing? We are simply debating a flawed agreement submitted to us by the President. We are not amending or voting on the agreement at all; we are just debating. The path which we take today—a detour into a box canyon, achieving nothing—has been forced upon us by the very same people who made the Senate swallow the nuclear option.

Where on Earth has the Senate gone? Well, the President has been breaking arms and political legs, urging my colleagues to use Senate procedure and deny Senators the right to vote. It is pretty simple: The President doesn't want the Senate to vote no on what he considers his foreign policy legacy.

However, on occasion, the Senate has put partisanship aside and debated issues of deep conviction and diverging opinions. This should be one of those times, but it is not. We should find a path forward that enables bipartisan accord as a legislative body. That path always starts when respect trumps partisanship. I regret that is not today, not this week, not this issue, not this President.

Given the fact that we are where we are, I think it is imperative that we fully understand how Iran interprets this agreement. The shoe is on the Iranian foot, and judging by the statements of their leaders, they believe it fits just fine.

We have heard in detail from Secretary Kerry. We have heard from and been lectured by the President. But Members should also know what Iranian President Hasan Ruhani and Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei told the Iranian people after the agreement was finalized. The difference is both pertinent and remarkable. Speaking before his constituency in Tehran, President Ruhani perfectly articulated where the United States began these so-called negotiations and where the United States made enormous concessions. According to him, we did not negotiate at all, we conceded.

It is a paradox of enormous irony that in order to know the truth about this agreement—highly praised by this administration and well-received by a determined minority in this Senate—to learn the unfortunate truth about who negotiated and who conceded, we have

to read and understand the remarks of President Ruhani of Iran to get the full picture.

President Ruhani stated that in the beginning, the United States capped the number of centrifuges to 100. Today, Iran is allowed over 6,000. Where original restriction and oversight were set for 20 years, today it is 8. With regard to research and development, the United States abandoned any limits on developing systems for enriching uranium. Instead, Iran is free to develop centrifuges to the highest level they desire—the IR-8. The administration placed a redline on heavy water production at the Iraq facility. Today the reactor will continue operating and produce heavy water.

We said sanctions would be lifted incrementally. Today they are virtually nonexistent. Soon Iran will receive a windfall of approximately \$100 to \$150 billion for whatever use it wishes—read, terrorism; read, anti-missile defense systems. Of greatest importance, what happened to the inspections regime? This administration said anytime, anywhere, but Iran walked away holding the key to who, how, and when inspectors will get in.

It is not so much what we in the United States know or believe. It is, rather, what Iran believes, in the words of their President and Supreme Leader. Their remarks not only put into absolute focus what the Iranian Government understands as their responsibility in regard to this agreement, but it also puts into perspective which side demanded and which side conceded.

The administration will argue President Ruhani's statements are but a show for the Iranian public; that Iran wants to claim they can become a stable influence in the Middle East. Sure, tell that to Israel. But the question remains, are we voting on an agreement or are we voting on concessions? According to President Ruhani, it is the latter.

Perhaps the proud boasting of President Ruhani is one thing, but the vows of the Ayatollah are quite another. His speech—punctuated by cheers of "Death to America," "Death to Israel"—vowed that regardless of the deals' approval, Iran would never stop supporting their friends in Palestine, Yemen, Syria, Iraq or Lebanon; the exact places Iran had been found backing terrorist organizations, which led to its listing as a State sponsor of terrorism by the State Department. But I have just listed the concessions and vows that Iran's leaders have made public. What about the ones that will never be revealed—the agreed-upon arrangements between Iran and the United Nations' International Atomic Energy Agency.

Today all Senators should be gravely concerned about these negotiations and agreements. Do we have access? No. Do we have information? No. Do we have transparency? No. Do we know what processes will be allowed? No. Well, actually we do.

Under the agreement's dispute resolution mechanisms, this agreement sets up a tortured path that does not just involve the much publicized 24-day waiting period. After 24 days, any dispute would be referred to a joint commission where there will be a 15-day waiting period. Then the dispute would be referred to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs with another 15-day day waiting period. Finally, the dispute would end up before an advisory board with—you guessed it—another 15-day waiting period. All of this, of course, can be delayed if the parties agree on an extension for further discussion, which they will.

Instead of resolution, we have an unending series of switchbacks to get to the top of a mountain which in fact we will never see. "The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results." We have tried IAEA inspections with Iran before, and they failed miserably. It seems nothing short of insane to say that we can trust Iran today.

This deal does more than give Iran the power to self-regulate, filibuster, and avoid inspections. It gives Iran the ability to remain unaccountable and rogue. This debate is not just about what the administration, this body or the American public thinks of an agreement with Iran, this is also very much about what the Iranians think we have and will accept.

I worry that we are looking at this so-called agreement through rose-colored glasses, based on hope and the misguided idea that any deal is better than no deal because the alternative is war. Why do I say "rose-colored glasses"? It is because civilized nations do that—nations such as America. We naturally want to believe that disaster and chaos will not happen but unfortunately they do.

Now, 14 years ago tomorrow, while heading into work I heard the news of the World Trade Center being attacked. My heart fell and my stomach churned because as a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee at that time, I had been repeating over and over again that the oceans no longer protected us and the nature of warfare was dramatically changing.

At the time of the attacks, coming up on 395, I could see black smoke billowing from the Pentagon. I knew the Capitol would be next. If it were not for the heroes of flight 93 who made the declaration "let's roll" a national rolling cry, my instincts would have been right and the Capitol would have been hit. The probability is I would not be making these remarks today had that happened.

Madam President, my colleagues, everybody watching, close your eyes. Imagine the terrible ramifications had that plane hit the Capitol. Where we sit today would have been rubble. Imagine that happening tomorrow.

Throughout our history, periods of peace, stability, and prosperity have unfortunately been the aberration, not

the norm. As a result, we have learned the hard way, as Americans who made the ultimate sacrifice in so many conflicts throughout our history. Around the world, we have witnessed man's inhumanity to man: the Holocaust, Cambodia, Rwanda, and now with the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria and their savage caliphate threatening almost indiscriminately against all those who do not subscribe to their Sharia law, and especially to our best ally in the region, the State of Israel.

My colleagues, despite our best efforts, our hope, our optimism, and the siren song, "It can't happen," I would only remind you that history tells us that it has happened, and it will happen again unless we have the courage to take off the rose-colored glasses and come to the realization with regard to the consequences of what we are doing or, more aptly put, not doing and whom we are dealing with. Today we are dealing with a State sponsor of terrorism and they will continue. Iran will become a nuclear-armed state.

As we mark the 14th anniversary of the horrific terrorist attacks and loss of over 3,000 Americans on September 11, 2001, I want to make it clear that I do not trust Iran, and I will never support concessions which will allow them to become a nuclear-armed state.

It is my hope to vote yes on the resolution of disapproval. As my good friend and colleague Senator CORNYN emphasized yesterday: Every Senator here should have—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority's time has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds.

Mr. CORKER. I agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. Every Senator should have the opportunity to vote on this issue, given the irony that Iran's leadership has given that power and privilege to its own Parliament. At least give me and others the privilege today, as a Senator, to cast the most important vote of my 35 years in public service.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I understand we have 60 minutes under Democratic control. I would ask unanimous consent that up to 7 minutes be available to Senator MERKLEY, up to 7 minutes to Senator MANCHIN, up to 6 minutes to Senator DONNELLY, up to 18 minutes to Senator FRANKEN, and up to 5 minutes to Senator HIRONO, and up to 10 minutes to Senator MARKEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, the United States, our citizens, our President, and I believe every single Member of Congress stand united in our commitment to block Iran from securing a nuclear weapon. The question we

are debating is the pathway that is best for ensuring that outcome. Is the international agreement negotiated between Iran and the P5+1 nations the best strategy for blocking Iran's potential pursuit of a nuclear weapon or is there some other route that yields better probability, better outcome? That is the issue we are considering.

Over the last month, I have explored the strengths of every argument and counterargument. I have met with policy experts, intelligence analysts, advocates, and the Ambassadors of our partner nations. I have sought and received the counsel of Oregonians on both sides of this issue. Taking all of this into account, this deal is the best available strategy for blocking Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

The plan's strength is that for 15 years it creates an effective framework for blocking Iran's three pathways to securing a nuclear weapon: the uranium path, the plutonium path, and the covert path. It blocks the uranium path by requiring Iran to dismantle two-thirds of its centrifuges; more importantly, to reduce its stockpile of enriched uranium by 97 percent; and to limit enrichment of uranium to 3.67 percent—far below the 90 percent required for a nuclear weapon.

It blocks Iran's plutonium pathway by requiring Iran to pull the core of its Arak reactor and to fill it with concrete, to build any replacement reactor with a design that will not produce weapons-grade plutonium, and to forgo the reprocessing of spent fuel which is essential to the plutonium path. The agreement also blocks a covert path to a bomb by imposing extensive inspections and monitoring. This includes providing onsite inspections anywhere a violation is suspected. Unprecedented procedures have been put in place to guarantee that Iran cannot indefinitely stall these inspections, including setting a maximum number of days for access and number of days that is guaranteed to ensure that we can, with confidence, detect any work with radioactive materials. The result—attested to by 75 nonproliferation experts and diplomats in a recent letter—is that it is “very likely that any future effort by Iran to pursue nuclear weapons, even a clandestine program, would be detected promptly.”

As many have pointed out on the floor today, the agreement is not without shortcomings. It has not sustained the current U.N. ban on Iran's importation of conventional arms. Iran could acquire conventional arms up to 5 years and missile technology after 8 years.

It does not dictate how Iran can spend the dollars it reclaims from cash assets that are frozen. It does not permanently maintain bright lines on Iran's nuclear research or nuclear energy program, lifting the 300-kilogram stockpile limit and 3.77 percent enrichment limit after 15 years. These exclusions are trouble.

It is possible, perhaps probable, that Iran will use some of that additional

cash and access to conventional arms to increase its support for terrorist groups. It is possible that Iran will use a nuclear research program and a nuclear energy program as the foundation for a future nuclear weapons program. That is a substantial concern.

For this reason, many have come to this floor and argued the United States, instead of implementing this agreement, should withdraw from it and negotiate a better deal. The prospects for that possibility, however, are slim.

Our P5+1 partners—and I have met with all of their Ambassadors to explore this issue—have committed the good faith of their governments behind this agreement. They believe this is the best path, the best opportunity to stop Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. They plan to honor the deal they have signed on to with or without the United States as long as Iran does as well. Iran has every reason to honor this agreement, even if the United States rejects it because agreement fulfills Iran's goal of lifting the international sanctions and it sets the stage for valuable trade and investment partnerships.

If Iran were to follow this course, it would gain many benefits while leaving the United States at odds with the balance of our partners, undermining, in a dramatic international fashion, American influence with strategic and security consequences throughout a large spectrum. On the other hand, if Iran exits this agreement and responds to its rejection by the United States, our country then is the one that stands in the pathway of a potential diplomatic solution to this incredibly important international security issue. It will be the United States blocking a plan with high confidence of stopping Iran from acquiring a nuclear bomb. Furthermore, the international support for economic sanctions would fray, giving Iran some of the economic relief it is seeking without the burden of intrusive inspections.

In short, this course would shatter diplomacy, impact and diminish American leadership, and shred our economic leverage, increasing reliance on one leftover tool—military options—while at the same time dramatically diminishing our confidence in the actual state of Iran's nuclear program. Less information, more reliance, and less confidence would be a dangerous combination.

The most effective strategy for blocking Iran's access to a nuclear bomb is to utilize this agreement and maximize American participation to hold Iran strictly accountable, not through the first 15 years but through the next decades that follow, where Iran is still completely constrained by its commitment to never develop a nuclear weapon.

After 15 years, Iran will be subject to the deal's requirement that it will never “seek, develop or acquire any nuclear weapons.” And Iran will continue

to be subject to ongoing intensive monitoring and verification by the International Atomic Energy Agency, or IAEA.

We, the United States, can greatly strengthen this framework. The United States should use a massive intelligence program to back up the plan in the first 15 years and strengthen the IAEA's monitoring after the first 15 years. The United States should lead the international community in defining the boundary that constitutes the difference between a nuclear research program and a nuclear energy program versus a nuclear weapons program. Those bright lines that are diminished are replaced with a commitment that has to be defined, and it is through participation and agreement that the United States can ensure that the international community sustains a clear line and enforces that clear line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 more seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. In conclusion, no foreign policy choice comes with guarantees. The future, whether we approve or reject this deal, is unknowable and carries risks. But this agreement, with its verification and full U.S. participation, offers the best prospect for stopping Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon at any point here forward, and for that reason I will support it.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, when I go home to my beautiful State of West Virginia, I have always said that if I can't explain it, I can't vote for it.

When this process began, I was supportive of the diplomatic efforts led by Secretaries Kerry and Moniz. I have always believed that to truly be a superpower, you must engage in superdiplomacy. Whenever I am able, I will choose diplomacy over war because the stakes are so high for West Virginia and our entire country.

In our State of West Virginia, we have one of the highest rates of military service in the Nation, participation-wise. But as I struggled with this decision, I could not ignore the fact that Iran, the country that will benefit most from the sanctions being lifted, refuses to change its 36-year history of sponsoring terrorism.

For me, this deal had to be about more than preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon for the next 10 to 15 years. For me, this deal had to address Iran's terrorist actions. Without doing so, it would reward Iran's 36 years of deplorable behavior and do nothing to prevent its destructive activities.

In fact, even during the negotiating process that we have been watching unfold, it has continued to hold four American hostages, support terrorism

around the world, breed anti-American sentiment, and acquire arms from Russia. The continued actions by Iran and its recent activities with Russia have proven to me that when we catch Iran violating the agreement—and I believe we will—I have grave doubts that we will have unified committed partners willing to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

I also cannot, in good conscience, agree to Iran receiving up to \$100 billion in funds that everyone knows will be used—at least in some part—to continue funding terrorism and further destabilize the Middle East. Lifting sanctions without ensuring that Iran's sponsorship of terrorism is neutralized is dangerous to regional and American security.

The administration has accepted what I consider to be a false choice—that this is only about nuclear weapons and not terrorism. However, the fact of the matter is that we are concerned about Iran having a bomb because, in large part, it is the world's largest state sponsor of terror. Asking us to set aside the terrorist question is irresponsible and misses the point.

Over the last 36 years, Iran has carried out thousands of acts of terror that have killed thousands of innocent lives, and not just in the Middle East but around the world. They have defied international sanctions and treaties, continued to call for an attempt to violently destroy the State of Israel, bombed diplomatic buildings, and murdered innocent civilians. On top of it all, Iran is directly responsible for the deaths of hundreds of U.S. soldiers. This regime has shown no signs that its deplorable behavior will change, and the deal does nothing to guarantee that behavior change.

The deal places real constraints on Iran's nuclear program for the next 10 to 15 years. After that term, Iran will be able to produce enough enriched uranium for a nuclear weapon in a very short period of time. While I hope its behavior will change in that span, I cannot gamble our security and that of our allies on the hope that Iran will conduct itself differently than it has for the last 36 years. It is because of that belief and a month of thoughtful consideration that I must cast a vote against this deal.

I do not believe that supporting this deal will prevent Iran from eventually acquiring a nuclear weapon or from continuing to be a leading sponsor of terrorism against Americans and our allies around the world. To those who are upset by my deliberations, I will simply say that the decision to pursue diplomacy is every bit as consequential as the decision to pursue war, and in many cases—possibly even this one—the choice to abandon the first path leads inevitably to the second. I, like most Americans and West Virginians, have already seen too much American sacrifice in the Middle East to push us down the path towards war. However, I don't believe a vote against this deal

forces us to abandon the diplomatic path. We must continue to pursue peace but on terms that promise a lasting peace for the United States and our allies.

I met with and spoke to every national security expert I could. I attended every secured briefing that was made available to me. I spoke with representatives of every Middle Eastern country, and most importantly, I listened to the good citizens of West Virginia. I thank all of my constituents who reached out to my office and to the many advisers who took their time to help me reach this decision.

I will continue to listen to my constituents, and I will support a path towards peace and diplomacy over war and aggression. But make no mistake about it. I will vote to use all of our military might to protect our homeland whenever it is threatened, defend our allies whenever they are put in harm's way, and to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

To be a superpower I believe you must possess superdiplomatic skills, and I believe we can use these skills to negotiate a better deal. We need a deal that citizens of West Virginia, our country, and the world know will make us safer.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, as Indiana's Senator, my top priority and most fundamental responsibility is to ensure the security of the people of Indiana and our Nation, as well as the security of our friends and allies, including Israel and the Gulf States. It is through the lens of these solemn obligations that I have carefully reviewed and evaluated the proposed nuclear agreement.

In making this decision, I bring to bear not only my responsibilities as a Senator but as the ranking member of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, overseeing our Nation's own nuclear arsenal and global nonproliferation efforts, and my convictions as a strong supporter of Israel and my concerns as a Hoosier who has attended the funerals of too many young men and women lost protecting our Nation in this conflict-ridden region.

After exhaustive assessment and careful thought, I determined that despite my questions about Iran's intentions, the most responsible course of action is to give this agreement the opportunity to succeed. It is not the agreement I would have written, but it is the one we have to make a decision on, and I believe the alternative is much more dangerous to our country and to Israel.

While reasonable people can disagree on the substance of the agreement, we can all agree that a nuclear-armed Iran poses an unacceptable threat to global security and the Iranian leadership should not and cannot be trusted. The question then becomes this: How can

we most effectively eliminate Iran's nuclear threat?

This agreement rolls back Iran's nuclear capabilities, shrinks its program, and gives us unprecedented access with the most intrusive inspections and verification regime ever put into place. Iran must get rid of 98 percent of their stockpiled uranium, more than two-thirds of their centrifuges, and the existing core of their heavy water plutonium reactor.

These measures not only give us the opportunity to restrain Iran's nuclear capabilities but also, according to our military leadership, improve the effectiveness of our military option should that one day become necessary. Without this agreement, we risk the worst of both worlds. The united front we have formed with the international community against Iran's nuclear program would break apart, the agreement would dissolve, sanctions relief would flow into Iran from those countries that are no longer willing to hold the line, and Iran is left with tens of thousands of centrifuges capable of producing highly enriched uranium, a heavy water reactor capable of producing weapons-grade plutonium, and a breakout time of just 2 to 3 months.

While I support this agreement, I also recognize that the only true guarantee that Iran will never become a nuclear-armed state is the steadfast resolve of the United States and our allies to do whatever is necessary to stop them and to put in place the policies to make that happen. With or without this deal, the day may come when we are left with no alternative but to take military action to prevent Iran from crossing a nuclear threshold. The burden and danger would, as always, be on the shoulders of our servicemembers, who put their lives on the line for our country.

Indiana is home to the Nation's fourth largest National Guard contingent, with more than 14,000 Hoosiers standing ready to serve their communities and our country. These men and women and the thousands of Hoosiers who serve in the Reserves and on Active Duty across the country and around the world have been called to serve time and time again. They have done so with honor and distinction. They make up the greatest fighting force the world has ever seen, and I have every confidence in their ability to meet any challenge put before them.

If the day does come that I am faced with a vote on whether to authorize military action against Iran, I owe it to our Armed Forces and to the people of Indiana to have tried all other options to stop Iran before we consider putting our servicemembers into harm's way.

We stand ready to take military action if needed, but we owe it to the young men and women who protect our country on the frontlines—from Terre Haute, Angola, Evansville, and Indianapolis—to at least try to find a peaceful solution. They should be able to expect at least that much from us here in

the Senate, and if that solution does not succeed, they stand ready.

While I share the concerns expressed by the agreement's critics about what may happen 10 years or 15 years or 20 years from now, I cannot in good conscience take action that would shift the potential risks of 2026 and 2031 to 2016.

I believe this agreement is, as my predecessor and friend, former U.S. Senator Richard Lugar, recently said, "our best chance to stop an Iranian bomb without another war in the Middle East." I owe Senator Lugar and my other fellow Hoosier, former Congressman Lee Hamilton, a great debt of gratitude for their input and expertise throughout this process.

This deal will not resolve every problem we have were Iran. It must be part of a comprehensive strategy to counter the broader threat Iran poses through their support for terrorists and other proxies across Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Yemen, and elsewhere.

I remain committed to working with my colleagues and friends on both sides of the aisle to confront these challenges with a clear, decisive strategy in the Middle East.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to express strong support for the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the diplomatic agreement that the United States and our international partners reached with Iran in July. I urge my colleagues to support the agreement and to reject the resolution of disapproval.

This is not a decision I came to lightly. Since the agreement was announced, I have consulted with nuclear and sanctions experts inside and outside the government, Obama administration officials, including Secretary of State John Kerry and Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz, Ambassadors from the other countries who negotiated alongside of us, our intelligence communities, advocates for Israel on both sides of the issue, my constituents in Minnesota, and, of course, with my colleagues in the Senate.

Many have expressed reservations about the agreement, and I share some of those reservations. It is not a perfect agreement, but it is a strong one. Many people have said no deal is better than a bad deal, but that doesn't mean that the only deal we can agree to is a perfect deal. The last perfect deal we got was on the deck of the USS *Missouri*. What a cost we had to pay for that, including the only use of a nuclear weapon in war—actually, two weapons.

This agreement is, in my opinion, the most effective, realistic option available to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon anytime in the next 15 years and beyond. Iran must never, ever have a nuclear weapon. And after 15 years, we will still have every option we currently have, up to and including

the use of military force, to prevent Iran from getting a bomb. Moreover, while critics have eagerly pointed out what they see as flaws in the deal, I have heard no persuasive arguments that there is a better alternative.

The agreement imposes a series of physical limits on Iran's nuclear program, especially its production of the fissile material it would require to make a bomb. The agreement's verification provisions are extremely strong, with 24/7 monitoring of and unfettered access to Iran's nuclear sites and ongoing surveillance of Iran's nuclear supply chain.

Let me briefly review the central limits on its nuclear program that Iran has agreed to and the verification provisions. Together they are designed to prevent Iran from trying to get a nuclear weapon and to detect them, if they do, with enough time to respond forcefully and effectively.

The agreement will prevent Iran from using weapons-grade plutonium as the fissile material for a nuclear weapon by requiring Iran to redesign and rebuild the Arak nuclear reactor, which, if completed as planned, could have produced enough weapons-grade plutonium for one or two bombs each year. Under the agreement, it won't be able to do that. Iran has to pull out the core of the nuclear reactor and fill it with concrete to destroy it. And Iran can't get any sanctions relief until it does that.

The agreement also significantly reduces and limits Iran's production of uranium which, in its highly enriched form, can also be used in a bomb. Iran currently has about 19,500 centrifuges capable of enriching uranium, and it has stockpiled about 10 tons of low-enriched uranium. Under the agreement, Iran has to go down to about 5,000 first-generation centrifuges for enriching uranium and down to 300 kilograms of low-enriched uranium—a 98-percent reduction. Iran does not get any sanctions relief until it does that.

Right now, it would take Iran about 2 to 3 months to get one weapon's worth of weapons-grade uranium. That is called the breakout time. The longer the breakout time is, of course, the better. This agreement will increase the breakout time to 1 year for the first decade. Because of the inspections included in the agreement, if Iran tried to cheat at their nuclear facilities and dash for a bomb, we would catch them almost instantaneously and have more than enough time to respond effectively. Iran's nuclear facilities will be subject to 24/7 monitoring and unfettered access by the inspectors of the International Atomic Energy Agency, or the IAEA. Limitations on Iran's nuclear facilities and strict verification make it impossible for Iran to dash for a bomb at its known nuclear facilities for the next 15 years.

But the verification provisions are also important for another reason. They make it much more difficult for Iran to be able to go for a bomb in se-

cret as well. Beyond the 24/7 monitoring of and unfettered access to Iran's nuclear sites, international inspectors will also be guaranteed access to any site in Iran that they have suspicions about, including military sites.

Now, a lot has been made about a provision in the agreement for resolving disputes when the IAEA seeks to access suspicious sites in Iran. That process can take up to 24 days. A lot of confusing and misleading things have been said about this. First of all, it is important to again emphasize that there is continuous monitoring at Iran's declared nuclear sites and unique safeguards on Iran's nuclear supply chain. That is not what the 24-day controversy is about.

Where the 24 days come in is in those cases where Iran disputes the IAEA's demand for access to a suspicious, undeclared site. People have expressed concerns that 24 days is too long. Prime Minister Netanyahu has likened this to giving a drug dealer 24-days' notice before you check his premises, saying that is a lot of time for a drug dealer to flush a lot of drugs down the toilet.

But here is the problem for Iran and the problem with this criticism. You can't hide radioactive material such as uranium. It leaves traces behind, and they can be detected for far, far longer than 24 days. One nuclear expert has said:

If Iran were to flush the evidence down the toilet, they'd have a radioactive toilet. And if they were to rip out the toilet, they'd have a radioactive hole in the ground.

Uranium-235 has a half-life of over 700 million years, and the half-life of uranium-238 is over 4 billion years. The IAEA will catch Iran after 24 days.

Now, it is true that there are some activities—related to weapons design, for example—that don't use nuclear materials and are much easier to hide. That is a genuine challenge that inspectors and our intelligence efforts will face. But the fact is that you can move a computer that you are doing design work on in 24 seconds or erase stuff in 24 milliseconds. I am sure it is actually a lot faster than that. But Iran is still not allowed to conduct those activities under the agreement and will face severe consequences if they get caught.

So the bottom line is that the IAEA's guaranteed access to suspicious sites will help support the verification of the agreement.

Perhaps more importantly, we will also have ongoing surveillance of Iran's nuclear supply chain. That means that in order to make a nuclear weapon in the next 15 years, and even beyond, Iran would have to reconstruct every individual piece of the chain—the mining, the milling, the production of centrifuges, and more—separately and in secret. And it would have to make sure it didn't get caught in any of the steps. This agreement—plus our own comprehensive intelligence efforts—would make it exceedingly unlikely that Iran

would be able to get away with any of that. And Iran would therefore risk losing everything it gained from the deal and the reimposition of sanctions, to say nothing of military attack.

We don't have to trust the regime's intentions to understand the reality it would face. Attempting to cheat on this agreement would carry an overwhelming likelihood of getting caught and serious consequences if it does.

We still have work to do to diminish the threat Iran poses to our national security and, of course, to the safety of our allies in the Middle East, beginning with Israel. As sanctions are lifted, the non-nuclear threat to the region may very well grow. We will need to bolster our support to regional counterweights such as Saudi Arabia. And, of course, we will need to maintain our terrorism-related sanctions, which are unaffected by the deal.

We also need to work very closely with Israel, our greatest friend in the region, in order to assure its security. As a Jew, I feel a deep bond with Israel. As a Senator, I have worked very hard to strengthen our country's bond with that nation and to bolster its security, and I will continue to do that. A nuclear-armed Iran would be a truly grave threat to Israel, and so I believe this agreement will contribute to the security of Israel because it is the most effective available means of preventing Iran from becoming nuclear armed, so do a number of very senior Israeli security experts, including some of the former heads of Israel's security services.

There is no doubt in my mind that this deal represents a significant step forward for our own national security.

One concern has been raised about what happens after year 15 when many of the restrictions in the deal expire. Well, there will still be major checks on Iran's nuclear program after that date. Under the deal, Iran will be subject to permanent, specific prohibitions on several of the steps necessary to build a bomb. Iran's nuclear program will still be subject to heightened monitoring by the IAEA and Iran's nuclear supply chain will still be subject to uniquely intrusive monitoring, which will limit Iran's ability to divert nuclear materials and equipment to a secret program without being detected.

Iran must never, ever have a nuclear weapon. We will still have every option we currently have, up to and including the use of military force, to prevent that from happening.

But we also must begin now to make the case to the world that the danger posed by an Iranian nuclear weapon will not expire in 15 years, and remind Iran that should it begin to take worrisome steps, such as enrichment inconsistent with a peaceful program, we stand ready to intervene.

That said, we don't know what the world will look like in 15 years. As long as this regime holds power, Iran will represent a dangerous threat to our security. But it is possible that by 2031,

Iran may no longer be controlled by hardliners determined to harm our interests. More than 60 percent of Iran's population is now under the age of 30. These young Iranians are increasingly well educated and pro American.

We don't know how this tension within Iran will work out. But I think if we reject this agreement, we will lose this opportunity with the people of Iran. If we back out of a deal we have agreed to, we will only embolden the hardliners who insist that America cannot be trusted. We will be doing self-inflicted damage to American global leadership and to the cause of international diplomacy.

What is more, the alternatives that I have heard run the gamut from unrealistic to horrifying. For example, some say that should the Senate reject this agreement, we would be in a position to negotiate a better one. But I have spoken to the Ambassadors or Deputy Chiefs of Mission of each of the five nations who helped broker the deal with us, and they all agree that this simply would not be the case. Instead, these diplomats have told me that we would not be able to come back to the bargaining table at all and that the sanction regimes would likely erode or just fall apart completely, giving Iran's leaders more money and more leverage and diminishing both our moral authority throughout the world and our own leverage. That is just the reality. And of course Iran would be able to move forward on its nuclear program, endangering our interests in the region—especially Israel—and making it far more likely that we will find ourselves engaged in a military conflict there. If Iran cheats on this agreement and we are a part of it, we will have a say in the international response. If we are not a part of this agreement, we will not.

Now, most opponents of the agreement do not seek or want war with Iran—even if opposition to the agreement makes such a war, in my opinion, more likely—but some of them do. One of my colleagues suggested that we should simply attack Iran now—an exercise he believes would be quick and painless to the United States. In fact, he compared it to Operation Desert Fox, intimating that it would be over and done with in a matter of days. But this is pure fantasy, at least according to what our security and intelligence experts tell us, and it is certainly not the lesson anyone should have learned from the disastrous invasion of Iraq.

The Middle East is an unstable, unpredictable, largely unfriendly region. We know that military undertakings in the region are likely to bring very painful, unpredictable consequences. That is partly why we should give diplomacy a chance. Yet, a number of my colleagues and others were intent on opposing such a diplomatic solution even before the agreement was reached.

In March—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. FRANKEN. I ask unanimous consent for another 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

In March, 47 of my Republican colleagues took the unprecedented step of sending a letter to Iran's leaders just as these sensitive negotiations were nearing an accord. It was a clear attempt to undermine American diplomacy and signaled that they would oppose any deal with Iran, no matter what the terms. So it is not surprising that these critics now oppose the finished deal, but it is disappointing that they refuse to acknowledge, let alone take responsibility for the dire consequences that would almost certainly result from killing it.

It is possible that there would not be a war if we reject the agreement, but what seems undeniable is that if we and we alone were to walk away from an agreement that we negotiated alongside our international partners, that would be a severe blow to our standing and our leadership in the world.

Diplomacy requires cooperation and compromise. You don't negotiate with your friends; you negotiate with your enemies.

Indeed, no one who is for this deal has any illusions about the Iranian regime, any more than the American Presidents who made nuclear arms agreements with the Soviet Union had illusions about the nature of the Communist regime there.

For a long time, it looked as if our only options when it came to Iran would be allowing it to have a nuclear weapon or having to bomb the country ourselves. This agreement represents a chance to break out of that no-win scenario. To take the extraordinary step of rejecting it because of clearly unrealistic expectations, because of a hunger to send Americans into another war, or, worst of all, because of petty partisanship would be a terrible mistake.

I therefore urge my colleagues to prevent this resolution of disapproval from moving forward and to vote in support of the agreement.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action that we have agreed to with our international partners and with Iran. This agreement, implemented effectively, is the best option we have to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

I sit on the Armed Services and Intelligence Committees. We have had numerous hearings. I have engaged with the administration. I have met with our international partners. I have studied the deal itself. I have read the commentary and analyses from all different perspectives. I have asked hard

questions. I have reached my conclusions based on the facts before us. This decision was not easy and should not be easy.

Like every Member of this body, I am committed to Israel's security. I am concerned about the alarming statements against Israel and Iran's support for terrorism. These concerns are real and valid.

Nuclear proliferation is one of the most consequential national security matters facing the world. Clearly, a nuclear Iran is unacceptable to all of us. So I would expect that any agreement to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon would be given serious, thoughtful consideration. Yet, there are those in this body and elsewhere who oppose even the idea of a diplomatic solution—at least one negotiated by the Obama administration. They have made clear their intention to oppose the agreement even while the negotiations were taking place.

For the first time I am aware of in U.S. history, dozens of Senators signed an open letter to a foreign government—the government of an adversary, no less—stating that any agreement reached by this administration would be undone. Before the actual ink was put to paper on the agreement, that was their message. Then, within hours of the deal's announcement, the same voices that opposed negotiations in the first place started denouncing it as a bad deal. Some claimed we could get a better deal. Others said that no deal was preferable, despite the fact that Iran was within 2 to 3 months of getting a nuclear bomb. I am fairly certain these people hadn't read the deal before they made such statements at the very outset. That is not how we should conduct foreign policy. Our national security, the security of Israel, and the stability of the Middle East are too important to turn into campaign ads or political rhetoric.

As we prepare to vote this afternoon, I would ask my colleagues to set politics aside and focus on the facts. The fact is, this agreement is the best option we have to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

First, we reached this agreement with the backing of our international partners, including China and Russia. I, along with some of my colleagues, met with Ambassadors of these countries, and I asked them point-blank: Would you come back to the table to bargain for another agreement if the United States walked away?

They said: No. There already is an agreement. It is the one that Congress should be supporting.

The Ambassador to the United States from the UK also said no.

I would remind my colleagues that after decades of U.S. unilateral sanctions against Iran, it was the weight of international sanctions that forced Iran to the table. We need our partners to make this deal work, and our partners have committed that if we choose this path, they will stand with us, they will be with us.

Second, the terms of this agreement, implemented effectively, cut off Iran's ability to create a bomb. Their uranium stockpiles will be all but eliminated. We will have unprecedented oversight over the entire nuclear supply chain.

The U.S. intelligence community has indicated that it will gain valuable new insights through this agreement. Indeed, with the information that can be garnered through this agreement, our intelligence community will be able to provide information that will enable us to make sure Iran stands up and abides by the provisions of this deal.

We will have veto authority of what goes into Iran and we will know what comes out of Iran.

These unprecedented oversight provisions have the support of arms control experts, nuclear scientists, diplomats, and military and intelligence leaders, all of whom believe this deal will make the difference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. HIRONO. I ask unanimous consent for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. HIRONO. Finally, this agreement isn't about trust. The deal requires verification that Iran is cooperating before sanctions can be lifted. If Iran cheats, we can snap back sanctions with international support. We can initiate military operations if we need to. Let me repeat. The deal before us does not prevent the United States from taking military action if needed.

This agreement is not perfect; however, rejecting this deal means risking our international cooperation, our security, and our ability to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

Based on the facts before us, this agreement deserves our support. Let's put politics aside. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the resolution before us today. I urge my colleagues to support the agreement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, for more than half a century, the United States has led global efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. Since the 1970s, the international community has set rules and procedures to prevent these weapons from spreading, particularly to unstable regions plagued by international and civil war.

Today, the world faces precisely this challenge in Iran. A nuclear weapon in the hands of Iran is a very real and dangerous threat not only to Israel and the entire Middle East but to all of humanity.

We are in unanimous agreement that Iran must never become a nuclear weapons state. Iran has given us good reason to be skeptical of its intentions. It has misled the world about its nuclear program, is a state sponsor of terrorism, and is a destabilizing force in the Middle East. With nuclear weapons,

the threat posed by Iran would increase exponentially. Because of these factors, we cannot ever trust Iran or ever give it a free pass on its destabilizing activity in the region and around the globe. As we speak today, Iran has the capability to develop a nuclear weapon within 3 months. With the Iran nuclear agreement, that will no longer be possible.

I believe that our negotiators achieved as much as possible and that if the agreement they negotiated is strictly implemented, it can do the job. On the other hand, if we walk away now, our diplomatic coalition will likely fall apart and the prospects for any renewed efforts would not be promising.

Together with many other Senators, I met with the Ambassadors of the five countries that joined in the effort to reach this agreement—Great Britain, France, Germany, China, and Russia. Their message was unified and crystal clear: If the United States walks away right now, we will be on our own and they will not come back to the table.

I acknowledge that the agreement carries risks, but, as recently stated in a letter signed by 29 leading American nuclear scientists, including six Nobel laureates, this agreement contains "more stringent constraints than any previous negotiated nonproliferation framework."

The agreement puts strict limits on Iran's nuclear program for the next 15 years. It reduces Iran's existing nuclear program to a fraction of its current size. It virtually eliminates Iran's plutonium capabilities and reduces its uranium capability by two-thirds. It pushes back the time required before Iran would be capable of building a nuclear bomb from 3 months to more than 1 year.

As I said earlier, this agreement is not based on trust. It imposes the most invasive, stringent, and technologically innovative verification regime ever negotiated. The agreement empowers inspectors to use the most advanced and intrusive methods to monitor Iran's compliance. This verification system will provide an unprecedented amount of reliable information and insight into Iran's nuclear program, ensuring that if Iran ever tries to develop a nuclear weapon, we will find out about it in time to stop them.

After 15 years, under both this agreement and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, Iran will remain bound never to seek nuclear weapons. In paragraph 3 of the agreement, Iran categorically makes the following binding obligation: "Under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop or acquire any nuclear weapons."

Under the agreement, Iran will be required to give the IAEA detailed plans for how it intends to develop nuclear technology for peaceful use. It will remain forever subject to IAEA inspection to verify that it never seeks nuclear weapons or engages in any nuclear weapons-related activities. If the

IAEA ever finds anything suspicious—not just in 10 or 15 or 25 or 40 years but forever—then it will be the IAEA's duty to promptly report its suspicions to the world. The IAEA's ability to verify Iran's compliance is the key to this agreement.

It will be critical to provide international inspectors with the support they require to detect, investigate, and respond to any suspicious nuclear activity before Iran has time to cover up the evidence.

With our support, the IAEA can and must aggressively investigate any indication of Iranian nuclear weapons activities and report promptly and unequivocally if Iran cheats. Likewise, we must be prepared to react at any time if the IAEA sounds the alarm.

I supported the tough sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place. There are mechanisms in this agreement to snap back sanctions quickly and prevent a Chinese or Russian veto.

Even without nuclear weapons, Iran poses very real risks, particularly to Israel, our closest friend in the region, and to our partners in the Arabian Peninsula. The administration has assured us that it is working closely with regional partners to enhance their security. Congress must be an active, insistent, and bipartisan partner in this effort, both with this President and his successors.

We must increase our security assistance to Israel to unprecedented levels. I have always been a strong supporter of Israel. When Saddam Hussein was developing nuclear weapons in 1981, I supported Israel's decision to bomb the Osirak reactor. When Israel needed more funding for a missile defense system in 2010, I voted to accelerate the development of the Iron Dome system. When Hamas attacked Israel in 2012, I supported its right to self-defense. We must continue to ensure Israel's qualitative military edge in the region and promptly finalize our new 10-year memorandum of understanding to cement our security assistance commitments. Likewise, we must strengthen our relationships with all of our regional partners. The countries of the Arabian Peninsula require our assistance to counter threats from Iran.

Our cooperation in ballistic missile defense and countering violent extremists through intelligence sharing and interdiction must continue and be enhanced. Over the past 2 months, I have consulted with many stakeholders, groups, advocates, and concerned constituents on both sides of this debate. Without exception, their passion is born of an unwavering desire to secure a lasting peace for the Middle East, Israel, the United States, and the world. This is a passion I share.

The world has come together in a historic way. With the agreement, we gain much, but most importantly, we avoid missing the significant diplomatic opportunity to ensure that Iran never emerges as a nuclear weapons state.

With this agreement, we will maintain the international solidarity that will enable us to reimpose sanctions if Iran ever does try to get a nuclear weapon. We will keep and continue to improve all of our capabilities required to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state, including a military option.

I thank Secretary Kerry, Secretary Moniz, and the entire U.S. negotiating team for their tireless efforts and service to our country in helping reach this agreement. I also thank President Obama for his leadership and commitment to diplomacy.

I urge the Senate to come together to support this diplomatic effort to prevent Iran from ever getting a nuclear weapon—not just this month or this year but forever. We must be ever-vigilant to ensure that every part of this agreement is verified.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, Congress presently has the heavy responsibility to conduct a thorough and rigorous review of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran. After numerous briefings from officials involved in the negotiations, consultation with scientific and diplomatic experts, meetings with Rhode Islanders, and a great deal of personal reflection, I have decided to support the plan. I do so because it blocks the pathways through which Iran could pursue a nuclear weapon, establishes unprecedented inspections of Iran's nuclear facilities and other sites of concern to the international community, and preserves our ability to respond militarily if necessary. The agreement also ensures the international sanctions regime against Iran can snap back into place if the Iranian Government reneges on its commitments.

This agreement, reached by the United States, United Kingdom, France, Germany, China, Russia, and Iran, establishes strict and comprehensive monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency to verify compliance and prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. The agreement does not take any options off the table for President Obama, or for future Presidents. It ensures no sanctions relief will be provided unless the Iranian Government undertakes a series of significant steps to satisfy IAEA requirements.

This agreement is the product of a joint effort among six sovereign countries, which working together have more force and effect than separated. I am encouraged that the other countries party to this agreement have committed to enforce this agreement and to ramp up enforcement of other international agreements against Iran's terror activities. I have also heard their warnings that if we walk away from this agreement before even giving it a try, the prospect of further multilateral negotiations yielding any better result is "far-fetched." Joining with other world powers in this impor-

tant effort bears a price in the United States' ability to negotiate unilaterally. That should be a surprise to no one. Critics of this agreement fail to acknowledge the leverage and strength behind a unified, international effort to block Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, and no one has offered a credible alternative that would lead to a nuclear weapons-free Iran.

This hard-fought bargain is the product of the canny determination of Secretary of State John Kerry, Energy Secretary and nuclear physicist Ernest Moniz, and Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Wendy Sherman, and of many months of hard work on the part of many dedicated American officials. It is also a testament to President Obama's steadfast resolve to reach a diplomatic solution to one of the most pressing security challenges of our time.

As more than 100 former American Ambassadors emphasized in their letter to the President endorsing the agreement, "the most effective way to protect U.S. national security, and that of our allies and friends, is to ensure that tough-minded diplomacy has a chance to succeed before considering other more costly and risky alternatives."

This agreement is also supported by more than two dozen leading American scientists, who found the deal to be "technically sound, stringent, and innovative" in its restrictions on Iran's nuclear capabilities and its monitoring and verification of Iran's compliance with the agreement.

By eliminating Iran's ability to gain a nuclear weapons capability for at least a decade, the deal allows the United States and the international community to focus needed energy and resources on other critical challenges Iran poses to the region, such as its support for Hezbollah and Syrian President Bashar Assad, as well as its human rights abuses.

Bilateral cooperation between the United States and Israel will be as important as ever as we go forward. This should include tangible demonstrations of support for Israel through deepened military and intelligence cooperation. President Obama has already declared his intention to provide "unprecedented" levels of military financing and equipment to Israel, on top of the record support already in place.

As former Israeli Deputy National Security Advisor Chuck Freilich has said, "The agreement, a painful compromise, not the one the U.S. or anyone else wanted, but the one it was able to negotiate, serves Israel's security." This conclusion is echoed in the words of officials from our Gulf Cooperation Council partners, like Qatar's Foreign Minister Khalid al-Attiyah, who said "This was the best option among other options," and "we are confident that what they [the negotiators] undertook makes this region safer and more stable."

I appreciate the thoughtful input of the many Rhode Islanders with whom I

met and who have reached out to me with opinions on both sides of this issue. It is, of course, a hallmark of our great democracy that we can openly and civilly debate these important questions. So too, I believe that through international engagement we can encourage a freer and more liberal society to emerge from the grip of the ayatollahs. That, with strong multilateral efforts to contain Iran's continuing mischief in the surrounding Middle East, provides the prospect of this becoming an historic turning point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I have been watching this debate as carefully as I possibly can. I think it has been very thoughtful. I think it is interesting that Members of this body have read the same agreement and come to different conclusions. It is not surprising. There are a lot of complications in this. Nobody can really know exactly how everything is going to turn out. So it does not surprise me that people have come to different conclusions.

I also agree with the Members of this body when they say this is probably one of the most important votes they will ever take. We are talking about a nuclear Iran and how we can potentially prevent that. That, obviously, would be a threat to world peace.

I know that sitting back in Oshkosh, WI, well before I ever became a Senator, I heard Members of parties declare definitively: We cannot allow Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon. Well, the sad fact is, I think this agreement puts it on a path to obtaining that weapon.

I also agree with President Obama in his speech really chastising those of us who don't agree with him when he says this is a pretty simple decision. I think it is a pretty simple decision. I just come at it from a totally different perspective and obviously draw a completely different conclusion from that.

Let me read a couple quotes that have been brought forth by Members of this body during this debate.

First:

Most importantly, this agreement cannot be based on hope or trust. History belies both in our experience with Iran. This deal is not the agreement I have long sought.

Another Senator:

We are legitimizing a vast and expanding nuclear program in Iran. We are, in effect, rewarding years of deception, deceit, and wanton disregard for international law.

Another Senator:

This agreement with the duplicitous and untrustworthy Iranian regime falls short of what I had envisioned.

Yet another:

This deal is not perfect and no one trusts Iran.

In my 4½ years in the Senate, I have been trying to find those areas of agreement. I agree with those comments. But what is kind of surprising about all of those quotes, these are

quotes from individual Senators—I won't name them—Senators who are going to vote to approve this awful deal. I think something else we can all agree on is that Iran is our enemy.

Let me read a couple other quotes.

Early this year, after his congregation broke out with a death to America chant, Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei said: Yes, of course. Yes, death to America, because America is the original source of this pressure. Death to America. Death to America.

Then only 2 days ago the Supreme Leader said: I say that you Israelis will not see the coming 25 years. And, God willing, there will not be something named the Zionist regime in the next 25 years.

So I agree that we cannot trust Iran. We cannot trust the Supreme Leader. I agree that Iran is our enemy. So my decision to vote for disapproval of this deal rests on a very simple premise: Why in the world would we ever enter a deal that will give tens of billions and eventually hundreds of billions of dollars to our enemy, our avowed enemy—an enemy that I have to remind this body was responsible, because of their IEDs, for the killing of 196 troops in Iraq and many more wounded and maimed, a regime that back in the late 1970s took 52 U.S. hostages for 444 days? That regime has not changed its behavior in all these intervening years. They are our enemy. Again, let me point out, why in the world would we ever agree to a deal that will strengthen our enemy's economy and our enemy's military? It seems pretty obvious. I agree with President Obama. This is a simple decision. But I disagree. He thinks it is a good deal. I think it is a very bad deal.

In my remaining time—I want to be respectful of my colleagues—I do want to talk about what this debate and what this vote is actually about. This is not a straight up-or-down vote to approve an international agreement that would be deemed a treaty. This body gave up our ability to deem this a treaty and provide advice and consent when we voted on my amendment to deem it a treaty.

President Obama, on his own authority, his article II powers, said: No, something this important, this consequential is not a treaty, it is an Executive agreement, and I can go it alone. And he basically did until the Senators from Tennessee and Maryland came together and recognized the fact that a key part of this deal is the waiver or lifting of the congressionally imposed sanctions that we put in place—against the President's objection, by the way—in 2012. What this debate is all about is whether President Obama can retain that waiver authority.

Regardless of how this turns out, President Obama, again, has negotiated this deal. He has run to the United Nations Security Council and gotten them to agree to it. The process will be put in place to lift those sanctions from the United Nations that, by

the way, were put in place in resolutions that would have required the suspension or halting of the uranium enrichment capability, which is not part of this deal, unfortunately.

So it is extremely important for the American people to understand that we are not debating and we are not going to be voting on the actual deal itself. We are going to be voting on something that has pretty weak involvement, pretty minor involvement, because President Obama has pretty well blocked us, blocked the American people from having a voice on a deal which is so important, so consequential, and which I believe is going to be so damaging to America's long-term interest, a deal which I believe really will put Iran on a path to obtaining a nuclear weapon. We are going to be lifting the arms embargo. We are already lifting the embargo on ballistic missile technology. And let me reiterate that we are going to be injecting tens of billions and eventually hundreds of billions of dollars to strengthen the economy and the military of our avowed enemy.

It is a simple decision for me, which is why I will vote to disapprove this very bad deal.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for his comments.

I rise today in opposition to this agreement. I do so because I believe it is bad for our country and bad for the world.

There are very few votes we take here in the Senate that have such a profound effect on our national security and the kind of world our kids and our grandkids are going to inherit as this upcoming vote we will take next week on this nuclear deal.

Over the past couple of months, I have taken the time to read the agreement carefully. I have attended the classified briefings. I have listened to my colleagues. I have talked to a lot of experts on both sides of the issue. I did take my time in coming to a decision because I was hopeful that we would be able to have an agreement that I could support and others could as well.

I have also listened to my constituents back home in Ohio. They have looked at this agreement too. They understand what is at stake. They have strong views on it. My calls and letters and emails are overwhelmingly opposed.

Through the process, what I did was I measured the agreement not based on just some abstract concept I might have, I actually based it on the actual objectives and criteria that were set out by the international community, the United Nations, and the United States of America, our government. I looked at it based on the redlines we had drawn. One of my great concerns about this agreement is that those redlines have not been honored. The broad

goal, of course, the biggest redline is that Congress, the Obama administration, the United Nations Security Council—everyone was very clear: Iran must stop and dismantle its nuclear weapons program. That is the most basic redline.

You have to remember that when Congress on a bipartisan basis enacted these crippling sanctions on Iran, it was not just to bring Iran to the table, which was the result, it was actually to get them to abandon their nuclear weapons program. That was the point.

I supported tougher sanctions to give leverage to the Obama administration even though, seriously, they did not want that leverage. They resisted Congress increasing those sanctions. In fact, they initially opposed any role for Congress in reviewing the agreement.

The Senator from Tennessee is here, the chairman of the committee, and he will tell you they are somehow reluctant even for Congress to have a role here, even to help them to be able to negotiate a better agreement. That was probably an indication of where we were going.

Despite that resistance, serious sanctions were enacted and Iran did come to the table. I had hoped then that with firm U.S. leadership—leading from the front, not from behind—we would be able to bring the international community along to ensure that we did meet the criteria I talked about earlier, longstanding, U.S.-international criteria. Unfortunately, after reviewing the terms of this agreement, it is explicitly clear that these redlines, these objectives, the criteria we have set out, have not been met.

We now have an obligation to reject this deal and begin to restore the consensus, both at home and abroad, that the Iranian Government must be isolated economically and diplomatically until it agrees to the longstanding terms on which the United States and the international community have long insisted. Some will say that is fine, but that is impossible. I respectfully disagree.

I respectfully quote President Obama, who has said repeatedly that no agreement is better than a bad agreement; meaning keeping the sanctions in place is better than a bad agreement. I believe that is where we are. This is a bad agreement.

Among the many serious flaws of this deal is the fact that Iran can continue research and development on more advanced centrifuges and can resume enrichment in 15 years, providing, at best, only temporary relief. Inspections, one of the most important safeguards we have, are not anywhere, anytime, as was talked about by the administration. Under this deal, Iran can delay the inspection of suspected nuclear sites for up to 24 days—and there is even a process to get to those 24 days. If the Iranians cheat, as they have in the past, we would have to employ a convoluted process to convince the international community to re-

store sanctions, a process I don't think we can rely on.

It is also important to note that other than reimposition of sanctions, the agreement does not specify any clear mechanism to enforce outcomes of the dispute resolution process, nor does it identify penalties for failure to comply. This means that the only realistic preagreed punishment for any violation—no matter how big or how small—is full reimposition of sanctions.

In a way, as I look at this, this is like having the death penalty as the only punishment for all crimes. I don't think that is realistic. I don't think you are going to get the international community to go along with that. That is why I worry about the compliance and the sanctions.

Given that only a full-blown Iranian violation would likely convince enough countries to reimpose all sanctions, I don't think the agreement provides the concrete tools to address less overt but still subversive forms of Iranian cheating that are designed to test international resolve and establish a new baseline for acceptable behavior. By the way, based on past behavior, this is likely.

In addition, of course, the inspections regime is subject to side deals between the United Nations, the International Atomic Agency, and Iran that none of us are allowed to see. This is contrary, by the way, to the Iran review act that was passed by Congress and was signed into law by the President of the United States. The language of that legislation is pretty clear. It requires the law to transmit to Congress "the agreement as defined in subsection (h)(1) including all related materials and annexes."

Then, when it talks about what that means it means, it says "including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, guidance, technical or other understandings," and so on and so forth. It is all here. That is in the agreement that we had with the President of the United States because it was part of the review act that he signed into law.

Based on recent press reporting, of course we are also hearing that Iran will be allowed to self-inspect, use its own inspectors and equipment to report on possible military dimensions of past suspected nuclear activity at one of its most secretive and important military facilities at Parchin.

Allowing a country accused of hiding a secret and illegal nuclear weapons program to implement verification measures for a facility where this program is believed to have been hidden certainly undermines the President's claim that the Iran deal "is not built on trust, it is built on verification."

Perhaps, most troubling is that this agreement ends Iran's international isolation without ending the behavior that caused Iran to be isolated in the first place.

As the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, based on our own State

Department analysis, Iran's nuclear program is just one part of a broader strategy that is dangerous and destabilizing. According to some estimates, of course, Iran will receive up to \$150 billion in sanctions relief early in the agreement—by the way, with or without sustained compliance—which will encourage the Iranians to cause trouble, to further support terrorist groups they sponsor.

National Security Advisor Susan Rice acknowledged something that I think is pretty plain. She said:

Iran is sending money to these groups now while they're under sanctions and they'll have more money to do it when sanctions are relieved.

Within 5 years, the agreement lifts the embargo on conventional weapons and lifts the ballistic missile embargo within 8 years—a last-minute concession to Iran in the rush by the administration to get to yes. At a minimum, this deal will ensure that Iran remains a threshold nuclear power but with a new set of tools and more resources to hurt our interests and those of our allies in the region, including Israel.

I believe it is clear that the deal, as currently written, will set up a conventional arms race in the Middle East. The President says the alternative to this deal is war. In fact, a Middle East bristling with arms will increase the risks of war—increase the risks of war because of this deal.

I have been involved in international negotiations. As U.S. Trade Representative, I understand they can be tough. I know both sides have to make concessions, but I also know that does not mean the United States of America concedes on fundamental principles, on the redlines. We have to have the courage to stand behind our legitimate public pronouncements, whether it is with the use of chemical weapons by the Assad regime in Syria, whether it is the violation of both Minsk cease-fire agreements by the Russians and their proxies in eastern Ukraine or our commitment that Iran must stop and dismantle its march toward nuclear weapons. These are all things you negotiate. These are all things you have to be firm on and tough on. It is not easy, but as Americans that is what we do.

There was a speech written that was never given, that was meant to be given on November 23, 1963. It was the day John F. Kennedy was assassinated. He said in that speech about America's role: Our generation, our Nation, by destiny—rather than choice—are the watch guards on the walls of world freedom.

That is who we are. We have to be tough in these negotiations and stand tall. Other countries look to us to be tall, to help build the consensus. That is what we had to do, and I believe we did not do in this what I am sure was a very difficult negotiation.

We have to honor our redlines. If we expect them to be effective in promoting peace and stability, we must lead. In particular, we have to say

what we mean and mean what we say if we are going to stop nuclear proliferation. The way this agreement developed I think will encourage other countries who are interested in pursuing nuclear weapons to say: I don't care what the U.N. says. I don't care what the United States says. What I see here is everything is negotiable. That is the message, I am afraid, this agreement will send.

The administration's position is that the only alternative to this agreement is war. That is what they are saying. As noted, if anything, I think this agreement will further destabilize an already turbulent region, but there is an alternative. The alternative to this bad deal is a better deal. Supporters of this agreement have compared this agreement to Ronald Reagan's arms control negotiations with the Soviets.

I want to just touch on that for a moment because I have heard a lot of that on the floor. I take a very different lesson from that analogy to Ronald Reagan. President Reagan succeeded by raising the pressure, not reducing it. He increased the cost of bad behavior until that behavior changed. He didn't strike a deal unless it fulfilled the core goals he had laid out, his redlines. He didn't want a deal for a deal's sake, and he was patient. At the Reykjavik summit in 1986, Ronald Reagan walked away from what would have been a major nuclear disarmament treaty with the Soviets because he felt the costs to U.S. national security were too high. He was criticized for walking away, but he kept trying. He held firm, and 1 year later he successfully concluded negotiations on the intermediate nuclear forces treaty.

This body must not sign off on an agreement that fails to honor our redlines, that strengthens Iran's destabilizing influence in the region, and does nothing to address the behavior that threatens our allies and our legitimate national security interests in this country.

We should reject this agreement with Iran and tighten those sanctions on a bipartisan basis. The President should then use the leverage that only America possesses to negotiate an international agreement that does meet the longstanding goals of the United Nations, of the international community, of the United States of America, of this Congress, and of the President himself.

We can't afford to get this one wrong, folks. We owe it to our children and grandchildren to get this right. As I noted in the beginning of my remarks, this is about what kind of a world they are going to inherit.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join me in rejecting the deal and pursuing a better way.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, for 23 years as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate

Foreign Relations Committee, I have had the privilege of dealing with major foreign policy and national security issues.

Many of those have been of a momentous nature. This is one of those moments.

I come to the issue of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran as someone who has followed Iran's nuclear ambition for the better part of two decades.

Unlike President Obama's characterization of those who have raised serious questions about the agreement or who have opposed it, I did not vote for the war in Iraq, I opposed it—unlike the Vice President and the Secretary of State who both supported it. My vote against the Iraq war was unpopular at the time, but it was one of the best decisions I have ever made. I have not hesitated to diplomatically negotiate with our adversaries or enemies, as is evidenced, for example, by my vote for the New START treaty with Russia.

I also don't come to the question as someone—unlike some of my Republican colleagues—who reflexively opposes everything the President proposes.

In fact, I have supported President Obama—according to Congressional Quarterly—98 percent of the time in 2013 and 2014. On key policies—ranging from voting for the Affordable Care Act to Wall Street reform, to supporting the President's Supreme Court nominees, defending the administration's actions in the Benghazi tragedy, shepherding within 1 vote for the authorization for use of military force to stop President Assad's use of chemical weapons when I was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to so much more—I have been a reliable supporter of the President, but my support is not and has not been driven by party loyalty but rather by principled agreement, not political expediency. When I have disagreed, it is based on principled disagreement.

The issue before the Senate now is whether to vote to approve or disapprove the agreement struck by the President and our P5+1 partners with Iran. This is one of the most serious national security, nuclear non-proliferation arms control issues of our time. It is not an issue of supporting or opposing the President. This issue is much greater and graver than that, and it deserves a vote.

With this agreement, I believe we have now abandoned our long-held policy of preventing nuclear proliferation, and we are now embarked not upon preventing it but on managing it or containing it, which leaves us with a far less desirable, less secure, and less certain world order.

So I am deeply concerned that this is a significant shift in our nonproliferation policy and about what it will mean in terms of a potential arms race in an already dangerous region.

Why does Iran, which has the world's fourth largest proven oil reserves, with

157 billion barrels of crude oil, and the world's second largest proven natural gas reserves, with 1,193 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, need nuclear power for domestic energy?

We know that despite the fact that Iran claims their nuclear program is for peaceful purposes, they have violated the international will, as expressed by various U.N. Security Council resolutions, and by deceit, deception, and delay advanced their program to the point of being a threshold nuclear State.

It is because of these facts and the fact that the world believes Iran was weaponizing its nuclear program at the Parchin military base—as well as developing a covert uranium enrichment facility in Fordow, built deep inside a mountain, raising serious doubts about the peaceful nature of their civilian program—and their sponsorship of state terrorism that the world united against Iran's nuclear program.

So in that context let's remind ourselves of the stated purpose of our negotiations with Iran. Simply put, it was to dismantle significant parts of Iran's illicit nuclear infrastructure to ensure that it would not have nuclear weapons capability at any time. We said we would accommodate Iran's practical national needs but not leave the region and the world facing the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran at a time of its choosing. In essence, we thought the agreement would be roll-back for rollback. You roll back your infrastructure, we roll back our sanctions. At the end of the day, what we appear to have is a roll back of sanctions and Iran only limiting its capability but not dismantling it or rolling back.

What did we get? We get an alarm bell should they decide to violate their commitments and a system for inspections to verify their compliance. That, in my view, is a far cry from dismantling.

Now, while I have many specific concerns about the agreement, my overarching concern is that it requires no dismantling of Iran's nuclear infrastructure and only mothballs that infrastructure for 10 years. Not even one centrifuge will be destroyed under this agreement. Fordow will be repurposed, Arak redesigned. The fact is everyone needs to understand what this agreement does and does not do so they can determine whether providing Iran permanent relief in exchange for short-term promises is a fair trade.

This deal does not require Iran to destroy or fully decommission a single uranium enrichment centrifuge. In fact, over half of Iran's currently operating centrifuges will continue to spin at its Natanz facility. The remainder, including more than 5,000 operating centrifuges and 10,000 not yet functioning, will merely be disconnected and transferred to another hall at Natanz, where they could be quickly reinstalled to enrich uranium.

Yet we, along with our allies, have agreed to lift the sanctions and allow

billions of dollars to flow back into Iran's economy. We lift sanctions, but even during the first 10 years of the agreement Iran will be allowed to continue R&D activity on a range of centrifuges, allowing them to improve their effectiveness over the course of the agreement.

Clearly, the question is: What did we get from this agreement in terms of what we originally sought? We lift sanctions, and at year 8 Iran can actually start manufacturing and testing advanced IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges that enrich up to 15 times the speed of its current models. At year 15, Iran can start enriching uranium beyond 3.67 percent, the level at which we become concerned about fissile material for a bomb. At year 15, Iran will have no limits on its uranium stockpile.

This deal grants Iran permanent sanctions relief in exchange for only temporary—temporary—limitations on its nuclear program. Not a rolling back, not dismantlement, but temporary limits. In fact, at year 10, the U.N. Security Council resolution will disappear, along with the dispute resolution mechanism needed to snap back U.N. sanctions and the 24-day mandatory access provision for suspicious sites in Iran.

The deal enshrines for Iran and, in fact, commits the international community to assisting Iran in developing an industrial-scale nuclear program, complete with industrial-scale enrichment.

Now, while I understand this program will be subject to Iran's obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, I think it fails to appreciate Iran's history of deception in its nuclear program and its violations of the NPT. It will, in the long run, if we believe there is a violation, make it much harder to demonstrate that Iran's program is not in fact being used for peaceful purposes because Iran will have legitimate reasons to have advanced centrifuges and a robust enrichment program. We will then have to demonstrate its intention is dual use and not justified by its industrial nuclear power program.

Within about a year of Iran meeting its initial obligations, Iran will receive sanctions relief to the tune of \$100 billion to \$150 billion, not just in the release of frozen assets that don't amount to that amount, but also in renewed oil sales of another million barrels a day as well as relief from sectoral sanctions in the petrochemical, shipbuilding, shipping, port sectors, gold and other precious metals, and software and automotive sectors.

Iran will also benefit from the removal of designated entities, including major banks, shipping companies, oil and gas firms from the U.S. Treasury list of sanctioned entities. "Of the nearly 650 entities that have been designated by the U.S. Treasury for their role in Iran's nuclear and missile program or for being controlled by the government of Iran, more than 67 per-

cent will be delisted within 6 to 12 months," according to testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

For Iran, all this relief comes likely within a year, even though its obligations stretch out for a decade or more. Considering the fact it was President Rouhani who, after conducting its fiscal audit after his election, likely convinced the Ayatollah that Iran's regime could not sustain itself under the sanctions and knew that only a negotiated agreement would get Iran the relief it critically needed to sustain the regime and the revolution, the negotiating leverage was and still is greatly on our side.

However, the JCPOA, in paragraph 26 of the sanctions heading of the agreement, says, "The U.S. Administration, acting consistently with the respective roles of the President and the Congress, will refrain from reintroducing or reimposing sanctions specified in Annex II, that it has ceased applying under this JCPOA."

I repeat: The United States will have to refrain from reintroducing or reimposing the Iran sanctions act that we passed unanimously, which expires next year and was critical in bringing Iran to the table in the first place.

In two hearings I asked Treasury Secretary Lew and Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman whether the United States has the right to reauthorize sanctions to have something to snap back to, and neither would answer the question, saying only it was too early to discuss reauthorization.

But I did get my answer from the Iranian Ambassador to the United Nations who, in a letter dated July 25 of this year, said:

It is clearly spelled out in the JCPOA that both the European Union and the United States will refrain from reintroducing or reimposing the sanctions and restrictive measures lifted under the JCPOA. It is understood that the reintroduction or reimposition, including through extension of the sanctions and restrictive measures will constitute significant nonperformance which would relieve Iran from its commitments in part or in whole.

The administration cannot argue sanctions policy both ways. Either they were effective in getting Iran to the negotiating table or they were not. Sanctions are either a deterrent to breakout or a violation of the agreement or they are not. Frankly, in my view, the overall sanctions relief being provided, given the Iranians' understanding of restrictions on the reauthorization of sanctions, along with the lifting of the arms and missile embargo well before Iranian compliance over years is established, leaves us in a weaker position and, to me, is unacceptable.

If anything is a fantasy, it is the belief that snapback without congressionally mandated sanctions, with EU sanctions gone and companies from around the world doing permissible business in Iran, will have any real effect. As the largest state sponsor of

terrorism, Iran—which has exported its revolution to Assad in Syria, the Houthis in Yemen, Hezbollah in Lebanon, directed and supported attacks against American troops in Iraq—will be flush with money not only to invest in their domestic economy but to further pursue their destabilizing hegemonic goals in the region.

If Iran can afford to destabilize the region with an economy staggering under sanctions and rocked by falling oil prices, what will Iran and the Quds Force do when they have a cash infusion of more than 20 percent of their GDP—the equivalent of an infusion of \$3.4 trillion into our economy?

And if there is a fear of war in the region, it will be one fueled by Iran and its proxies, exacerbated by an agreement that allows Iran to possess an industrial-sized nuclear program and enough money in sanctions relief to significantly continue to fund its hegemonic intentions throughout the region.

This brings me to another major concern with the JCPOA, namely the issue of Iran coming clean about the possible military dimension of its program. For well over a decade, the world has been concerned about the secret weaponization efforts conducted at the military base called Parchin. The goal we in the international community have long sought is to know what Iran accomplished at Parchin, not necessarily to get Iran to declare culpability but to determine how far along they were in their nuclear weaponization program so that we know what signatures to look for in the future.

David Albright, a physicist and former nuclear weapons inspector and founder of the Institute for Science and International Security, has said, "Addressing the IAEA's concerns about the military dimensions of Iran's nuclear programs is fundamental to any long-term agreement . . . an agreement that sidesteps the military issue would risk being unverifiable."

The reason he says an agreement that sidesteps the military issues would be unverifiable is because it makes a difference if you are 90 percent down the road in your weaponization efforts or only 10 percent advanced. How far advanced Iran's weaponizing abilities are has a significant impact on what Iran's breakout time to an actual deliverable weapon will be.

The list of scientists the P5+1 wanted the IAEA to interview were rejected outright by Iran. After waiting over 10 years to inspect Parchin, they are now given 3 months to do all of their review and analysis before they must deliver a report in December of this year.

How the inspections and soil and other samples are to be collected are outlined in two secret agreements the U.S. Congress is not privy to. The answer as to why we cannot see those documents is because they have a confidentiality agreement between the

IAEA and Iran which, they say, is customary, but this issue is anything but customary.

Let me quote from an AP story of August 14:

They say the agency will be able to report in December. But that assessment is unlikely to be unequivocal because chances are slim that Iran will present all the evidence the agency wants, or give it the total freedom of movement it needs to follow up the allegations. Still, the report is expected to be approved by the IAEA's board, which includes the United States and other powerful nations that negotiated the July 14 agreement. They do not want to upend their July 14 deal, and will see the December report as closing the books on the issue.

It would seem to me what we are doing is sweeping this critical issue under the rug.

Our willingness to accept this process in Parchin is only exacerbated by the inability to achieve anytime, anywhere inspections, which the administration always held out as one of those essential elements we would insist on and could rely on in any deal. Instead, we have a dispute resolution mechanism that shifts the burden of proof to the United States and its partners to provide sensitive intelligence, possibly revealing our sources and methods by which we collected the information, and allow the Iranians to delay access for nearly a month—a delay that would allow them to remove evidence of a violation, particularly when it comes to centrifuge research and development and weaponization efforts that can be easily hidden and would leave little or no signatures.

The administration suggests that other than Iraq, no country was subjected to anytime, anywhere inspections. But Iran's defiance of the world's position, as recognized in a series of U.N. Security Council resolutions, does not make it any other country. It is their violations of the NPT and the Security Council resolutions that created the necessity for a unique regime and for anytime, anywhere inspections. The willingness to accept these limitations are a dangerous bellwether of our willingness to enforce violations of the agreement as we move forward.

If what President Obama said in his NPR interview of April 7, 2015—"a more relevant fear would be that in year 13, 14, 15 they have advanced centrifuges that enrich uranium fairly rapidly, and at that point breakout times would have shrunk almost down to zero"—is true, it seems to me, in essence, this deal, at best, does nothing more than that kick today's problem down the road for 10 to 15 years. At the same time it undermines the arguments and evidence of suspected violations we will need because of the dual-use nature of their program to convince the Security Council and the international community to take action.

It is erroneous to say this agreement permanently stops Iran from having a nuclear bomb. Let us be clear. What the agreement does is to recommit Iran

not to pursue a nuclear bomb—a promise they have already violated in the past. It recommits them to the NPT treaty—an agreement they have already violated in the past. It commits them to a new Security Council resolution outlining their obligations, but they have violated those in the past as well.

So the suggestion of permanence in this case is only possible for so long as Iran complies and performs according to the agreement because the bottom line is, this agreement leaves Iran with the core elements of its robust nuclear infrastructure.

The fact is, success is not a question of Iran's conforming and performing according to the agreement. If that was all that was needed, if Iran had abided by its commitments all along, we wouldn't be faced with this challenge now. The test of success must be, if Iran violates the agreement and attempts to break out, how well will we be positioned to deal with Iran at that point?

Trying to reassemble the sanctions regime, including the time to give countries and companies notice of sanctionable activity, which had been permissible up to then, would take up most of the breakout time, assuming we could even get compliance after significant national and private investments had taken place. That, indeed, would be a fantasy. It would likely leave the next President, upon an Iranian decision to break out, with one of two choices: Accept Iran as a nuclear weapons state or take military action. Neither is desired, especially when Iran will be stronger, economically resurgent, a more consequential actor in the region, and with greater defensive capabilities, such as the S-300 missile defense system being sold to them by Russia.

So the suggestion of permanency in stopping Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon depends on performance. Based on the long history of Iran's broken promises, defiance, and violations, that is hopeful. Significant dismantlement, however, would establish performance up front, and therefore the threat of the capability to develop a nuclear weapon would truly be permanent, and any attempt to rebuild that infrastructure would give the world far more than 1 year's time.

The President and Secretary Kerry have repeatedly said the choice is between this agreement or war. I reject that proposition, as have most witnesses—including past and present administration members involved in this issue—who have testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and who support the deal but reject the binary choice between the agreement or war. If the P5 had not actually achieved an agreement with Iran, would we be at war with Iran today? I don't believe so.

I believe we can still get a better deal, and here is how: We can disapprove this agreement without reject-

ing the entire agreement. We should direct the administration to renegotiate by authorizing the continuation of negotiations and the joint plan of action—including Iran's \$700 million-a-month lifeline, which to date has accrued to Iran's benefit to the tune of \$10 billion—and pausing further reductions of purchases of Iranian oil and other sanctions pursuant to the original JPOA. Iran will continue to want such relief as well as avoid a possible military attack, so they are incentivized to come back to the negotiating table.

We can provide specific parameters for the administration to guide their continued negotiations and ensure that a new agreement does not run afoul of Congress. A continuation of talks would allow the reconsideration of just a few but a critical few issues, including the following:

First, the immediate ratification by Iran of the Additional Protocol to ensure that we have a permanent international agreement with Iran for access to suspect sites.

Second, a ban on centrifuge R&D for the duration of the agreement to ensure that Iran won't have the capacity to quickly break out just as the U.N. Security Council resolution and snapback sanctions are off the table.

Third, close the Fordow enrichment facility. The sole purpose of Fordow was to harden Iran's nuclear program to a military attack. We need to close the facility and foreclose Iran's future ability to use this facility. If Iran has nothing to hide, they shouldn't need to put it deep under a mountain.

Fourth, the full resolution of the "possible military dimensions" of Iran's program. We need an arrangement that isn't set to whitewash this issue. Iran and the IAEA must resolve the issue before permanent sanctions relief, and failure of Iran to cooperate with a comprehensive review should result in automatic sanctions snapback.

Fifth, extend the duration of the agreement. One of the single most concerning elements of the deal is its 10- to 15-year sunset of restrictions on Iran's program, with off-ramps starting after year 8. We were promised an agreement of significant duration, and we got less than half of what we are looking for. Iran should have to comply for as long as they deceived the world's position, so at least 20 years.

Sixth, we need agreement now about what penalties will be collectively imposed by P5+1 for Iranian violations, both small and midsized, as well as a clear statement as to the so-called grandfather clause in paragraph 37 of the JCPOA, to ensure that the U.S. position about not shielding contracts entered into legally upon reimposition of sanctions is shared by our allies.

Separately from the agreement but at the same time, we should extend the authorization of the Iran Sanctions Act, which expires in 2016, to ensure that we have an effective snapback option.

We should immediately implement the security measures offered to our partners in the gulf summit at Camp David, while preserving Israel's qualitative military edge.

The President should unequivocally affirm and Congress should endorse a declaration of U.S. policy that we will use all means necessary to prevent Iran from producing enough enriched uranium for a nuclear bomb, as well as building or buying one, both during and after any agreement. After all, that is what Iran is committing to. We should authorize now the means for Israel to address the Iranian threat on their own in the event Iran accelerates its program.

We must send a message to Iran that neither their regional behavior nor nuclear ambitions are permissible. If we push back regionally, they will be less likely to test the limits of our tolerance toward any violation of a nuclear agreement.

The agreement that has been reached failed to achieve the one thing it set out to achieve—it failed to stop Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state at a time of its choosing. In fact, in my view, it authorizes and supports the very roadmap Iran will need to achieve its target.

I know the administration will say that our partners will not follow us, that the sanctions regime will collapse and that they will allow Iran to proceed—as if our allies weren't worried about Iran crossing the nuclear weapons capability threshold anymore. I heard similar arguments from Secretary Kerry when he was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, as well as from Wendy Sherman, David Cohen, and others, when I was leading the charge to impose new sanctions on Iran. That didn't happen then, and I don't believe it will happen now.

Despite what some of our P5+1 Ambassadors have said in trying to rally support for the agreement—clearly, since they want this deal, they are not going to tell us they are willing to pursue another deal, echoing the administration's admonition that it is a "take it or leave it" proposition—our P5+1 partners will still be worried about Iran's nuclear weapons desire and the capability to achieve it, and the United States is the indispensable partner to ultimately ensure that doesn't happen.

They and the businesses from their countries and elsewhere will truly care more about their ability to do business in a U.S. economy of \$17 trillion than an Iranian economy of \$415 billion. And the importance of that economic relationship is palpable as we negotiate T-TIP, the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership agreement.

At this point, it is important to note that, over history, Congress has rejected outright or demanded changes to more than 200 treaties and international agreements, including 80 that were multilateral.

Whether or not the supporters admit it, this deal is based on hope—hope

that when the nuclear sunset clause expires, Iran will have succumbed to the benefits of commerce and global integration; hope that the hardliners will have lost their power and the revolution will end its hegemonic goals; and hope that the regime will allow the Iranian people to decide their fate, unlike the green revolution of 2009. Hope is part of human nature, but unfortunately it is not a national security strategy. The Iranian regime, led by the Ayatollah, wants above all to preserve the regime and its revolution, so it stretches incredulity to believe they signed on to a deal that would in any way weaken the regime or threaten the goals of the revolution.

I understand this deal represents a tradeoff, a hope that things may be different in Iran in 10 to 15 years. Maybe Iran will desist from its nuclear ambitions. Maybe they will stop exporting and supporting terrorism. Maybe they will stop holding innocent Americans hostage. Maybe they will stop burning American flags. Maybe their leadership will stop chanting "Death to America" in the streets of Tehran. Or maybe they won't.

I know that in many respects it would be far easier to support this deal, as it would have been to vote for the war in Iraq at the time. But I didn't choose the easier path then, and I am not going to now. My devotion to principle may once again lead me to an unpopular course, but if Iran is to acquire a nuclear bomb, it will not have my name on it.

It is for these reasons that I will vote for cloture and to disapprove the agreement.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, just inquiring—it is my understanding that Senator WARNER and Senator COONS are to speak now. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no order to that effect.

Mr. CORKER. It is my understanding that we have agreed to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time is under the control of the Democratic leader.

Mr. CORKER. How much time is left? That is really what I was getting at.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democrat leader.

Mr. DURBIN. I would say to the Senator from Tennessee through the Chair, it is my understanding that we have two 5-minute segments now. Senator WARNER and Senator COONS each claim 5 minutes.

Mr. CORKER. It is my understanding, then, that we will have that and then we move to an alternating session until the time of the vote. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is equally divided time until the vote, after the time allotted for the Democratic leader.

Mr. CORKER. And there is 10 minutes left on the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. CORKER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator from Virginia can proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in speaking on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

While this deal is far from perfect, I believe it is the best option available to us right now for preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

I share many of the concerns with this agreement that have been expressed by my colleagues, but the choice I ultimately had to make was between accepting an imperfect deal or facing the serious ramifications throughout the world if Congress rejects a deal that has the support of the international community, including many of our allies.

As I reviewed this agreement, I kept two fundamental questions in mind: No. 1, does this agreement advance the goal of keeping Iran free of nuclear weapons, and No. 2, is there a viable alternative that would be superior to this deal?

As many colleagues before me have outlined, this deal outlines a significant reduction in Iran's fissile material stockpile, reducing their uranium stockpile by 98 percent. It restricts Iran's production capacity and completely removes their ability to produce weapons-grade plutonium. It further limits Iran's research and development activities. These reductions and restrictions on Iran's nuclear infrastructure will extend Iran's breakout time from a matter of months to at least 1 year over the next 15 years.

This agreement also established a verification regime that includes continuous inspections. With the assistance of our intelligence community, verification goes beyond the four corners of this agreement. What this means is that we will have significantly more information about Iran's nuclear program with this deal than we would have without it.

The other major question we have to ask is, Is there a viable alternative to this deal? I have given those opponents numerous opportunities to convince me there was a viable alternative. The conclusion I have reached is that there is not.

I have been a strong supporter of tough international sanctions that helped bring Iran to the negotiating table in the first place. Since I have been in the Senate, I have supported every important piece of sanctions legislation passed by Congress. But during my deliberations, I spoke with representatives of many foreign governments—not the EU or the P5+1 entirely but also those nations, particularly in Asia—about whether they would be

willing to uphold sanctions to pressure Iran if we turned this deal down. In virtually every case, the response I got from allies was that if Congress were to reject this deal, the vast international sanctions that we have in place would fall apart. As we saw in the literally dozens of years prior, just U.S. unilateral sanctions alone are not enough.

I have determined that moving forward with this international agreement is our best option now to advance U.S. and world security.

I know we have other Members who want to speak, but let me add a couple of final comments.

While I support this deal, I believe there are additional actions Congress can and should take to strengthen it. I want to make sure that we—the United States—have the ability to respond to any Iranian activities with all means at our disposal.

While the inspections provided in this deal will give us better insight, there is more we can do. I am working with my colleagues—both supporters and opponents of the deal—on efforts to shore up its weaker points. I will work to clarify that Congress retains the ability to pass sanctions against Iran for nonnuclear misbehavior. My hope is that in future legislation, we will spell out that this agreement will not shield foreign companies if sanctions must be reimposed because of Iranian violations. And I will seek more reporting from the administration, including on how Iran uses any funds received through sanctions relief.

Moving forward, I will work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure Israel's security. I will press the administration and work with my colleagues to ensure that Israel preserves a qualitative military edge. I will look for ways to strengthen our commitments to Israel and support additional efforts to stop Iran from advancing both the nuclear agenda and from other efforts to destabilize the region.

Let me assure you that this agreement is the beginning and not the end of our combined international efforts to keep Iran free—not just today and not just for the next 15 years but forever—from having a nuclear weapon.

Before my colleague from Delaware speaks, I want to thank him for his efforts and many of us who spent a great deal of time the last few weeks of August talking about how we could build upon this agreement to make it stronger. He received assurances from the President and letters. I know that he and I and others are working on how we can even move beyond those assurances to make sure that we can look back on this agreement and recognize that we move not only the issue of peace but the issue of security going forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I would like to thank my colleague from the great State of Virginia and a number of

other colleagues who have dedicated a great deal of time to reflecting and to consulting together about what is the wisest and best path forward. The Senator from Maryland who is ably leading the floor debate and is the minority ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee and my colleague, and the Senator from Colorado, who will speak following me, are among many whom I have closely consulted. As was just remarked upon on the floor by the talented Senator from Virginia, this is a deal with flaws and with challenges that we must work together to address. I am hopeful and eager to find that path with the administration and with my colleagues to ensure that we do everything we can to deploy the full measure of America's military and economic capabilities to ensure the security of Israel and to ensure that this agreement—now that it is clear it will move forward—is fully, thoughtfully, and thoroughly implemented.

I want to rise briefly to address what I understand is now a scheduled cloture vote at 3:45 today. On critical and historic issues such as the nuclear agreement with Iran, I think the American people deserve to know how their individual Members of Congress—whether in the Senate or the House—will vote as their representatives. Over the years that I have served here, there have been far too many issues that were decided by a procedural vote—by a cloture vote—rather than by getting to the substance of the underlying issue. I think the American people deserve better than to have a critical issue such as this complex deal ultimately resolved with a procedural vote.

As we proceed to that vote later today, I wanted to let those who are watching know that is not the end of debate on this issue. If the cloture vote fails, as I believe it will, it means we will simply continue the debate and may take up another vote or several votes next week.

This morning leader REID made a fair offer to Senator MCCONNELL, the majority leader, on this floor to have a single up-or-down vote by a 60-vote margin, to clearly show the American people how every Member of this Chamber feels about this deal—to allow us to vote on the substance. It is my hope that the majority leader will reconsider and that either today or next week we will have the opportunity to have that up-or-down vote and to let the American people know exactly where each of us stands and then get to the demanding and difficult work of building a bipartisan coalition to deal with the challenges of this deal, to insist on effective deterrence of Iran's nuclear ambitions and to find a path together to joining the international community that is joined in the implementation of this deal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I would like to speak on the agreement the

P5+1 powers reached on Iran's nuclear program.

I was an early cosponsor of the bill that gave Congress an opportunity to evaluate the agreement. Because of that legislation, we have had extensive discussion and debate. This Chamber has a history of voting on critical national security issues at a 60-vote threshold, and I would have preferred an up-or-down vote on the merits. But, as too often happens, politics prevailed, and this will likely be the only vote we will have on this agreement. So this vote serves as the vote on the substance.

In 2003, Iran was operating approximately 164 centrifuges and had virtually no enriched uranium. By 2009, when the current administration took office, Iran had between 4,000 and 5,000 centrifuges installed.

Over the next few years, Congress passed increasingly tough sanctions that the administration, to its credit, set out to implement. As a member of the banking committee in 2010, I helped write and pass those sanctions.

By 2013, even in the grasp of the toughest international sanctions regime, Iran's nuclear program had raced forward.

The country had 19,000 centrifuges installed, 10 bombs worth of enriched uranium, and 2 to 3 months' breakout time to a bomb.

The harsh reality is that today Iran stands on the threshold of a nuclear weapon.

So we have to weigh the agreement against this set of facts.

Our goal throughout this process has been clear: to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

Like many Members of this Chamber, I have undertaken an exhaustive review of the agreement and a lengthy consultation process.

This included briefings from our own national security and intelligence experts, international verification experts, regional experts, former Israeli military and intelligence officials, and the P5+1 Ambassadors as well as Israel's Ambassador to the United States.

My conclusion is that the JCPOA is more likely to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon than the plausible alternatives. For that reason, I will vote to support the agreement.

It is no surprise to me that there are sincere, heartfelt differences of opinion about the merits of this deal. I have deep concerns about what the shape of Iran's nuclear program could look like beyond the 15 year horizon. But I also believe that implementation of this agreement is the best of bad options.

If Congress rejects this agreement, Iran will receive billions of dollars of sanctions relief and there will be no oversight of its nuclear program. That is an unacceptable result.

Some have argued that the United States could reject this agreement in favor of returning to the negotiating table. But this logic only holds if the

international coalition holds, and everything I heard this summer tells me that won't happen.

While this agreement has flaws, it is clearly better than the alternatives. The agreement is the best option for preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, and it maintains all of our options to respond to a move by Iran to break out to a bomb.

The agreement doesn't eliminate the deep concerns I hold about Iran's horrific acts of terror and its hegemonic pursuits, but all of Iran's malevolent acts would only be more dangerous if backed by a nuclear weapon.

We must also help our closest ally in the region, the State of Israel, defend itself. Let me be clear. The survival of the State of Israel is essential to the security of the Jewish people, and, as far as I am concerned, Israel's survival is essential to our humanity.

For these reasons and for our own security, we cannot allow Iran to acquire a nuclear weapon, and we must be crystal clear that we will use force to prevent it from doing so. In fact, we will have more credibility to use force if this agreement is in place, and we will have more legitimacy when we work to build an international coalition to respond to Iranian cheating.

There are risks to the successful implementation of the agreement, and the President and Congress must now work to make it stronger. I have worked with others in the Senate to push the administration toward that goal.

Since the announcement of the agreement, I have also worked with Senator CARDIN to develop a legislative package to address the accumulated shortcomings of our policies towards Iran and to strengthen the agreement.

Among other measures, our legislation will ensure that we track the resources Iran obtains from sanctions relief and work with our regional partners to counter conventional Iranian threats. It also invests in our intelligence capabilities and provides Israel deterrence to ensure Iran cannot shield covert systems and facilities, no matter how deeply they are buried.

As we implement this agreement, we must set in place a strategy with our partners to ensure that Iran appreciates the consequences of its violations, for the next 15 years and beyond.

My grandparents, John and Halina Klejman, and my mother Susanne Klejman had everyone and everything they knew taken from them in the Holocaust. Yet, as my grandmother always told me, they were the lucky ones—they had the chance to rebuild their shattered lives in a country that accepted them and let them succeed beyond their wildest dreams.

We live in dangerous times, and whether you support the agreement or not, we must develop a cohesive strategy for U.S. policy in the Middle East that addresses the grave security concerns in the region. Separate from Iran's nuclear program, the region is

threatened by war, sectarian violence, a terrible refugee crisis, and acts of barbaric brutality that belong to another century. We should seize this opportunity to play a constructive role in addressing these threats.

Our young men and women in the Armed Forces have been asked to sacrifice so much. None of us can have any doubt that, if called upon again, they would rise to any challenge, anywhere in the world. We honor their courage and spirit of sacrifice by exhausting diplomatic options before we turn to military ones. This isn't a sign of weakness but proof of our strength. And it will help us rally our allies to our side if ultimately we need to turn to military action.

Our primary objectives are to prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon, make sure Israel is safe, and, if possible, avoid another war in the Middle East. This agreement represents a flawed but important step to accomplish those goals. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we are now going to have brief comments, alternating between the two sides. We will begin with Senator GARDNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for his work to get us to this point, the countless hearings he has held, the briefings that we have had to fully understand the fine details and to scrutinize every aspect of the agreement that is now before us. I also wish to thank the ranking member and the Senator from New Jersey for their tireless efforts on the committee when it comes to the process that is before us.

Make no mistake. There is not a single Member in this body, in the Senate or House of Representatives, or the American public who would complain about the President's initial goals—the goals he laid out as recently as October of 2012, as he began negotiations with Iran.

I quote the President:

Our goal is to get Iran to recognize it needs to give up its nuclear program and abide by the U.N. resolutions that have been in place. . . . But the deal we'll accept is—they end their nuclear program. It's very straightforward.

But the deal we got from the administration is anything but the straightforward ending of a nuclear program. I have listened very carefully to the hearings we have held. I have listened to the classified briefings. I have studied the language of the text—language that says things such as this: "Requests for access pursuant to provisions of this JCPOA will be made in good faith, with due observance of the sovereign rights of Iran, and kept to the minimum necessary to effectively implement the verification responsibilities under this JCPOA."

Senator COLLINS from Maine a couple of days ago said it very well: "Not only will Iran retain its nuclear capability, but also it will be a far richer nation and one that has more conventional weapons and military technology than it possesses today."

This doesn't end the nuclear program as the President stated was his goals. It continues it. It paves a patient pathway to an industrialized nuclear complex in Iran. With the blessings of the world community, a flourishing economy, a lifting of the conventional arms embargo, a lifting of the ballistic missile embargo—and that is a good deal for us?

Over the last several days, I have heard colleague after colleague who are supporting this deal come to the floor to say things such as: This deal is flawed. It is not the best. It needs improvement. Since when did a bad option in the Senate become the only option in the Senate? Since when did second, third, fourth, fifth best for this country become the best for this country?

Several months ago I had the opportunity—as have many colleagues—to visit with Prime Minister Netanyahu to talk about the dance of porcupines created by entering this deal—the nuclear tripwire that will be set up because this does not end Iran's nuclear program. Through this deal, we have given up the golden nuggets of leverage that we had with Iran—our leverage of sanctions that were beginning to work. In fact, in the briefings that we have all attended, analysts have said that our sanctions are eroding support for the regime daily, hurting their economy, devaluing their currency, and bringing them to the table. Yet the deal that we have allows continued uranium enrichment, repeal of U.N. resolutions, and removal of the Iran nuclear issue from their agenda. That is the benefit of the bargain that the United States is about to enter into.

We heard talk over the past several days about status quo versus hypothetical. Here is the status quo that we will be entering into: a status quo that in 5 years allows conventional arms to resume in Iran, a status quo that will allow ballistic missiles to resume in 8 years and advanced centrifuge research to continue.

As the chairman of the committee stated yesterday, talking about how one IRH centrifuge could replace vast numbers of the current centrifuges they have today, they will be allowed to keep apparently all for radioisotope purposes.

Why do they need ballistic missiles and conventional arms for radiation treatment? We have desanctioned and delisted numerous individuals, people who were the fathers of the Iranian nuclear program, the A.Q. Khan of Iran, delisted, desanctioned under this deal.

Conglomerates of companies like IKO are delisted and desanctioned under this deal. These are a group of companies that were sanctioned in 2003 not

because of nuclear arms-related issues but because of their threat to the world financial system. That conglomerate is now desanctioned under the terms of the deal. Sure, the United States gets to sanction them on our own, but as we heard today, yesterday, and the day before, the sanctions the United States has apparently aren't enough, and that is why we have to enter into this deal. Yet we have, as Juan Zarate said, the Sword of Damocles holding over Iran's head with the snapback provisions that apparently are good enough when we do them on our own.

One of the things that hasn't been talked about very much over the past several weeks is a letter that Secretary Kerry sent to every Senator on September 2. I think that was around the same day that enough votes were achieved to block or sustain the President's filibuster.

In the first paragraph of this letter that every Senator received, there are two sentences that I want to make sure everybody here recognizes.

We share the concern expressed by many in Congress regarding Iran's continued support for terrorist and proxy groups throughout the region, its propping up of the Assad regime in Syria, its efforts to undermine the stability of its regional neighbors, and the threat it poses to Israel.

In the very next sentence, Secretary Kerry goes on to say:

We have no illusion that this behavior will change following implementation of the JCPOA.

We have no illusion that Iran's behavior will change. That is the status quo.

The letter goes on to detail what we are going to do once this deal is entered into:

Additional U.S.-GCC working groups are focused on counterterrorism, military preparedness . . . and the goal of building political support for multilateral U.S.-GCC ballistic missile defense (BMD) cooperation.

So we are going to enter into some deals to fight ballistic missiles that this deal allows in 8 years.

The letter goes on to say that we will push back against Iran's arms transfers. Conventional arms embargoes will be lifted in 5 years. The letter then goes on to say that we will work on Iran's Missile Technology Control Regime guidelines about the transfer of sensitive systems, such as ballistic missile technology, and yet this deal allows ballistic missiles in 8 years.

The letter goes on to say:

U.S. support for Israel and our Gulf partners has never been a partisan issue, and we believe these proposals would receive wide bipartisan support.

This is a partisan deal with bipartisan opposition, and I will submit that the only element of bipartisanship on the Senate floor today is the opposition.

I urge my colleagues to vote to invoke cloture. The American people deserve to know where the United States Senate stands and deserves to know where their Members of the Senate stand with the United States.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, in accordance with the law, Congress has been reviewing the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action for the past 53 days. I have spent countless hours reading, being briefed and poring over the intelligence. I have diligently worked to make an informed decision, one that weighs risk and considers a future 10, 15, 25 years from now. Without question, this vote is among the most serious I have taken. This vote has monumental and enduring consequences.

Throughout my review of this deal, my questions have been: How does this deal affect the safety and security of the United States? And how does this deal affect the safety, security and viability of Israel?

For all my time in both the House and Senate, I have been an unabashed and unwavering supporter of Israel. I have persistently supported the sanctions that brought Iran to the table. I have been insistent on foreign aid and military assistance to Israel that maintains its qualitative military edge on missile defense. With the horrors of the Holocaust in mind, I have been deeply committed to the need for a Jewish homeland, the State of Israel, and its inherent ability to defend itself, and for the United States to be an unwavering partner in Israel's defense. I have been and always will be committed to those principles.

I took an extensive review of this deal. I took a workman-like approach, covering every aspect of the deal: military, intelligence, diplomatic, economic. I actually read the deal, both the classified and the unclassified annex. I met the U.S. diplomats, nuclear experts and the national security staff who negotiated the deal. I actively participated in every classified and unclassified briefing available to me. I took the additional step of traveling to Vienna to meet with the Director General of the IAEA and his technical staff to evaluate for myself, first hand, the inspection and verification requirements. I have listened to my constituents, including leaders in the Jewish community. I did my homework.

Throughout, I asked the tough questions. And I questioned the answers to those questions. These were my key questions: No. 1, does this agreement block the four pathways to a nuclear bomb: highly enriched uranium at Natanz, highly enriched uranium at Fordow, weapons grade plutonium, and covert attempts to produce fissile material? No. 2, is it verifiable? No. 3, do inspections work to detect overt and covert violations of the agreement? No. 4, what is the impact of a 24-day delay to get an inspection? No. 5, does the IAEA have the capacity to implement the agreement? No. 6, what sanctions will be lifted, when and under what conditions? No. 7, do snapback sanctions really have a snap? No. 8, if we

reject this deal, what are the alternatives that would be effective and achievable?

The answer to my first question—does it block the four pathways to a nuclear bomb?—is yes. This deal sufficiently blocks the four pathways to get to a bomb. There is no shortcut to a nuclear bomb. This deal fundamentally addresses that fact.

First, it blocks Iran's ability to have weapons-grade plutonium. The Arak reactor would be redesigned. Spent fuel would be sent out of Iran in perpetuity. Efforts to use Arak for weapons-grade plutonium would be detected.

Second, it drastically cuts Iran's uranium enrichment capabilities by reducing Iran's inventory of active centrifuges at Fordow and Natanz. The deal also monitors the uranium supply chain and procurement channel for 25 years.

Third, it reduces Iran's uranium stockpile below levels needed to make a single bomb. It cuts the uranium stockpile by 98 percent, to 300 kilograms, for 15 years. It puts uranium enrichment of the remaining stockpile at 3.67 percent.

Fourth, by blocking the pathways, it makes it very difficult for Iran to develop a separate covert program.

In answering my second and third questions—is it verifiable? do inspections work to detect overt and covert violations of the agreement?—I have found that this deal provides sufficient verification and inspection mechanisms. The IAEA has extensive access to Iran's declared nuclear sites, making the detection of violations and a covert program more likely. The IAEA also has direct access to centrifuge manufacturing sites to conduct inspections on short notice. Under Iran's additional protocol, the verification and inspection process has also been scientifically reviewed and validated by the U.S. Department of Energy's nuclear scientists and endorsed by 29 of the Nation's top scientists, including several Nobel prizewinners who described the inspection process as "innovative and stringent."

In answer to my fourth question—what is the impact of a 24-day delay to get inspections?—the IAEA will have daily access to Iran's declared nuclear facilities: Natanz, Arak and Fordo. The 24-day process would apply to undeclared sites only. These would be sites where the IAEA suspects Iran is conducting covert nuclear activities.

In answer to my fifth question—does the IAEA have the capacity to implement the agreement?—I would say, yes. After visiting the IAEA in Vienna and delving into the organization, I believe that it has sufficient expertise to implement this deal. But all nations involved in its funding, including but not limited to the United States, have to be aggressively involved in monitoring the resources of the organization.

In answer to my sixth question—what sanctions will be lifted, when and under what conditions?—the parts of

the agreement that would lift sanctions are among its most complicated and controversial elements. I would have preferred a glidepath over a 3-year period, or longer, for sanctions relief. Under the agreement, however, no sanctions will be lifted until Iran takes key steps: limits its uranium enrichment program, resolves issues with possible military dimensions, converts the Arak facility, and allows for proper inspections. And these steps must be certified by the IAEA, which will deliver its key assessment of possible military dimensions on December 15.

When these requirements are met, the U.S. will lift sanctions in key sectors: oil and gas; banking and financial services; insurance related; shipping, ship building and transport; gold and precious metals; software; and people, including international travel visas. That process will take 6 months to 1 year. The sanctions are lifted, not terminated, and can be snapped back, per the agreement.

Which takes us to my seventh question—do snapback sanctions really have a snap? Russia, China, India, and our European partners were very active members of the negotiations with a common interest in Iran not having a nuclear weapon. I believe they would support a snapback in sanctions if a violation was identified and verified. But the snapback sanctions mechanism, while innovative, is untested.

Finally, I have asked if we reject this deal what the alternatives are that would be effective and achievable. I have considered the alternatives very closely, but in the end, they don't present a more viable option to this deal. The two alternatives are more sanctions or military action.

Some have suggested we reject this deal and impose unilateral sanctions to force Iran back to the table, but maintaining or stepping up sanctions will only work if the sanction coalition holds together. It is unclear if the European Union, Russia, China, India, and others would continue sanctions if Congress rejects this deal. At best, sanctions would be porous or limited to unilateral sanctions by the U.S., but these are the same reasons that the efficacy of the snapback provision is questioned. If you don't think snapback works, enhanced sanctions won't work either.

There are also those who have proposed military action as an alternative to end Iran's nuclear program, but taking military airstrikes against Iran would only set the program back for 3 years. It would not terminate the program. Iran would continue to possess the knowledge of how to build a bomb and could redouble its resolve to obtain a weapon, completely unchecked. Iran would almost certainly use Hezbollah or other proxies to attack Israel or conduct terrorist or cyber attacks against U.S. interests. The military option is always on the table for the United States. We are not afraid to use it. But military action should be the

last resort, since it will have only temporary effects versus the longer term effects of this deal.

No deal is perfect, especially one negotiated with the Iranian regime. I have concluded that this Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is the best option available to block Iran from having a nuclear bomb. For these reasons, I will vote in favor of this deal. However, Congress must also reaffirm our commitment to the safety and security of Israel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, please advise both sides of the time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republicans have 11 minutes 20 seconds, Democrats have 5 minutes 5 seconds.

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, over the past 5 months, we have learned much about the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and the intentions of Iran's ayatollahs. We know the nuclear deal will release billions of dollars to the terrorist-sponsoring Iranian regime. We know Qasem Soleimani and other terrorists who have killed Americans will be relieved of international sanctions. We know the side deals between the IAEA and Iran—side deals we have yet to see in this Senate—may entrust the Iranian regime to collect its own verification samples at its most secret nuclear facilities, allowing Iran to monitor itself instead of insisting on real, verifiable, and independent inspections.

We know the right to enrich at all, which this administration conceded early on in these negotiations, will trigger an arms race in the Middle East. Just this week, the ambassador from the United Arab Emirates told the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that if this deal goes through, the UAE may no longer abide by its nonproliferation agreements and may begin an enrichment program. I fear Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and other countries may follow suit.

We know the ayatollahs—fresh from the negotiating table at Vienna—continue to lead Quds Day crowds in chants of “Death to America” and issue threats at our president and our people.

And, yes, we know that the deal will begin to expire in a mere 10 to 15 years, unleashing a nuclear-capable Iran on the world, free of international sanctions, with a healthier economy, and without the restraints that American diplomacy has painstakingly cultivated over the past decade.

But, in the end, our vote on the Iran nuclear deal won't turn on any of these particulars. Ultimately, this vote isn't about specific centrifuge numbers or enrichment levels or the exact scope of sanctions relief. No, it is simpler than that.

This vote is about history. It is about the responsibility of this Senate and the greatest Republic in history. It is

about where we want the course of history to lead for our children and our grandchildren.

This vote is not about a party or a President. After all, the Iranians chant “Death to America,” not “Death to Democrats,” not “Death to Republicans,” not “Death to our President,” but “Death to America.” Just this week, the Iranians again labeled America the Great Satan.

So this vote is about empowering an evil, terror-sponsoring regime and continuing this history or seizing the moment to change history. If this deal is approved, in just a few years, Iran may test a nuclear device, as North Korea did in 2006, just 12 years after a similar nuclear agreement. With a rumbling explosion that will shake the Earth, Iran may announce its status as a nuclear power and the opening of a second nuclear age that our Nation has struggled so long to prevent.

If Iran goes nuclear, history will not remember kindly the Senators who supported this nuclear deal. It won't remember your hand-wringing, your anguished speeches, your brow-furrowing. It won't remember your glib beliefs about the flawed inspection system or unworkable enforcement mechanisms. It won't remember your soft rationalizations that this deal is “better than nothing” or “the only alternative to war.”

History will remember your vote and only your vote. It will remember that you opened the gate to Iran's path to a nuclear weapon. It will remember you as the ones who flipped the strategic balance of the Middle East and the world toward the favor of our enemies. And it will remember you, this Senate and this President, as the ones who, when given the chance to stop the world's worst sponsor of terrorism from obtaining the world's worst weapon, blinked when confronted with this evil.

A world menaced by a nuclear-capable Iran is a terrifying prospect. Over the past three decades, Iran has waged a low-intensity war on the United States and our partners. Iran has financed and trained Hezbollah and Hamas terrorists to do its bidding as their proxy. Iran fueled the virulent insurgency whose roadside bombs and suicide attacks devastated Iraq and sadly killed or maimed thousands of American troops. And Iran has sowed unrest throughout the Middle East and propped up Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad, creating a crisis that has engulfed the entire region and that is fast spreading beyond its borders and other parts of the world.

Iran has done all of this without nuclear weapons. Should it be allowed to continue enrichment and conduct research and development on nuclear technology—as this deal lets it—the ayatollahs will grow even more brazen, fearsome, reckless, and insulated from conventional forms of deterrence and pressure. Upon the expiration of this deal—or its repudiation by the ayatollahs at a time of their choosing—

Iran's strategy of terror and intimidation will become nuclearized.

That is the world we may face in a few short years because of your votes. That is the threat we will confront if you bestow your blessing on a nuclear program run by the anti-American, anti-Israel, Jihadist regime in Tehran.

So we should soberly recognize that the context of this vote isn't a debate that is fast coming to a close. The context isn't demagoguery or backroom pressure from a lameduck President, and it isn't the effect of this vote on our political fortunes.

The context for this vote is the broad sweep of history.

In late 1936, Winston Churchill spoke on the years of British appeasement in the face of German rearmament. He observed:

The era of procrastination, of half-measures, of soothing and baffling expedients, of delays, is coming to a close. In its place we are entering a period of consequences.

Churchill's words are as true today as they were then. We are entering a period of consequences. Because of your vote today, the consequences may well be nuclear. God help us all if they are.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I am pleased that shortly we will have a chance to vote. I would have preferred the vote to be on the final passage of the resolution with the 60-vote threshold. I regret that was not agreed to.

I will vote what I think is in the best interest of our country, to keep Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state, and our best chance to avoid a military option. I have already indicated that I intend to oppose the agreement and I have given my reasons on the floor and I will not repeat them at this moment.

But I wish to speak about what happens after this vote is over and whatever votes take place next week, with the deadline being next Thursday. At that time, I hope everyone here recognizes that it is important for us to put division aside. I wish to remind some of my colleagues of what happened 14 years ago on a vote with Iraq, the authorization for force. I voted against that resolution. And when that vote was over, Democrats and Republicans, proponents and opponents, joined together to support our troops and our mission under the leadership of President Bush to give America the best chance for its foreign policy to succeed.

So when the votes are over, I hope that Democrats and Republicans, proponents and opponents of the plan will work towards congressional involvement. Working with the President gives us our best opportunity to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state and gives us the least risk of using a military option. I say that because my colleague from Maryland outlined that very clearly. A mili-

tary option—although we must have that option in our quill—a military option will not solve the problem and it has a lot of collateral consequences.

I hope we can work together, because that is what is in the best interest of the U.S. Senate. That is what is in the best interest of the United States of America.

I look forward to working with Senator CORKER and all members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the U.S. Senate to see how Congress can work together with our President so that we can achieve that goal.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I will be brief. I know the Senator from Tennessee would like to close on this matter.

I think everything that needs to be said about the details of this deal has already been said. I do want to be recorded for history's purposes, although I know what is going to happen in regards to this if it goes through. Iran will immediately use the money in sanctions relief to begin building up its conventional capabilities. It will establish the most dominant military power in the region outside of the United States, and it will raise the price of us operating in the region. They are going to build anti-access capabilities, rockets capable of destroying our aircraft carriers and ships, continue to build these swift boats, these fast boats that are able to swarm our naval assets so that it will make it harder and harder for U.S. troops to be in the region. They will also work with other terrorist groups in the region to target American service men and women. They may or may not deny that they are involved, but they will target us and raise the price of our presence in the Middle East until they hope to completely pull us out of that region. They will also continue to build long-range missiles capable of reaching the United States. Those are not affected by this deal, and they will continue to build them as they have been doing.

Then, at some point in the near future, when the time is right, they will build a nuclear weapon, and they will do so because at that point they will know that they have become immune, that we will no longer be able to strike their nuclear program, because the price of doing so will be too high.

This is not just the work of imagination; it exists in the world today. It is called North Korea, where a lunatic possesses dozens of nuclear weapons and a long-range rocket that can already reach the United States, and we cannot do anything about it. An attack on North Korea today would result in an attack on Tokyo or Seoul or Guam or Hawaii or California. So the world must now live with a lunatic in possession of nuclear weapons.

This is the goal Iran has as well—to reach a point where they become im-

mune to any sort of credible military threat because the price of a military strike would be too high, and then they become an established nuclear weapons power. Never in the history of the world has such a regime ever possessed weapons so capable of destruction.

Iran is led by a supreme leader who is a radical Shia cleric with an apocalyptic vision of the future. He is not a traditional geopolitical actor who makes decisions on the basis of borders or simply history or because of ambition. He has a religious apocalyptic vision of the future—one that calls for triggering a conflict between the non-Muslim world and the Muslim world, one that he feels especially obligated to trigger. And he is going to possess nuclear weapons? This is the world that we are on the verge of leaving our children to inherit and perhaps we ourselves will have to share in.

So I want to be recorded for history's purposes if nothing else to say that those of us who opposed this deal understood where it would lead, and we are making a terrible mistake. I fear that the passage of this deal will make it even harder for us to prevent it. I hope there is still time to change our minds.

But here is the good news. Iran may have a Supreme Leader, but America does not. In this Nation, we have a republic, and soon we will have new leaders, perhaps in this chamber but also in the executive branch. I pray on their first day in office they will reverse this deal and reimpose the sanctions and back them up with a credible threat of military force, or history will condemn us for not doing what needed to be done in the world's history.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, a lot has been said about the impact of this agreement. I would like to speak for a moment about the impact of no agreement. What if the Republicans and those who oppose this agreement have their way and this agreement goes away? Iran is still a nuclear threshold state. If you have your way and stop this agreement, the result will be literally leaving in Iran the capacity to build 10 nuclear weapons today. And the timing on that: 2 to 3 months before they have the fissile material for a nuclear weapon—if you have your way and kill this agreement.

That is some holiday surprise, that if we walk away from this agreement, this effort for inspection, Iran could develop a nuclear weapon. That is the reality. If you have your way, there will be no inspectors. Iran will be closed off to the world. How can that possibly make the Middle East safer for Israel or for any other country in the world? How can it make it safer if we as a coalition who have worked so hard to build this agreement fail in the effort?

What I have listened for during the last 3 days of debate is any suggestion from the other side of the aisle about

what is the alternative to this agreement. Now, some have been bold enough to say it is military, and we shouldn't wince at the prospect of a military solution. One Senator on the other side of the aisle said 4 days is all we need to take them out; we will take care of Iran. I have heard that before, I say to my friends. I heard it before the invasion of Iraq where we were going to be greeted as liberators, and it would be a matter of weeks before our troops would be coming home. It didn't turn out that way.

What we are trying to do and what the President is trying to do is to start a diplomatic process to avoid the military option, to avoid a war. That is why I am supporting it. I think it is the right thing to do. I am sorry that the vote we are about to cast here is a procedural vote. Twice, Senator REID has asked Senator MCCONNELL to give us a straight, up-or-down, clean vote on this question of disapproval by a 60-vote margin, and twice Senator MCCONNELL has objected and insisted instead on this procedural vote. We know where everyone stands. Everyone in this chamber has publicly declared where they stand on this matter. That should be the rollcall that we take next. Unfortunately, we are faced with a procedural rollcall.

I will close by saying one word about the Members on this side of the aisle. For 6 weeks I have contacted them—and in fact harassed them—asking them what they were going to do on this important question. For any people who are critical of this Senate, believing it is too superficial and too partisan, I will tell you that on this side of the aisle they took their time, they read the agreements, they were briefed by the intelligence agencies and Department of Defense, and they made up their mind and announced their position publicly. It is a proud moment for this institution because I think that is what we all believe to be our responsibility.

As we close this debate, I ask those who support the agreement to vote no on the cloture motion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, before I make closing comments, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture vote this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I wish to begin by thanking the vast majority of this body for the fact that over—four times since 2010, Members of this body almost unanimously passed sanctions that brought Iran to the table—people on both sides of the aisle. I want to thank people for that.

I want to thank this body for another reason. When we realized that the President was going to negotiate with Iran and do so through what was called

a nonbinding political commitment and that he was going to take this agreement directly to the U.N. Security Council—he was not going to cause it to be a treaty, but he was going to cause it to be an agreement that he could execute without our involvement—because of the fact that we brought Iran to the table through the sanctions that we collectively put in place, we rose up and we passed a bill on a 98-to-1 basis that allowed us to go through this process we are going through today.

I want to thank Senator CARDIN, who has been an outstanding ranking member. I want to thank Senator MENENDEZ before him, who was an outstanding chairman and ranking member.

What this agreement said we would do is we would debate. I want to stop there and say that I think we have had a dignified debate. People on both sides of the aisle have handled themselves as Senators, and I am very proud of that.

The other piece of that was that we would vote, that we would let the people of this country know where we stood. We have a bipartisan majority that disapproves of this deal. The most substantial foreign policy people on the Democratic side oppose this deal. Always we have known that yes, we were going to do this under regular order, and under regular order what that means is there is this procedural vote where the Senate decides that debate has ended and we are going to move to a final vote. We are at that juncture, and I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that on a 98-to-1 basis voted to allow us to vote to now vote yes on this cloture motion, to allow the Members of this Senate, who have handled themselves so responsibly, to be able to record on a majority basis where we stand on this issue.

The majority of the people in the Senate believe that this deal that has been negotiated is not in the national interest of this country, will not make our Nation or the Middle East safer, and I hope that all of us are going to have that opportunity to vote after we pass this procedural hurdle. I hope that all Members will vote to allow this to proceed to a final vote within the next few days.

With that, I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2640.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Kelly Ayotte, John Thune, Cory Gardner, Mike Crapo, Ron Johnson, Joni Ernst, Tom Cotton, James M. Inhofe, Thad Cochran, Bill Cassidy, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Jerry Moran, John McCain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2640, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, to H.J. Res. 61, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 264 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Ayotte	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cardin	Hoeben	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Schumer
Coats	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johnson	Sessions
Collins	Kirk	Shelby
Corker	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Menendez	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	
Ernst	Murkowski	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 58, the nays are 42.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the cloture motion with respect to H.J. Res. 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 2640.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2640.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Bob Corker, Steve Daines, David Perdue, Tom Cotton, Susan M.

Collins, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, Ron Johnson, Cory Gardner, Marco Rubio, Lamar Alexander, James M. Inhofe, Mike Rounds.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for H.J. Res. 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.J. Res. 61, a joint resolution amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Bob Corker, Steve Daines, David Perdue, Tom Cotton, Susan M. Collins, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, Ron Johnson, Cory Gardner, Marco Rubio, Lamar Alexander, James M. Inhofe, Mike Rounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the issue before us is of immense consequence to our country. The American people are entitled to a real voice and to know where their elected Senators stand on this important issue.

Until recently, this was a principle Members of both parties seemed to endorse rather overwhelmingly. In fact, not a single Democrat—not one—voted against the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. We all recall it passed 98 to 1. They told us this was an issue too important for political games.

This is what one Democratic colleague said just last week:

As a caucus that was opposed to games with filibusters over the last four years, I would think it would be really regrettable if we didn't ultimately go to the floor and cast our votes for or against this deal.

But that was last week, apparently. Democratic Senators just voted to filibuster and block the American people from even having a real vote on one of the most consequential foreign policy issues of our time.

It is telling that Democrats would go to such extreme lengths to prevent President Obama from even having to consider legislation on this issue. If the President is so proud of this deal, then he shouldn't be afraid.

We all know the amount of time the administration has spent here asking all of these guys to take a bullet for the team—and, of course, the team is Team Obama. They all wanted to have a say. When it came time to have a say, they said it was more important that the President not have to veto a resolution of disapproval—more important to him than to them.

This is a deal that was designed to go around Congress and the American peo-

ple from the very start. We all remember the President didn't want to submit it to us at all. It was going to be an executive agreement, it is still an executive agreement, and he didn't want us to have any say at all.

Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN worked together and developed a proposal—overwhelmingly proposed and supported—to give us a chance to weigh in on this important deal.

It would empower Iran to maintain thousands of centrifuges and to become a recognized nuclear-threshold state, forever on the edge of developing a nuclear weapon. That is what is before us.

It would effectively subsidize Hezbollah, Hamas, and the Assad regime in Syria—which, by the way, is now going to apparently include a Russian military base in Syria—by showering tens of billions of dollars on their benefactors in Tehran.

It would leave Iran with an enrichment capability just as the Iranian leadership is again calling for Israel's destruction and praying every day for our destruction. This deal is sure to have many consequences that will last well beyond this administration.

Yet as things presently stand, it would limp along with little or no buy-in or input from Congress or from the American people—who we know overwhelmingly opposed the deal in spite of the President's best efforts to sell it to them. This shouldn't be an acceptable outcome for our friends on the other side, even those who support the deal. I predicted earlier—and I predict again today—we are going to have a raft of new bash-Iran proposals introduced by our friends on the other side, who are going to be born again Iran bashers.

So let me make it clear to all of our colleagues, we have voted, we are going to vote again, but we are voting on the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. We are not going to be taking up bills that have fewer than enough cosponsors to override a Presidential veto. If we want to make a law, as we did with Corker-Cardin, show us enough cosponsors to make a law, but we are not interested in using floor time for get-well efforts over on the other side to try to fool their constituents into thinking: Oh, I really, really was serious about Iran, in spite of the fact that I voted for the deal that you hate.

We only have so much floor time in the Senate. We are going to try to use it on serious proposals that have a chance of becoming law, and my assumption is the President is not going to want to revisit this issue. He got what he wanted. He is not going to want to revisit this issue. So if we want to do anything further about this Iranian regime, bring me a bill with enough cosponsors to override a Presidential veto, and we will take a look at it.

Otherwise, the American people will give us their judgment about the appropriateness of this measure 1 year from November because this is not an ordinary issue. This is an issue with a

real shelf life. This is a regime that is still going to be there a year and a half from now.

And, of course, as we know, it is an Executive agreement only. So if, perchance, there is a President of a different party, I would say to our Iranian observers of the debate that it will be looked at anew based upon Iranian behavior between now and then.

As others have said, the Iranian Parliament is apparently going to get to weigh in. I heard the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee say that. I guess they are going to get a vote.

But our friends on the other side want to employ a procedural device, which, as the Democratic leader has pointed out, is commonly used here, but the question is, on what kind of measure is it used?

This is no ordinary measure. This is different.

So we will have another opportunity to see whether we want to move past this procedural device.

The President is proud of the deal. I don't know why he would be reluctant to veto a resolution of disapproval that is put on his desk. He is having press conferences about it. He is bragging about it. He thinks this is really great.

I don't know what they are protecting him from. I would think he would have a veto ceremony and invite all you guys to join him and celebrate. What are you protecting him from?

We will have a chance next week, one more chance, to allow him to say how he feels about the resolution of disapproval. We know how he feels about it already. For the life of me, I can't get why he is reluctant to veto this resolution of disapproval, in effect, underscoring again what a great deal he thinks it is for America.

So we will revisit the issue next week and see if maybe any folks want to change their minds and give us a chance to remove the procedural roadblock and give the President what he has been asking for.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want to be as respectful of my friend as I need to be, but let's speak reality.

We are in a Congress that is dominated by the Republicans. They control the House by a large margin, and they control the Senate by a large margin.

The legislation that is before this body was proposed, legislated, and brought to us by Republican leadership. It is their legislation, not ours.

I didn't spend all my time in my office visiting with people today; I watched the speeches. It was stunning—the nonreality that is facing my Republican friends. They dwelled, a number of them, on what is going on in the Middle East. Not once—not once—did anyone mention the worst foreign-policy decision ever made by our great country, the invasion of Iraq. It has destabilized that part of the world for a long, long time to come. For what? So

my friends can blame all the problems in the Middle East on the President, but they are blaming the wrong person. We can't take what we have because they want to rewrite history. History is as it is, and people are writing history as it is.

Now the part of history that they are trying to rewrite is history that is taking place in this body. We offered, on two separate occasions, publicly before the American people and in this body: Do you want a vote? We will let you have a vote. Both times it was objected to because in the convoluted reasoning, I guess, of my friend, he thinks that people who are watching all of this have no common sense and can't understand the English language.

We offered to have a vote on this on two separate occasions. It was objected to both times. Now, the inane response is you are filibustering this. I know why there are filibusters because we have had to file cloture more than 600 times because of filibusters by the Republicans. Never in the history of the country has there ever been anything close to it.

Now, what were most of those filibusters on? On motions to proceed. On this legislation that came before this body, we said we don't need a vote on a motion to proceed, go to the bill, go to it. We also said, as part of the agreement, let the leader offer the first amendment, and he did that.

Now, a 60-vote threshold, my friend talks as if: Oh, wowee, where in the world did this come from? Why would they ever consider 60 votes on this?

First, I know it is late in the day. I didn't bring the subject up, but my friend the Republican leader is talking about a world that doesn't exist anymore. And who created this world that doesn't exist anymore? My Republican friends.

This is July 30, 2011, from Senator MCCONNELL:

Now, look, we know that on controversial matters in the Senate, it has for quite some time required 60 votes. So I would say again to my friend, [that is me] it is pretty hard to make a credible case that denying a vote on your own proposal is anything other than a filibuster.

A little while later:

I wish to make clear to the American people Senate Republicans are ready to vote on cloture on the Reid proposal in 30 minutes, in an hour, as soon as we can get our colleagues over to the floor. We are ready to vote. By requiring 60 votes, particularly on a matter of this enormous importance, it is not at all unusual. It is the way the Senate operates.

Another one, a few months later:

Mr. President, I can only quote my good friend [that is me] the majority leader who has repeatedly said, most recently in early 2007, that in the Senate it has always been the case we need 60 votes. This is my good friend the majority leader when he was the leader of this majority in March of 2007, and he said it repeatedly both when he was in the minority or leader of the majority, that it requires 60 votes certainly on measures that are controversial.

There is no question the measure before this body—using the words of my

friend the Republican leader—is something that is important. There is no question that this measure has been controversial. Also, using his words, is this legislation of enormous importance? I think so. At least that is my mind.

Quoting from a little while later:

So who gets to decide who is wasting time around here? None of us have that authority to decide who is wasting time. But the way you make things happen is you get 60 votes at some point, and you move the matter to conclusion, and the best way to do that is to have an open amendment process. That is the way this place used to operate.

And I say "used to operate." That is my own editorial comment.

Two or three months later:

Madam President, reserving the right to object, what we are talking about is a perpetual debt ceiling grant, in effect, to the President. Matters of this level of controversy always require 60 votes. So I would ask my friend, the majority leader—

Referring to me as the majority leader—

if he would modify his consent request and set the threshold for this vote at 60?

I am not going to be reading these forever, but I will read one more:

Well, as we all know, it takes 60 votes to do everything except the budget process. We anticipate having a vote to proceed to the 20-week Pain-Capable bill sometime before the end of the year as well.

That was just the early part of August of this year.

So, Mr. President, my friend is in a dire situation, and I understand that. The House is in a terrible state of disarray. They do not know what they are going to do. On one hand, what they say they are going to do is—the President can't send the papers to them. So they want to have a vote on that. The papers didn't come to them. And then they turn right around and are going to vote on a resolution of approval. I guess they do not need the papers for that. Then they are going to vote on more sanctions. Then they don't know what they are going to do. It is very unusual, when one party controls both branches of the bicameral legislature, that they do not know how to work together, but obviously they are not working together here. So I understand my friend's frustration. This is a situation where he has lost the vote, and it is a situation where he is simply not in touch with reality as it exists.

So I want to say to everyone within the sound of my voice that the Senate has spoken and has spoken with a clarion voice and declared that the historic agreement to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon will stand. That is what this agreement is all about. It is about whether Iran should have a nuclear weapon. And the countries you wouldn't think would be involved in supporting something such as this—they know the importance of it themselves, and they agreed to go along with this agreement. They helped us negotiate it. China, Russia—they agreed to it. The Senate has spoken with a clarion voice and declared that

this historic agreement to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon will stand.

So I say, my fellow Americans—and I say that with all respect for everybody who is out there listening or will read about this—our allies and negotiating partners around the world should know that today's outcome was clear, decisive, and final. There is now no doubt whatsoever that the United States Congress will allow this historic agreement to proceed. Efforts by opponents to derail this agreement were soundly rejected by a margin much larger than anyone thought achievable even a few days ago.

Any future attempts, as my friend is talking about, to relitigate this issue—I guess we will be in a position like with the Affordable Care Act. Are we going to try to repeal it 60 times? Are we going to try to break that record? Any future attempts to relitigate this issue in the Senate will meet the same outcome and will be nothing more than wasted time—time we can't afford to waste with a government shutdown looming in a matter of weeks, more of the disarray of my friends the Republicans. We are not making up closing government. The government was closed 2 years ago for almost 3 weeks. So we take those threats seriously. And I would hope we could get around to doing something about that rather than having wasted cloture motions on something on which we agreed to have a vote. Filibusters are an effort to stop debate. We said when I came in here Tuesday—Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday—if you want more time than that to debate, go ahead and do it. We are not in any way stopping debate, as was done by my Republican colleagues hundreds of times in years past. So this can be relitigated. Let's do it over 60 times to try to break the Affordable Care Act record, if you choose, but this matter is over with. It is something of such importance, but we should move on to something else. We have so much to do in this body—so much to do.

We have our highway situation that is deteriorating. We have hundreds of thousands of bridges that are in a state of disrepair and need refurbishing and some of them need to be replaced. Today I met with the regional transportation authority, someone who represents 80 percent of the population in our State. We are in desperate shape all over Nevada as far as doing something about highways, but we are not doing anything about highways, we are fiddling around on that patching stuff. We had something done, and I was happy to get that done.

We have cyber security issues. As we are here talking right now in this body, we have groups, individuals, and countries trying to hack us—they are not trying; they are doing it. We have not had the ability to get cyber security legislation before this body. It is something we have brought up as an afterthought. We have Senator BURR and Senator FEINSTEIN and the bill they

produced. It is not my favorite. I think we could do better than that. But I support their legislation. We have to do something. Let's start someplace doing something that is important for the American people.

So I say to everyone here that it is time we move on to something else. This matter is over. You can continue to relitigate it, but it is going to have the same result.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as the Democratic leader frequently reminded me when he was the majority leader, the majority leader always gets the last word.

I enjoyed hearing the Democratic leader's history lesson, going back, as I recount—I am sure I will leave some out—to the Iraq war resolution, which he voted for, as did Hillary Clinton, to a recitation of past debates from ObamaCare, to you name it, including complaining about highways, a bill Senator BOXER and I worked on and actually passed that he voted against, which hopefully will soon be in conference, but none of that has anything to do with what is before us today.

The issue before us today is the Iran nuclear agreement. We know how the American people feel about it. They are overwhelmingly opposed to it. We know how the Israelis feel about it. They are overwhelmingly opposed to it. We know our Sunni-Arab allies are now visiting the Russians to talk about arms purchases because they do not trust us anymore. We know the President wanted to transform the Middle East, and, by golly, he has. Our friends don't trust us and our enemies are emboldened.

So the issue is not over. The Democratic leader saying the issue is over doesn't make it over.

This agreement and the foreign policy of this administration is best summed up by Jimmy Carter. A couple of months ago, he was asked to sum up the Obama administration's foreign policy, and this is almost a direct quote. He said he couldn't think of a single place in the world where we are in better shape now than we were when the President came to office. That is Jimmy Carter.

Foreign policy will be a big issue going into 2016, and this agreement is a metaphor for all of the mistakes this President has made. You name the area of the world, and you will see the results. So no amount of saying the issue is over makes it over. It is still on the floor of the Senate. We will have an opportunity again next week to move past this procedural snag to give all Members of the Senate an opportunity to vote up or down on a resolution of disapproval, which we know is supported on a bipartisan basis.

And I end with this: There is bipartisan opposition to this deal—bipartisan opposition to this deal. Only Democrats support it. So if the President is so proud of it, I can't figure out

what these folks over here are protecting him from.

You guys should all be invited down to the veto signing. Break out the champagne, celebrate, take credit for it. You own it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, one last thing. I recognize my friend is going to be next, and I am going to be very short here.

I am glad my friend brought up my vote on Iraq. I have stated on national TV, I have stated every chance I get that the biggest mistake I ever made in my public service was voting for that bill. And I learned it quickly. It was just a matter of a few short months after I voted that I realized I had been misled in voting for that. But that doesn't matter. I voted for it, and, as some say in some circles, I have repented publicly for having done that. So my feeling about the Iraq war has not changed, the mere fact I had voted for that.

I would also say this in closing: I hope the one thing we can agree on here as Democrats and Republicans is that the ability of Iran for the next 15 years to build a nuclear weapon is pretty well taken care of. No one has to agree with that part of my statement, but the one thing I hope we can agree on—I would hope we would work together to make sure we continue, as indicated in the letter Senator Kerry wrote to everybody, all of us, and the Cardin legislation—I hope everyone will take a look at that because, as I said in a statement I gave on Tuesday morning, I have looked at what was suggested in the Kerry letter to make Israel more safe and more secure and some of the suggestions that Senator CARDIN had in his outline. These are things on which I hope we can work together. Put this to one side for the time being. Let's hope in the future we can work together to make sure the only true democracy in that part of the world, this ally of ours, is safe and secure. And we will continue everything we can to make sure they are, I repeat, safe and secure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, there is no question the Israelis need a lot of reinforcement, no question they need to know for sure we are on their side because this administration has just entered into an agreement that by all objective standards could even threaten their very existence. So I think there is no question the Israelis need every reassurance we can possibly give them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I want to rise and offer some thoughts on the comments we just heard from the majority leader and from our leader. I want to say a word about process, and

I want to say a word about partisanship.

Let me start with a word to all of my colleagues. I respect your position on this deal however you voted. I am not here to stand and name-call or chastise anybody who reaches a different position on this bill than I do because it is a hard matter, and I don't think we serve the body well by challenging folks who reach a different position.

Let me say a word about process. The allegation has been made on the floor in recent days that this vote, including the vote that was just taken, was somehow a procedural blocking of the vote on the deal. That is just not the case.

I was one of the coauthors of the review act that is currently before us, and as we worked on the act in the Foreign Relations Committee, everyone understood that it would take 60 votes to pass either a motion of approval or disapproval. We worked on the act in January and February—months before a framework was on the table. Democrats wanted a 60-vote threshold for a motion of disapproval, but Republicans wanted a 60-vote threshold for a motion of approval, and that was the understanding of everyone in the committee when we cast a 19-to-0 vote to pass this in early April, and it was clearly understood when we cast a 98-to-1 vote on the floor of this body.

A 60-vote threshold was understood. It was so clearly understood that that is the way we do things around here that 47 Members of the Senate put that in a letter to the leaders of Iran. So this is not an unusual thing to ask for a 60-vote threshold. In fact, the Democrats have asked twice in last 3 days: Let's have an up-or-down vote on the motion of disapproval with a 60-vote threshold—and our request for a vote on the merits has been twice blocked by the majority.

I hope we will have a chance to vote on the merits again next week under the 60-vote threshold that we all agreed to, but regardless of whether we do or whether we don't, this is a completely transparent vote because all 100 Members of the Senate have indicated what their position is. I respect everybody's position, but it is very clear, and the clear rule is, under the review act we just passed, by this vote this deal will now go forward as we agreed it would a few months back.

Partisanship. The majority leader suggested the position that is being taken on this side of the aisle is just to protect the President. I find that insulting. That is basically saying that on this side of the aisle my colleagues didn't do the work to dig into the deal. So let me just say a word about my colleagues—my colleagues in the minority in this body.

This deal was announced on the 15th of July. Did anyone on this side of the aisle run out and take a position on the deal within hours after it was out? Did anyone on this side of the aisle say, yes, I know what I am going to do and

I haven't even read the bill. Has this side of the aisle in lockstep all taken exactly the same position with respect to this bill? No.

On this side of the aisle, we haven't approached it in a partisan way. On this side of the aisle, every Member took the time to master the details and make their own decision. Some announced their decision a few days after the deal was announced, some announced their decision 7 weeks after the deal was announced. On this side of the aisle there is a difference of opinion—42 of us support the deal, 4 of us do not support the deal—but we respect each other's opinions, and we have approached it as a matter of conscience.

So I categorically reject the statement and the implication by the majority leader that this is just something over here that is being done casually to protect the President. I would ask my colleagues in the majority: Compare the diversity of opinion and the time it took to reach an opinion and the respect that we have for each other's position—compare that on this side of the aisle with your own track record on this bill, with the speed with which people announced that they were opposing it, some even admitting they were opposing it before they read it.

Contrary to the claim of the majority leader that there is no bipartisan support for this deal, I have to say, Senator John Warner, Republican, 36-year Member of the Senate, chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, wrote with Senator Carl Levin, former chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, "Why Hawks Should Support the Iran Deal"; Brent Scowcroft, National Security Advisor for two Republican Presidents and general, strongly supports this deal; GEN Colin Powell, Republican, Secretary of State, strongly supports this deal. There is bipartisan support for this deal. It is just that in this body the minority has been willing to have differences of opinion and respect those differences and not approach this in a partisan manner. That is not exactly the case with respect to the other side. I applaud my colleagues for treating this as a matter of conscience, for reaching the conclusions they reached, even differences of opinion, and respecting each other's views.

Under the terms of the review act, as we agreed to it, we have now taken a vote. Unless the majority will allow us to have a vote on the merits, pursuant to the 60-vote threshold, this vote will stand and the deal will go forward. I hope we can vote on the merits. I hope the majority will agree to let us do what we agreed to do when we passed the review act just a couple of months ago.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I was not planning to speak—I know Senator CAPITO is next in line—but I am really disappointed in my friend from Vir-

ginia indicating that somehow people on this side of the aisle did not study this deal, did not spend time understanding the details, and somehow people on this side of the aisle, in a knee-jerk way, made their decision. That is an insult, not something I would expect—not something I would expect to come from my friend on the other side of the aisle.

I have enjoyed so much working with him and I will continue to. I respect him greatly. But, look, I don't want to start tit-for-tatting this. Certainly Senator FEINSTEIN came out immediately in support of this, NANCY PELOSI came out immediately in support of this, and no doubt there were some people on this side of the aisle that did the same. I came out in opposition for this after—after—two Democrats had come out in opposition. So I wish those comments had not been made.

We had 12 hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee, well attended by people on both sides of the aisle. I just take offense that somehow, because there is bipartisan opposition and only partisan support—that somehow those who support are more bipartisan. Now, I don't know. That is a leap I have not heard.

I have said hundreds of times that if this deal achieved what the President said it was going to achieve, I would be voting for it. If this dismantled Iran's nuclear program, I would be voting for it. If this didn't industrialize their program, I would be voting for it. He said it would end their nuclear program. There would be 100 votes on the floor for that. This is a far cry from that.

So I am sorry to have this kind of conversation on the Senate floor, but I have to say I have sat here listening to the speeches. I think people on both sides of the aisle have thought a great deal about this. I do think there has been extreme pressure. My friends on the other side of the aisle have told me they have never been addressed in such a personal manner by the administration—never. So, yes, there has been pressure. I understand that, by the way. If the shoe were on the other foot, it would be taking place. I got that.

But, look, I think the debate has been thoughtful. I think, by and large, the vast majority of people on both sides of the aisle have been thoughtful. After the debate we have had, I am discouraged that my friend on the other side of the aisle would indicate that somehow because there is bipartisan opposition—bipartisan opposition—the most informed Members on the other side of the aisle, the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the former ranking member and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, are voting against that—and because we happen to agree with the leading Members on the Democratic side, we are partisan? So I am sorry.

Now, back to the procedure. There is no question—I have said this over and

over—I understand regular order, and this bill was drafted under regular order. I got it. I understand that certainly the procedures in this body are that cloture is to end debate, and that takes 60 votes. I got it. It doesn't take but about a week here to understand the importance of cloture.

So I have always known, and I have said this, that a threshold to get us to a place for final passage was going to be 60 votes. But we also passed the bill with 98 votes that said we wanted to vote. One Senator was missing who supported it. It would have been 99 to 1.

So, look, I understand there can be debate about filibuster and all of that, but to say there was some preagreement—I mean, the text of the deal, the text of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act says that we are going to go through regular order. We caught a lot of grief over that as a matter of fact. I am sorry.

A lot of people on our side wanted a privileged motion. We understand the leader on the other side didn't like privileged vehicles because he felt he lost control of the floor. We discussed that thoroughly last January.

So, look, I understand how cloture is used. I understand how cloture is used. I got it. I understand it takes 60 votes, people in here saying, yes, we agree that we should end debate and, yes, we want to move on. I know that hasn't happened today. I understand a lot of times cloture is used as a vote, as you just indicated you believe that it does, but I just want to say, again, there has been no agreement. We understand the threshold. We understand the hurdle. We understand we didn't achieve it today. But to say that Members on this side somehow—because we agree with the leading Members on the other side that this deal doesn't accomplish the goals the President said he wanted to achieve, that that makes us partisan, I am sorry, I disagree.

We had many discussions in our office about the merits of this and the demerits of this. The fact is, I do think this agreement is fatally flawed. I am despondent over the fact that when we had a boot on the neck of this rogue nation that is the No. 1 exporter of terrorism around the world—when we had a boot on their neck—we gave away our leverage, and in 9 months—in 9 months—they are going to have all their money back, the major sanctions relieved, and no apparent change of behavior. Even Secretary Kerry in his letter to us said he doesn't expect that.

So, look, I am disappointed that we have agreed, that the administration has agreed, and that, unfortunately, a minority of people in this body agree, and they have kept us from being able to send a disapproval to the President to veto. I am disappointed, when an agreement has been agreed to by this the President and by others that allows them to industrialize their nuclear program and gives them incredible—incredible—economic access.

I think maybe the Senator might have responded to some recent comments on the floor. I hope that is the case. But I haven't seen anything but dignity on this floor over the last several days, people being incredibly knowledgeable—which they never would have been without this bill that the Senator from Virginia helped us bring about, crucial, in helping make that occur.

But what has happened here is everybody in this body now knows more about this than they ever would have. Everyone has taken the time, I think, to understand this in great detail. And just because there are a few people who come out quickly on our side and on your side—and on your side—that doesn't diminish the fact that people have arrived at their decisions based on conscience as to whether they support it or not. I am disappointed, on the other hand, that we weren't able to move beyond cloture and to a final vote.

With that, I yield the floor.

My understanding is Senator CAPITO now has the floor.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, could I ask my friend to yield to me for 2 minutes? And I apologize to my colleague, but two of my favorite members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Through the Chair, two of my favorite members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who have been critically important to us having this debate on foreign policy—Senator KAINE and Senator CORKER—they are two Members I deeply respect.

Let me just make this observation. I think Senator CORKER is absolutely correct. As a result of Senator KAINE and Senator CORKER—and I am proud of the role I played—the Members of the United States Senate have had more information about a major foreign policy issue than in the history of this country. We have had the exposure to classified briefings. We have had the incredible opportunity to try to understand the JCPOA and to make our independent judgments on that. So I think this process has worked the way it should work.

I share disappointment that we couldn't go to a vote on the merits with a 60-vote threshold because I think that was what was anticipated, and we all understood it was going to take 60 votes to move this. I think it would have been better if we went directly to that type of a vote rather than what has gone forward. So I just want to underscore that.

The other point I want to underscore—and I agree with Senator CORKER and Senator KAINE—is that many Members of the Senate, in a relatively short period of time, made a decision. They didn't think it was a close call, so they made their judgments. In reality, it was a lot more Republicans than Democrats. But that was the case. A lot of Members took a lot of time to

try to understand this and really labored on the issue. I know that because I made my official position known just about a week ago, and I know in talking to many colleagues the process they went through.

I don't question the motives of any Member. I think each Member is trying to do what they believe is in the best interests of our country. I know the two Senators—I know them personally. I am just making my own observations. I know that is how they believe also. But I do think the process we set up lent itself to getting the material, waiting for the hearings, listening to the administration make their point, reading the classified documents, trying to understand how the IAEA interacts in the review process—that it was important to understand all of that before drawing a conclusion.

I applaud most Members of the Senate who dove into it in order for that to be the case. I needed to make that point. I can tell you this: With Senator CORKER and Senator KAINE, I really feel blessed to serve on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I think our country is well served by both. I know that we are going to work together to provide our country the strength it needs to deal with the international challenge and to carry out the responsibility of the Senate.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, before I start my formal remarks, I would like to make a few comments about what has occurred in terms of the cloture vote and in terms of some of the discussion that we have had most recently.

I wanted to react, first of all, to something the minority leader said in his remarks. He basically said that we, as Republicans, are trying to rewrite history. He went into a long explanation of why he believed that. It really struck me, with these young folks who are sitting right here in front of us. We are not trying to rewrite history. We are trying to write a future for these young kids that is safer, that is strong, where we as the United States are making agreements that are in their best interests—not just for tomorrow or the next 5 years or 6 years but the next 30, 35, 40 years. I am not interested in rewriting history. But writing history for the future I am interested in.

The other reaction I have is that I am very disappointed in what has happened here, that we can't have a straight up-or-down vote. When I was in the West Virginia Legislature, in the house of delegates, believe it or not, our votes were not taken. They were voice votes, except in very rare occasions when we would have a rollcall. We all know the difference between a voice vote and a rollcall vote. A rollcall vote is a part of history. People see exactly what you are intending and

how you are going to vote. On a voice vote, you can almost say: Well, I voted yes or I voted no. Nobody can really pin you down on that.

I was one of the few Republicans in the house of delegates who voted in favor of making every single vote we had a rollcall vote. I am pleased to say, the legislature didn't change it that year but they finally did change it.

As the Senator from Virginia said, everybody knows what everybody is going to do on this vote. I don't understand what the controversy is to move forward over the procedural motions and to then have that vote to have it as a part of history. This is your rollcall vote. This is your voice on this Iran agreement. I hope next week the body changes its mind, we move forward, and we have an affirmative vote on the motion of disapproval.

Today I want to talk, obviously, about these issue because I have deep concerns about them. I believe that this debate should revolve around three key questions. Will this agreement eliminate Iran's path to a nuclear weapon? Will it improve the security situation in the Middle East? Will it make America safer for the young, for us, and for the future generations?

Unfortunately, after much study I have concluded that the answer is no to all of these questions. I do not believe the President's agreement would make America safer or our allies safer. To the contrary, the agreement will provide Iran with the resources to continue to finance terror throughout the Middle East and around the world.

Even if Iran were to comply with this agreement in full, this deal virtually guarantees that Iran will become a nuclear threshold nation with an industrial nuclear program. We know that. It is legitimized in this agreement. Iran is the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism. Everybody has said that in this body. It is acknowledged nationwide. The windfall of cash that will flow to Iran—the signing bonus and the continuing impact of sanctions relief under this deal—will only increase its ability to prop up the Syrian regime, finance Hezbollah, and threaten America's allies such as Israel.

One of the actions you learn when you grow up is that past behavior is a great predictor of future action. Even as its own economy has been hampered by the economic sanctions and the pressure from those sanctions brought Iran to the table, in the name of “our people are suffering”—whether it is food or whether it is economic conditions—what have they been doing? They have been financing terror in their region. Terrorism is a priority for them, even as their own people are suffering.

National Security Advisor Susan Rice agrees. She says: “We should expect that some portion of that money would go to the Iranian military and could potentially be used for the kinds of bad behavior that we have seen in the region up until now.”

That is the National Security Advisor. The President and the Secretary of State have said that the sanctions will snap back into place if Iran violates this agreement. I have been in Washington now for 15 years. I have never seen anything snap anywhere in the Halls of Congress. We know that the current sanctions against Iran cannot be easily snapped back. We know that. It doesn't even pass the sniff test, as we say.

It took more than a decade for the United States, working with our allies, to construct the sanctions that brought Iran to the table. This type of effective sanctions regime cannot be brought back over and over. I have listened to a lot of speeches. A lot of my colleagues on both sides, no matter how they voted, what they believe, have said exactly the same thing. On another note, we need to examine the end of the international restrictions on selling ballistic missile technology to Iran and the end of the conventional arms embargo contained in this agreement.

The Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff told the Senate Armed Services Committee in July that "under no circumstances should we relieve pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capabilities and arms trafficking." The administration chose to reject this advice. It really surprised many of us who did not know that these were even on the table. We didn't even know they were part of a bargaining chip that anybody was going to play.

The President's agreement would remove all international limitations on Iran's missile program in 8 years, contradicting early promises from the administration that restrictions would remain in place. Ballistic missiles are not a necessary component of a peaceful nuclear program. Iran's continued efforts to improve this technology should send a clear message to this Chamber of their intentions. In addition, the arms embargo on conventional arms will be lifted in 5 years.

Indeed, Iran's President said last month: "We will buy, sell and develop any weapons we need and we will not ask permission or abide by any resolution for that."

The end of the arms embargo and ballistic missile restrictions will strengthen Iran's ability to threaten Americans, our allied forces, and our citizens. The President's agreement does not contain the necessary enforcement measures to protect future generations from a nuclear Iran. Any agreement worthy of congressional approval should include rigorous, immediate inspections of suspected nuclear sites.

Senior administration officials publicly called for "anywhere, anyplace"—I heard it repeatedly—inspections. Yet the President's agreement fails to live up to that. Indeed, Iran can block access to suspected nuclear facilities for 24 days or even longer. We have not even seen these side deals. This is part of the discussion. The bill that we

passed that said that we were going to have the right to debate this says explicitly in the language that the side agreements were to be turned over to Congress for our inspection before we made this vote.

Finally, those who support ratifying the Iran agreement frequently argue that the only alternative is war. I disagree. I reject that notion. Under that false misguided premise, the American people are being told we should simply accept any deal, regardless of how flawed it may be. When asked if our only option was the agreement or war, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said that "we have a range of options."

The President's agreement does not live up to the administration's prior statements on important items such as inspections, elimination of advanced centrifuges, and ballistic missiles. A better agreement with Iran could be forged from the positions taken by senior administration officials during the negotiation.

A better deal was possible. The American people should accept nothing less. Some argue that we should approve this deal, despite its faults, and then use the threat of separate legislation or tough talk to keep Iran in check. To me that is just seeking cover. Those of us who are going to vote in agreement with this Iran deal are then going to turn around in a week, 10 days or 2 days and say: Let's get tough on Iran on this. Let's make sure we protect Israel. Let's give more military aid to Israel. All of the rhetoric you are already hearing we can do now. We can do that now by disagreeing with the Iran agreement that the President has put forward. The better course for us is to reject this agreement and reopen negotiations.

I believe that stronger sanctions could also force Iran to accept a better agreement that will improve the security of the Middle East and the world. The danger to the United States, Israel, and other American allies posed by Iran is real. As the current refugee crisis and prior acts of terror clearly demonstrate, instability and violence in the Middle East reverberates into other parts of the world.

I do not believe that the President's agreement reduces that threat of violence or adds to the stability of the region. Instead, the agreement will strengthen Iran's position—you can already tell by their swaggering bravado of rhetoric that we hear—and leave the United States with fewer ways to combat nuclear proliferation. For those reasons, I will vote to reject the President's nuclear agreement with Iran.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise today for the 110th time to ask my colleagues to wake up to climate change. Long after today's debate has died down, it will still be looming and

threatening. We stand now at the precipice of an environmental catastrophe. The burning of fossil fuels has unleashed a flood of carbon pollution that is pushing the climate system planetwide into conditions that are unprecedented in human history. It has already permanently altered the world that we will leave to future generations. If we keep sleepwalking through this and allow the carbon flood to continue, we will leave even bigger changes and risk absolute catastrophe.

Last month marked the 10th anniversary of Hurricane Katrina. When that storm made landfall in Southeast Louisiana on August 29, 2005, it was a category 3 hurricane. Katrina's 125-mile-per-hour winds pushed a massive storm surge before it that overtopped New Orleans' systems of levees and flooded the city. By the end, Katrina killed an estimated 1,200 people and caused more than \$100 billion in damage. Images of broken levees, flooded streets, and people stranded on their rooftops are seared into our national memory. This natural disaster—compounded by man-made errors—showed how vulnerable we are to major storms and how vigilant we must be in planning for these extreme events.

We can't say that climate change caused Katrina, but we do know that climate change increases the risk posed by future storms. The oceans are warming, and warmer water temperatures load the dice for more intense storms and heavier rainfall. Meanwhile, sea levels rise on the shores of the gulf coast and the Southeastern States. Storm surges riding in on higher seas will push even more floodwater inland. For those who suffered in the devastation of Hurricane Katrina, we owe them to learn from that catastrophe and take to heart the human threat we face from climate change—lost lives, lost property, and scarred communities. But that seems unacceptable to some on the Republican side. That would be admitting to the scale of the problem, would oblige them to offer a solution, and would offend the fossil fuel industry. The polluters' grip on the Republican Party is remorseless.

President Obama went to New Orleans to honor the memory of those lost in Katrina and to hail the city's resurgence. But get this: Before the President's visit, Louisiana Governor and Republican Presidential candidate Bobby Jindal sent a letter to President Obama urging him not to talk about climate change, not to insert what he called "the divisive political agenda of liberal environmental activism." Really? So when is it OK to talk about climate change, and what does Governor Jindal have to say about it? "I'm sure that human activity is having an impact on the climate," he said. "But I would leave it to the scientists to decide how much, what that means, and what are the consequences." Sounds to me like just another version of that Republican climate denial classic, "I'm not a scientist."

OK, Governor. Let's leave it to the scientists. The scientific community has determined that human activity is responsible for just about all of the warming we have observed around the globe since the 1950s.

In 2012, scientists from Louisiana State University and the Southern Climate Impacts Planning Program, which is a consortium of researchers from NOAA, LSU, Texas A&M, and the University of Oklahoma, reported on the risks climate change poses for Louisiana and the gulf coast. Through their research, they found the following:

Over the past century, both air and water temperatures have been on the rise across the region.

Rising ocean temperatures heighten hurricane intensity, and recent years have seen a number of large, damaging hurricanes.

In some Gulf Coast locations, local sea level is increasing at over 10 times the global rate, increasing the risk of severe flooding.

Saltwater intrusion from rising sea levels damages wetlands, an important line of coastal defense against storm surge and spawning grounds for commercially valuable fish and shellfish.

I don't need to tell the Presiding Officer the importance of the fish and shellfish industry to the State of Louisiana.

The study's lead author, Hal Needham, said:

Climate change is already taking a toll on the Gulf Coast, but if we act now to become more resilient, we can reduce the risks, save billions in future costs, and preserve a way of life.

I certainly don't need to tell the Presiding Officer about the way of life.

Dr. Needham continues:

The Gulf Coast is one of the first regions to feel the impacts of climate change.

Sea level rise is already an immediate problem for Louisiana, and it is one that is going to get rapidly worse.

This chart comes from the New Orleans Times-Picayune. It shows how sea level rise will inundate the Louisiana coast. This area on the chart is New Orleans. Red areas, such as these, will be lost underneath 1 foot of sea level rise, 2 feet of sea level rise will inundate the orange areas, and the yellow areas will be lost and will disappear under water at 3.3 feet—1 meter—of sea level rise.

According to analysis from the Risky Business Project, mean sea level at Grand Isle, LA, will likely rise up to 2.4 feet by 2050. That takes us over the orange. It will rise up to 5.8 feet by 2100—i.e., at the end of this century. All of the red, all of the orange, all of the yellow, and more will be inundated. The Risky Business Project estimates that by 2030, almost \$20 billion in existing coastal property in Louisiana will likely be below mean sea level. People own that property. That is \$20 billion that will be lost. That is a lot to ask people to pay. By 2050, that number—the value of lost land to sea level rise—increases to between \$33 billion and \$45 billion.

The science is clear. Just look to the scientists at LSU, Tiger scientists. The

threat is real. Yet, for Governor Jindal, climate change should not be mentioned. It is inconvenient.

Republican Presidential candidates—except one, the senior Senator from South Carolina—would rather avoid any talk of it. They all protest the President's Clean Power Plan to limit carbon emissions from powerplants, but which of them offers an alternative? None. And, like his fellow candidates, Governor Jindal's stated position is to have no plan.

State and national scientific agencies and experts, local officials around the country, corporate leaders, military professionals, physicians and health care professionals, and faith leaders are all telling us this is a problem and begging us to wake up. Yet, the Republican Presidential candidates and, frankly, the Republican Party here in the Senate have nothing—nothing. They don't even want to talk about it.

The American people are in favor of action. Polling from Stanford University and the New York Times shows that two-thirds of Americans, including half of Republicans, favor government action to reduce global warming, and two-thirds, including half of Republicans, would be more likely to vote for a candidate who campaigns on fighting climate change. So why doesn't the GOP have a climate plan?

Regular Louisianans are doing their part to rebuild their State's natural defenses. Common Ground Relief, a Lower Ninth Ward-based operation aimed at creating resilient gulf coast communities, has been planting marsh grass and trees—about 10,000 trees every year—in the wetlands and barrier islands along the Louisiana coast. Those natural barriers can absorb some of the power of big storms and take some of the pressure off the new levees. Last July, New Orleans mayor Mitch Landrieu joined Pope Francis at the Vatican to discuss global challenges, including climate change. Mayor Landrieu recalled the memory of Katrina. I will quote him:

We have now become a warning to all the others. Neglected environmental degradation has consequences. The poor are hit the hardest and they suffer the most. The levees broke, the water flooded in, and in the blink of an eye, the Gulf of Mexico surged over the rooftops of a great American city. Thousands of us, many of the most vulnerable who couldn't find a way to evacuate the city, were left behind as if their lives did not have value.

We know that we are loading the dice for more damaging weather with our relentless carbon pollution. To pretend this threat does not exist is to put property at risk, to put communities at risk, and to put American lives at risk. And incidentally, it is also to put our heads in the sand.

Eventually the Republican Party is going to have to break itself free from the clutches of the fossil fuel industry. They are going to have to. They are losing the American people, their own young voters. And they are going to

have to rise up to their duty to serve the people of their States and of this country. It is my hope that when they get around to doing that, it won't be too late, but it is time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The esteemed Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise to add my voice for the bipartisan disapproval of the President's nuclear agreement with Iran that we have been debating all week and that we will continue to debate. I do so in the spirit that resulted in 83 U.S. Senators from both sides of the aisle writing a letter just last year to the President of the United States. This letter hasn't gotten a lot of attention in this debate, and I certainly think it should.

In that spirit, the Senate, in an incredibly bipartisan way—by the way, several of those Senators are still here. There were 41 Democrats, 41 Republicans, and 1 Independent who signed this letter to the President of the United States saying: These are the strategic goals we want in this agreement, these are the goals we should have for the security of the United States, and these are the goals we think will protect America and our allies. None of these have been met in the nuclear agreement we have been debating. This letter says that Iran must dismantle its nuclear weapons program and it must be prevented from ever having a path to a nuclear bomb. It also states that Iran should have no inherent right to enrichment.

I commend my colleagues to reread this letter. The President's nuclear deal clearly does not meet the goals that are laid out in the letter. Nonetheless, it has become clear that a number of Senators on the other side of the aisle are going to vote to support the President's agreement despite having signed that letter. That is going to be a personal decision for them, but if you are a signatory, you ought to take another look at the letter you signed to the President and the American people in 2014.

I will lay out a few of my concerns about the deal. I think many of my colleagues have done a fantastic job this week. I don't want to name names, but there are so many on both sides of the aisle—again, bipartisan—who have raised their concerns about the President's Iranian nuclear deal.

One of the biggest frustrations I think so many of us have seen as we have done our sacred duty in this body—to read the agreement, to understand the details, to go to all of the hearings and briefings, to reach out to experts in the field—as we have raised questions about this agreement, what we don't get is straight talk. What we have been getting, unfortunately, is spin.

I think Senator COATS did a great job yesterday of explaining how this agreement is filled with ambiguities, with language that allows it to mean so many different things to so many different people, including Iranians. Let

me provide a few examples that many of us have raised and that I have spoken on the floor about in the past, but I think they are important enough and they bear repeating.

First, Secretary Kerry came and said to us: There is no grandfather clause in this agreement. So we see Europeans rushing now to invest in Iran. The Secretary said there is no grandfather clause. Here is what paragraph 37 of the agreement says:

In such an event that sanctions are reimposed, the provisions in this paragraph would not apply with retroactive effect to contracts signed between any party in Iran or Iranian individuals and entities prior to the date of application.

That sure sounds like a grandfather clause to me, but we are told it is not.

Second, there has been much talk about this snapback provision, but there is no provision in this agreement that says “snap back.” We talked about how we are going to immediately increase sanctions overnight.

I had the opportunity to be a part of the Bush administration’s team that was economically isolating Iran. We went around the world to our allies—we had to threaten, in many cases, our European and other allies to divest out of Iran. That is how we got the economic isolation of Iran. It took years to do this. It took years. Yet, this administration is saying: Overnight, despite the fact that European companies are already in Tehran investing, we are going to snapback sanctions overnight. It is not a snap. Divestiture out of Iran is a slog, and it will take years, again. The snapback is a fallacy.

Finally, Senator AYOTTE and others have done a great job of raising questions about a basic scenario that is laid out—very important—with regard to other paragraphs in this agreement. In an important hypothetical, which is actually very likely, we have asked Secretary Kerry and Secretary Lew—a number of us: Let’s assume sanctions are lifted. In six to nine months, the economy starts humming, the Annex II sanctions are lifted, is Iran still a sponsor of terrorism—the world’s largest sponsor of terrorism—and they commit an act of terror. This body goes to reimpose sanctions; whoever the next President is agrees because of some heinous act of terrorism. What Iran can do is cite either paragraph 26 or paragraph 37 that states: “If sanctions are reinstated, in whole or in part, Iran will treat that as grounds to cease performing its commitments” under the entire agreement.

So what happens? We resanction Iran for a terrorist action that they are likely to take. They say: Hey, we can legally walk. Read paragraph 26. Read paragraph 37. Read our letter to the U.N. Security Council. It is all laid out there. They walk, legally; the sanctions are lifted, they are still the No. 1 sponsor of terrorism in the world, their economy is humming, and they are on the verge of getting a nuclear weapon.

We have asked that question to the administration leaders who negotiated

this deal time and time again, and they have never given us an answer as to why that is not a correct reading of this agreement—because it is.

These are just a few examples. Many of my colleagues have done an outstanding job of looking at different parts of this agreement and expressing our concerns, but just as important is what our constituents think. What do Alaskans think? What do the American people think? Like all of my colleagues, I spent my recess back home in Alaska, and I spoke to hundreds of my fellow Alaskans at townhall meetings, roundtable discussions, our State fair.

Remarkably, I did not have one Alaskan come up to me saying: I really think you should support that Iranian nuclear deal of the President’s. Every single interaction I had was in opposition to this agreement, and it was visceral, particularly among Alaska veterans. We are a proud State. We have the largest number of veterans per capita of any State in the Union. But whether they were recent vets from Iraq or Afghanistan or Vietnam vets, they literally would look at me and say: What on Earth are we doing? Help me understand that, Senator SULLIVAN. What are we doing? Visceral.

During this debate this week, even some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—they are not big supporters—are using terms such as “seriously flawed,” “deeply flawed,” “serious concerns,” “falls short in many areas.” Across the country, Americans are overwhelmingly opposed to this deal by a margin of 2 to 1. And the more the public knows about the deal, the more they dislike it. These poll numbers in terms of support are dropping. Right now, the latest poll, 21 percent of Americans—that is it—support this deal.

The people are wise. They elected us to listen, and we should do so. They might not know all the details as some of us do, but they know—they know—I saw it from my constituents—that something is fundamentally wrong with this agreement.

So we have to ask ourselves why. Why? Why are Americans—the more the President and John Kerry talk about this agreement, the more Americans become opposed to it. And why are even the supporters, as we saw this week, so tepid in their support?

Now, all negotiations require compromise. All negotiations require concessions. We all know this. We have negotiated. In fact, many of my colleagues, particularly on the other side, emphasize this. Concessions are part of what we do. They are part of an agreement, but at a certain point, concessions become humiliations. If they are too significant and too frequent, concessions are humiliations. No one likes to be humiliated, but especially proud citizens of a great Nation like the United States do not like to be humiliated.

That is what I believe is going on here. This, I believe, explains the vis-

ceral reaction we have seen in opposition to this deal. Americans feel that our concessions not just to any country, but to the world’s No. 1 sponsor of terrorism, have gone so far that they are humiliating to our great country. People feel that our concessions have gone so far, it is as if we are treating Iran as an equal, and Iran is not an equal to the United States of America.

I first started to realize this and sense it during a closed briefing with Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman. She was sent to brief the Senate on the secret side deal between the IAEA and Iran involving the inspection regime at the Parchin military facility, long suspected as Iran’s premier nuclear weapons facility. Senator MCCAIN spoke about this briefing yesterday. For those of us—again, Democrats and Republicans—who went to this briefing, it was pretty remarkable, and I am not saying that in a positive way. It was actually unbelievable to have a senior member of the Obama negotiating team first begin the briefing by telling us she had seen this secret side deal, but she didn’t have a copy of it, and she wasn’t allowed to have a copy of it because it was just between Iran and the IAEA. So the Iranians had it, they were reading it, but not us. No matter that the President had just signed a law—the Corker-Cardin law—that required the administration to provide this agreement to the Congress. No matter that the United States is a board member of the IAEA—not only a board member; we are the country that came up with the idea of the IAEA. This was an American initiative in the 1950s. Our board member could have demanded this agreement, but we were told it was just between Iran and the IAEA.

This, of course, was an affront to the law, to the American people, but the worst was yet to come. Under Secretary Sherman then actually described the substance of this secret side deal, the essence of which we all know now because it was eventually leaked to the press. Here is the essence of that side deal: Iran will conduct the inspections at the Parchin nuclear facility by themselves, with no one else present. Let me repeat that. No one else is allowed in that facility. Iran will conduct the inspections by itself. They will take air samples. They will take environmental samples. She was literally describing Iranian officials with a camera filming themselves in the facility with no one else there, and they were going to give this film and these samples—whose chain of custody we can’t trust—to IAEA officials, who are not allowed in the facility.

Every jaw in that room dropped, every Senator—Democrat, Republican. I remember looking around the room. We couldn’t believe it. Heads were shaking. The U.S. Senate was stunned.

After claims by the President that his agreement had the most intrusive inspection regime ever, after being told by the President that his agreement

had nothing to do with having to trust Iran—it wasn't about trusting Iran—we are told in a briefing by one of his top negotiators that with regard to the most suspicious nuclear weapons facility site in Iran, the Iranians will inspect themselves.

The AP broke the story, and when they did, they stated that the secret side deal at Parchin will “let the Iranians themselves look for signs of the very activity they deny—past work on nuclear weapons.”

Let me repeat that. This is the AP. The side deal—that we are agreeing to, by the way, in the Senate, or that some of my colleagues are—will “let the Iranians themselves look for signs of the very activity they deny—past work on nuclear weapons.”

This secret side deal is absurd on its face. This secret side deal will let Iran cheat with impunity. This secret side deal is fully and unequivocally based on trusting the Iranians, regardless of what the administration officials say about the deal. And this secret side deal is not just some kind of concession; it is a humiliation. The IAEA has never done this with any country, ever—especially a country that is a serial cheater and continues to be the world's No. 1 sponsor of international terrorism.

For these reasons alone, as Senator PERDUE mentioned yesterday, the Senate should reject the President's deal. It certainly doesn't square with many of the demands in the March 2014 Senate letter from 83 U.S. Senators last year, one of which was: We believe Iran must fully resolve concerns addressed in the United Nations Security Council resolutions, including any military dimensions of its nuclear program. Well, that is not going to happen in Parchin. We believe Iran must also submit to a long-term and intrusive inspection and verification regime—83 Senators said this to the President. That is not going to happen at Parchin either. But these kind of absurd concessions go much further than the Parchin inspection side deal, and they are the driving force for why so many Americans reject this deal so overwhelmingly.

When we agreed to lift sanctions on General Soleimani, the head of the Quds Force, that wasn't a concession, that was a humiliation. Senator ERNST said last night it was a slap in the face to our veterans, many of whom were killed by IEDs supplied by General Soleimani.

When the leader of Russia, one of our so-called international partners, met with General Soleimani recently to discuss arms transfers, that wasn't a concession, that was an outrage.

When the United States, in the President's agreement, states that it wants “a new relationship with Iran” and they don't respond in kind in the agreement but respond by saying “Death to America” in their weekly chants, that is not a concession, that is a humiliation.

When we agree in the agreement to “protect Iran from nuclear security

threats, including sabotage”—that is in the agreement—that is not a concession, that is an outrage.

When the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff says that under no circumstances should Iran ever obtain ballistic missiles and only days later the Secretary of State agrees to lift the ban on ballistic missiles and conventional weapons, that is not a concession, that is an abdication.

When we go into minute detail in this agreement—dozens of pages on our obligations to lift sanctions, including our obligations to literally import Iranian pistachios—that kind of detail—yet we can't get four American hostages released, that is not a concession, that is a humiliation.

Finally, when we give the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism up-front relief and tens of billions of dollars in a signing bonus and we are told by administration officials that certainly Iran is going to use some of those proceeds to conduct terrorism activities against Americans and our allies, that is not a concession, that is a surrender.

It is a culmination of the so-called concessions that give our constituents the sinking feeling that the President's agreement is decidedly not in our interest. That is dangerous for our country, and it is the scope and number of these concessions that solidify the sense that during these negotiations we have slowly and subtly ceded our power to a country that just recently was considered the world's No. 1 pariah state.

When these negotiations began, every country in the world was standing against Iran and international sanctions were crippling them. That is what brought them to the table, as Senator CORKER mentioned earlier today. And guess what. This was due not to the international community's leadership, not to China, not to Russia, not to the European Union, this was due to the leadership of the United States of America, the Members in the Democratic Party and Republican Party of the Congress, and members of the Bush administration and the Obama administration. That is what brought them to the table—American leadership, Congress, and the executive branch working together.

Remarkably, the deal the President and the administration have negotiated has flipped all of this on its head. It is incredible that we are at this point, as if we are treating Iran as an equal, blessed by all the world's great powers. Make no mistake, we are, as Senator CARDIN and others mentioned—this deal legitimizes Iran's nuclear program and it blesses Iran as a threshold nuclear power.

So the question has to be asked: Why not stick the original goals set out by the Senate just a year ago, in 2014, in the letter to the President to dismantle Iran's nuclear capabilities, to prevent them from having enrichment capability.

Well, according to the President, he has stated, “There is no one who thinks that Iran would or could ever accept that, and the international community does not take that view that Iran can't have a peaceful nuclear program.”

The Congress of the United States and the Senate of the United States thought that just a year ago. So it is remarkable that the President says now there is no way we can get that done. Why not go back to Iran and the P5+1 and get a better deal, one without the serious flaws that so many Members, Democratic and Republican, have stated over the last week?

In a remarkable interview with the Atlantic Monthly, Secretary Kerry talks about how, if we sought a better deal, if he went back and sought a better deal—a deal, by the way, that 83 Senators said we needed to have—we would be “screwing Iran and the Ayatollah, and we will be confirming the Ayatollah's suspicion that the United States is untrustworthy.” That is a quote from the Secretary of State of the United States. In another interview, Secretary Kerry said he would “be embarrassed” to go out and try for a better deal.

What is most remarkable of all is that in attempts to sell this deal to the Congress and the American people, the President and his team no longer emphasized that Iran, the world's biggest sponsor of terrorism, is isolated, is a pariah state, but instead they emphasized that our most important ally in the Middle East, Israel, is, and so, too, is the Congress, and so, too, will be the United States if we don't approve the President's deal.

On August 5, the President stated that “every nation in the world that has commented publicly supports this agreement, except Israel.” And U.N. Ambassador Samantha Power, our Ambassador, recently stated, “If we walk away, there is no rewrite of the deal on the table. We would go from a situation in which Iran is isolated to one in which the United States is isolated.”

This rhetoric represents a fundamental shift in a world view. We have been debating this Iranian deal for the past week, but we really are debating America's role in the world. There is a world view that is taking hold with this administration, one where America is no longer the leader of the free world but a player as part of an international partnership, one where we don't lead by example but are being led by others, one where we are leading from behind, one where we are embarrassed—that is in the Secretary of State's words—rather than steadfast, and one where we are more worried about “screwing” the head of a pariah state than standing with our most steadfast ally in the region, the nation of Israel.

This kind of deal that we are debating today is what an echo chamber produces. This is what happens when you want a deal too badly, when you will

not walk away from the table during negotiations, when your view of America's leadership role in the world is tentative, tepid, and not confident, and this is what happens when you fail to listen to the American people. This is what happens. Right turns wrong, good turns bad, a country that recently was a pariah state, the largest state sponsor of terrorism, is steering the negotiations and welcomed to the community of nations, and top officials in the United States of America are afraid that we will become isolated if we demand a stronger deal that keeps us and our allies safe. This, in effect, is how bad and dangerous policy is made.

I would like to conclude by talking about our role with regard to this agreement. History has shown that on most major foreign policy issues, when the United States of America is most effective and most strong is when the Congress and the Executive are working together. That is the way our Constitution was structured, and that has been America's history since the founding of the Republic. The examples abound from this Chamber. The Louisiana Purchase—something important to you, Mr. President—passed the Senate, bipartisan majority vote 24 to 7; NATO was ratified by bipartisan majority, 82 to 13; the first strategic arms limitations negotiations with the Soviet Union, bipartisan majority, 88 to 2; even something as controversial as relinquishing control of the Panama Canal to Panama, bipartisan majority, 68 to 32.

More recently in 2010, this body voted to further reduce nuclear arms with the Russians, bipartisan majority, 71 to 26.

One common area of agreement is that everybody who has talked about this agreement this week on both sides of the aisle has stated it was one of the most important national security issues facing the United States in a generation, whether and how and to what degree the world's largest sponsor of terrorism is going to obtain a nuclear weapon.

But perhaps for the first time in U.S. history, an agreement that is so grave and important for the national security of our great Nation is going to move forward, not with a bipartisan majority in the U.S. Senate but a partisan minority in both Houses. Such result will undermine America's strength and I believe shows a profound disregard for our constitutional form of government. Even the Iranian Parliament is going to need a majority to pass this agreement, but the world's greatest democracy will not, and I believe that is another humiliation.

Finally, just a few hours ago we saw what has been a theme throughout this entire process—how the administration has been dismissive of the American people, not wanting a role for the American people through their representatives in Congress to weigh in on this deal.

If the President is so proud of this agreement, he shouldn't be directing

Democrats to filibuster it. I believe the vote we just took is a sad day for the U.S. Senate. If this deal was good for the country and our allies, I would certainly be gladly supporting it, but it is not, and a bipartisan majority of the Senate knows it. That is why a bipartisan majority of this body is voting against it. We are doing so because it is a bad deal, a deal that will make the world more dangerous, and we are doing so because the American people see that, too, and they are counting on us to protect them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the agreement reached in July on Iran's nuclear program.

Preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon is one of the most important objectives of our national security policy. I have strongly advocated for and supported the economic sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table. While the agreement is by no means perfect, I have concluded it is our best available option to put the brakes on Iran's development of a nuclear weapon, and that is why I support it.

I do this with my eyes wide open to the nature of the Iranian regime, including its human rights abuses, its unjustified detention of American citizens, its threats against Israel, and its destabilizing actions in the region, including its support for terrorist groups.

Over the last several weeks, I have reviewed the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action as agreed to by the P5+1 nations and Iran. I have attended briefings with national security and nuclear experts. I have spoken with Minnesotans who hold strong views on both sides of this issue. Finally, I have met with the Ambassadors from the other five nations involved in these negotiations and asked detailed questions about what their countries and others would do if Congress does not approve the agreement.

After a lot of thought and discussion, I have concluded that an Iran in possession of a nuclear weapon would make an already volatile situation much worse by greatly increasing the danger to Israel and our other allies in the Mideast. If we were to reject this agreement, Iran would be able to continue all of its destabilizing activities while continuing its pursuit of the most destructive weapon in the world.

I have deep respect for those who hold different views on this subject and acknowledge that this was a difficult decision. As I have proven through my votes and my actions since coming to the Senate, I am deeply committed to protecting Israel's security, including full aid funding and support for security measures such as Iron Dome.

In conjunction with my support for this agreement, I will push the administration and my colleagues in Congress for additional assistance to Israel and our other regional allies to

strengthen their security. I will also continue to support efforts to combat terrorist groups in the Mideast.

These are the reasons that led to my decision.

First of all, I believe this agreement, while imperfect, curbs Iran's ability to develop a nuclear weapon. Before negotiations began in 2013, we were moving steadily closer to the nightmare scenario of Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon. Even under the pressure of massive economic sanctions, Iran was continuing to build its nuclear infrastructure. It was installing more and more centrifuges, accumulating a stockpile of enriched uranium, and building a reactor capable of producing spent fuel that can be reprocessed into plutonium.

That point deserves to be emphasized. The situation prior to the negotiations was not a good one. We had the strongest sanctions regime in place, and it has brought Iran to the table, but Iran was still on the path to developing a nuclear weapon. We have heard that without the restrictions imposed on its program, Iran could produce a weapon in as little as 2 to 3 months. This negotiated agreement will put the brakes on Iran's development of a nuclear weapon.

As recently noted in an open letter by 29 top American nuclear scientists, including 6 Nobel Laureates, the agreement contains "more stringent constraints than any previously negotiated nonproliferation framework."

Specifically, the agreement requires Iran to first of all give up 98 percent of its stockpile of enriched uranium and not enrich uranium to the levels needed to create nuclear weapons. It would require Iran to disconnect two-thirds of its centrifuges, with restrictions on where and how it can operate the remaining ones. It limits uranium enrichment to a single facility. Fordow, the fortified site that Iran long sought to hide from the world, will be converted into a research facility. The core of Arak, the heavy water reactor, will be removed and filled with cement, rendering it unusable for the production of weapons-grade plutonium.

It will open its nuclear facilities to continuous monitoring and allow stringent inspections of its uranium supply chain. It will permanently commit to never seeking, developing, or acquiring nuclear weapons.

Second, if Iran cheats on this deal, sanctions can be reimposed or, as they say, snapped back. In addition—and this is very important to me—U.S. military options remain on the table, just as they were before the deal. We are not bringing back ships. We have not agreed to do anything to take the military option off the table. This agreement by no means limits or lessens our country's ability to use force against Iran if it violates this agreement and pursues nuclear weapons.

If Iran attempts to develop a nuclear weapon, the terms of this agreement

will have given us more information and more limited targets in the event that military action becomes necessary.

It should also be noted that this agreement does not in any way constrain the ability of future Presidents or Congresses to authorize military force against Iran.

Third, rejecting the agreement would lead to a splintering of the international partnership that has been critical to preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, that has been critical to bringing them to the table, and that has been critical to these economic sanctions. They would not be nearly as effective if we had done them alone.

Some have argued that we should reject this deal so we can return to the negotiating table. Yet, I recently met with the Ambassadors representing the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, and China. Not one of them believed that abandoning this deal would result in a better deal. Instead, it would allow Iran more time to build up its nuclear infrastructure. The countries that have been our partners in this effort would no longer be unified. The sanctions regime would start to fray, splintering the international consensus on Iran and leaving its nuclear program unconstrained.

Finally, this agreement must move in parallel with increased commitment to security assistance for Israel and our other allies in the region. In my view, the most troubling issue with this agreement that one of my colleagues has addressed is that sanctions relief Iran will receive after it implements key restrictions on its nuclear program will provide it with additional funds, and a certain portion of those funds could be funneled into Iran's destabilizing activities around the region.

I am deeply committed to the security of our allies and want to ensure that we are taking steps, in parallel with this nuclear agreement, to enhance our allies' ability to defend themselves. I want to see further enhancements of our security assistance to Israel, greater defense cooperation with our Arab allies, and stronger actions to counter Iranian militant activities.

We are in the midst of discussing other initiatives in this Chamber to provide additional assistance and enhance the security of Israel and our allies in the region. I will work with my colleagues and the administration as we move forward. That is how I will end. I call upon the administration and all of my colleagues to work together to help ensure that this agreement works and to help ensure that we provide the assistance necessary to protect Israel and our allies.

As I said earlier, I have deep respect for people who have different views. We have had a lengthy debate. We have looked at this agreement now for over a month and had time to ask questions of the Energy Secretary and the Sec-

retary of State and anyone we could about this agreement. So the time is now here where I believe this agreement should be approved. And, again, we have different views. I think it is very important, given the heated nature at times of this debate, that we come together when this is over to stand up for Israel, our beacon of democracy in the Mideast, and continue to work together on a bipartisan basis on our Mideastern policy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I would like to thank the majority leader for scheduling this debate about the agreement struck by the Obama administration and the leaders of the Islamic Republic of Iran. It is important to highlight right up front what this deal is. It is nothing more than a political agreement between President Obama and the current leaders of Iran. This deal does not have the support of the American people, nor will it have the consent of their elected representatives here in Congress. At no point in the course of negotiating this deal did the Obama administration seek the advice and consent of the Senate or display any respect for the constitutional limits of the Executive in foreign affairs.

Nevertheless, I am glad the Senate has been debating this agreement because this is how the Senate is supposed to function, on the basis of open and robust deliberation. I hope it is how the Senate will function well into the future on matters of national security and domestic policy.

But if the debate we are trying to have today could be congressional deliberation at its best, the Obama administration's deal with Iran is the product of diplomacy at its worst. As the negotiations neared completion earlier this year, President Obama began building his case for the deal on the specious claim that the only alternative to the deal was war.

This black-or-white setup—the notion that the art of statesmanship is little more than navigating a series of binary either-or propositions—is plainly absurd. It misses the mark. We learned this from the fiasco following the New START treaty in 2010. At that time, President Obama and Secretary Clinton warned that it was the only way to reset the relationship with Russia. But now, 5 years later, we know it was, in fact, the starting point for the worst era of U.S.-Russia relations since the Cold War. But the Obama administration has repeated this “my way or war” maxim with such faithful devotion and emotional conviction that it appears at some point along the way they began to believe it themselves. They actually started to believe it, even though it was wrong.

Just look at the facts regarding this deal.

Fact No. 1: The centerpiece of the agreement is the lifting of significant portions of the multilateral financial,

energy, and transportation sanctions currently imposed against Iran. Lifting these sanctions—lifting them prior to any meaningful action by Iran in exchange—will immediately give the world's largest supporter of terrorism access to tens of billions of dollars in currently frozen assets. That is just on day one. Welcoming Iran with open arms to the global marketplace will provide untold future riches to Tehran's revolutionary government.

The current sanctions are not perfect, but they are in place for a very good reason: to restrict Iran's access to resources we know its radical leaders will use to acquire nuclear weapons and continue exporting terrorism not only throughout the region but throughout the world. This is not a matter of speculation. It is not a matter of hyperbole. It is exactly what Iran's own leaders have told us in no uncertain terms.

Those sanctions were originally put in place in response to Iran's repeated violations of previous nuclear agreements. It is complete fantasy to believe they can be revived in the future when—not if but when—they cheat on this deal.

Fact No. 2: Nothing in the agreement will prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. It won't. Under the terms of this deal, the Iranian Government will be allowed to conduct research on more advanced nuclear centrifuges after only 8 years. After 15 years, there will be no limits whatsoever on their nuclear fuel production—no limits whatsoever. To believe that this deal will stop the Iranian nuclear weapons program requires an act of blind faith. In fact, it requires us to disregard the facts altogether.

Fact No. 3: This agreement will increase Iran's access to conventional weapons and ballistic missiles. It will do this by providing for the removal of the U.N. conventional arms and ballistic missile technology embargo. If this seems out of place in an agreement that was supposed to be about Iran's nuclear weapons program, well, that is because it is. It is entirely out of place for this type of an agreement. It was never supposed to be part of the deal. But you see, in the eleventh-hour negotiations, the Ayatollah demanded it, sensing—rightly—that the Obama administration was unlikely to object.

This deal is not the work of savvy negotiation. No, this deal is the product of desperate capitulation. For years, this administration has been dead set on reaching a deal, any deal with the mullahs in Iran. That is why they got the deal they did, an agreement that fulfills a wish list for the Iranians and the sprawling network of terrorist groups that depend on their largesse, including Hezbollah, Hamas, the Houthis in Yemen, and Bashar al-Assad's tyrannical regime in Syria.

And what does the United States get in exchange? Well, we get a promise from the Ayatollah to abandon Iran's 35-year quest for deliverable nuclear

weapons—weapons they crave for the explicit purpose, as they put it, of wiping Israel off the face of the Earth and fulfilling the aspiration of their infamous motto “Death to America.”

Evidently, this is good enough for the Obama administration and for the supporters of this deal, but it is not good enough for the American people—not even close.

In fact, the public opposes the proposed deal by a 2-to-1 margin, but not because they are clamoring for war with Iran. The truth is that most Americans would prefer a diplomatic solution to the problems posed by Iran’s apocalyptic, nuclear, ambitious theocracy. But this is not a diplomatic solution. This diplomacy won’t solve anything.

I would note that the public’s overwhelming opposition to the Iran deal did not catch the Obama administration by surprise. In fact, public opposition to the deal was one of the primary reasons why the administration decided not to submit the agreement to the Senate for ratification as a treaty.

When Secretary Kerry testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee just a few weeks ago, I asked him to explain why the agreement with Iran was not submitted to the Senate as a treaty for ratification—ratification requiring two-thirds of the Members of this body who support it. His answer was, in effect, to say that the deal does not amount to a treaty because it is a multilateral agreement, one that involves more countries than just Iran and the United States.

But the inclusion of multiple parties to an international agreement has absolutely no bearing whatsoever on whether it can be considered a treaty. There is no shortage of examples of this, of examples of multilateral agreements that have been ratified by the Senate, including the Chemical Weapons Convention, including the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

In fact, as I pointed out to Secretary Kerry at the time, the State Department’s own Web site provides a definition of the word “treaty” that includes multilateral agreements, which is why I think the more honest and troubling answer was the one that he provided just 1 day earlier when Congressman REID RIBBLE of Wisconsin asked Secretary Kerry the exact same question: Why does the Obama administration not consider the Iran deal to be a treaty?

This was Secretary Kerry’s response to that question asked just 1 day earlier in the other body. Secretary of State John Kerry said as follows:

Well, Congressman, I spent quite a few years trying to get a lot of treaties through the United States Senate, and frankly, it’s become physically impossible. That’s why. Because you can’t pass a treaty anymore.

This is indefensible. Secretary Kerry’s appeal to expedience shows an ignorance of—or disdain for—both principle and precedent. The Senate has not lost the ability to ratify a treaty.

No, the Senate is perfectly capable of ratifying treaties, as it did 160 times during the George W. Bush administration. It is just reluctant to ratify unpopular treaties and treaties that undermine U.S. interests. There is a distinction between these two types of treaties.

From the Obama administration’s perspective, this is a problem with the Senate. But from the perspective of the Constitution, this is the purpose of the Senate, and it is exactly why the framers included the Senate in the treaty-making process.

Article II, section 2 of the Constitution states that the President “shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the senators present concur.”

The sharing of the treaty-making power between the Executive and the Senate is not a quirk, nor is it optional. It is a constitutional command. Both branches are essential. They are essential to this process. Without both branches, you cannot make a treaty and have it take effect.

The Executive is best suited to manage negotiations with foreign nations, but only legislative consent can grant the kind of broad political consensus necessary to ensure that the United States lives up to the terms of an agreement in the long run.

In “The Federalist,” Alexander Hamilton defended the sharing of treaty-making power between the Executive and the Senate. He wrote: “The history of human conduct does not warrant that exalted opinion of human virtue which would make it wise in a nation to commit interests of so delicate and momentous a kind, as those which concern its intercourse with the rest of the world, to the sole disposal of [the] President of the United States.”

Of course, not all international agreements are treaties, and those that aren’t do not need legislative consent in order to go into effect. But, historically, agreements that make long-term commitments or include significant changes to the United States’ relationship to another country have been considered treaties and have, therefore, been submitted to the Senate for approval.

As I see it, the Iran deal fits both of these categories quite comfortably. The terms of the deal purport to extend well beyond President Obama’s remaining time in office. According to the administration’s own reckoning, this agreement will fundamentally alter the relationship between the United States and Iran.

People of good faith can disagree about whether the Iran deal should be considered a treaty or merely an executive agreement, though not on the farcical grounds provided by Secretary Kerry.

But this debate is worth having. This is the debate that we should be having. It is worth it for the sake of our national security and for the health of

our political institutions, and it is a debate that must include the Senate, just as the Constitution itself requires.

The past few months have been a case study of the dysfunction and the danger that result when the Executive chooses to ignore, instead of engage with, the Senate in order to determine whether an international agreement should be considered a treaty.

The President’s go-it-alone approach has become all too familiar in the realm of domestic policy.

President Obama has spent much of the last 6½ years justifying his will-to-power Presidency on the basis of expediency. Constitutional restraints and historical precedent have only slowed—never stopped—the President’s routine abuse of power to unilaterally impose his domestic policy preferences on the country. Now, with this Iran deal failing to receive the support of even half of the Senate, the President appears willing to extend his imperial Presidency, even to the area of foreign policy.

We must do everything in our power to stop this Iran agreement from receiving congressional sanction. The facts are clear. This is a bad deal for global security, it is a bad deal for our allies—including, especially, Israel, our strongest ally in the Middle East—and it is a bad deal for the American people. But we must also learn from this experience.

Later this year, the Obama administration will negotiate a major climate change agreement, what will be known as the Paris Protocol. Already the administration has indicated it does not intend to submit the protocol to the Senate for ratification, even though the agreement would call for a significant expansion of the already broad powers of our Federal regulatory regime.

It would empower unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats to seize even more control over the American energy sector and insert themselves ever further into the everyday lives of the American people.

On account of its expected size, scope, cause, and effect on the American economy, failure to submit the Paris Protocol to the Senate as a treaty would be an unprecedented and dangerous abuse of Executive power.

Now is the time to make clear to ourselves, to the White House, and to the American people that the Senate understands and plans to defend the centrality of the treaty-making process to the negotiation of international trade agreements and the full and rightful role of the Senate in that important process.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the great State of Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I join my colleagues this afternoon in speaking on a joint resolution on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran.

I wanted to make clear my position on this agreement. We use the term

“deal” in the Senate talking about the Iran deal. I almost feel like we need to put it in quotation marks because in my mind a deal is something that has been negotiated in give-and-take, back-and-forth, and there is an agreement that is relatively evenhanded or fair on both sides. I do not believe that this deal is a fair deal. I will support the resolution of disapproval when we have that opportunity for that vote.

This is not where I hoped I would be on this because I do believe—and I do believe strongly—that diplomacy is the way that we solve disagreements around the world. I think that most of us were actually very hopeful when the administration began negotiation some years ago with the aim and with the purpose that Iran would cease its nuclear program and end its progress toward a nuclear weapon.

I believe that our world would be safer if we were able to achieve those goals—without question—and these are goals that the President himself articulated. He stated specifically that this was his aim.

But, unfortunately, this agreement fails to meet those goals. Simply put, this agreement is not in our national interest.

After considerable study and considering the terms of the agreement and the views of experts on both sides, the many closed hearings that we had, the many public hearings that were out there, I have concluded that this is not just a bad deal, but I think this is a sad deal. I think this is a sad time for us because of this deal.

In fact, this is a deal that borders on capitulation and appeasement, a deal that rewards nuclear extortion. Those are pretty tough words, but that is where I feel we are—a deal which is far worse than no deal at all.

I reject, absolutely out of hand, the statement from our President that we have no choice, that it is either this deal or it is war. That is a false choice, and I think it is wrong to put it that way before the American people.

Certainly, these negotiations were hard. They were very difficult. That is the nature of these negotiations and deliberations.

But other options do exist, and we have been on the floor for several days talking back and forth about them. Well, what else is there? Well, first, there are the sanctions that got Iran to the table in the first place. There are even stronger sanctions that can be imposed. There is continued diplomacy. It is not an apt description to say it is this deal or it is war.

Before I discuss my specific objections to the agreement, I would like to place my views on this agreement in context with my views on international agreements in general. I am certainly not opposed to joining with international partners in making the world a better and a more peaceful place. On issues ranging from the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities to the new START treaty,

I have worked with the administration. I have been there.

I approach these issues with an open mind and an open heart, and I have strived to maintain an open mind on this agreement. But quite honestly it is hard, it is really hard, if not impossible, to maintain an open heart when it comes to Iran. Iran is not a country that is open to resetting relations with a world that clearly is seeking peace and a civil society. Before it entered into this agreement, Iran wasn't talking about a reset here, and it has shown no evidence of changing its ways because of where we are with this agreement now.

We hear every day that Iran's senior leaders are leading the chant “Death to America.” And they said this before the agreement. One would think maybe now there has been this agreement that tone would change. But no, despite all the efforts of Secretary Kerry and others, they are still chanting “Death to America” today. That hasn't changed.

In fact, just yesterday the Supreme Leader called again for the obliteration of Israel. These are not rabble rousers in the street. These are the leaders in Iran who are calling repeatedly for “Death to America” and to wipe Israel off the map. Say what you will about the reportedly moderate President Rouhani, but the facts speak for themselves.

We have The Washington Post's Tehran correspondent who has been in jail since July of 2014. Iran continues to hold him on trumped-up espionage charges, and he is not alone. Iran also holds an American pastor, a U.S. marine who traveled to Iran to visit family members, and it is believed to hold Robert Levinson, who was kidnapped from an island off of Iran's coast. Iran continues to persecute Christians and Baha'is in its own country. These are flagrant human rights violations.

The facts do not suggest to me this is a regime that is ready for reform. I am not speaking about human rights violations that occurred at an early time in history. This is here, this is now. These persecutions, these human rights violations, these imprisonments are right here, right now.

If this were not enough to cause one to question whether we can trust Iran to change its ways, consider this. Iran is a key funder of Hamas and Hezbollah, committed to the destruction of the State of Israel. It funds the rockets which are launched into Israel's sovereign territory from Gaza, southern Lebanon from Syria, and these rockets don't just threaten Iran's sworn enemy, the State of Israel. They also endanger civilian populations in the countries from which they are launched by inviting, if not demanding, immediate retaliation from Israel. So one has to ask the question: Is this a nation that is committed to peace and good global citizenship? Hardly. It just is not.

I think we recognize—and the Presiding Officer, in his capacity before

coming to the Senate, has been engaged in diplomatic negotiations, and he knows that in diplomacy we often end up negotiating with those who don't share our views, don't share our values. It is important for us to look at what Iran gives the world in return for this agreement. In light of the progress Iran has made in its quest to develop a nuclear weapon, it was imperative to me that an agreement—if we were going to get to an agreement—must not simply arrest Iran's nuclear ambition but require the abandonment of those ambitions. It had to stop those nuclear ambitions. The agreement before us, viewed in absolutely the most favorable light, simply does not accomplish this goal. At best we have pushed the pause button. At best it puts a pause on Iran's final preparations towards becoming a full-fledged nuclear state.

And even then, to regard that pause as meaningful requires me to suspend disbelief. I have to suspend my disbelief that Iran can be trusted to live up to the terms of the agreement. I must believe that even though Iran is not required to fully disclose the military dimensions of its existing nuclear program, the international verification mechanisms are indeed effective. I can't do that.

I must also believe that other nations will be inclined to meaningfully call out Iran on violations and not simply rationalize them away in order to keep up the appearances this deal is working. I don't think that is going to happen.

Each of these assumptions is just a bridge too far. I can't get there. And I hear from Alaskans, as I know my colleague in the Chair does, when they are asking me: Hey, what happened to these anytime, anywhere inspections this administration was promising? Now they are not there. They are asking about these snapback sanctions. It is a pretty catchy word, but what exactly does it mean? How feasible is it? Is it practicable in its implementation?

And I can't look at them squarely in the eye and say: Sure, you can count on those snapback provisions to come into play. And even if we could get them back in, we know those sanctions would be weaker, would be less effective than what we have now.

Alaskans are also asking: Well, what about these side agreements—these side agreements between Iran and the IAEA—how is it only they know what is going on there?

And we can't go back to our constituents, we can't go back to the good people of the great State of Alaska and say with confidence: Yes, we have these provisions on verification that give us that security; yes, snapback sanctions are practicable; no, there are no side, secret agreements. We can't do that.

Before causing the release of billions of dollars in frozen Iranian assets and allowing sanctions to expire, I need some clear and convincing and unequivocal evidence this agreement will

achieve what it set out to achieve. Ideally, I seek Iran's commitment to change its ways, to act as a responsible player on the world stage. It was through sanctions—and we keep hearing this on both sides, whether you support this agreement or do not support this agreement—that Iran was brought to the table in the first place by crippling sanctions. We will lose our leverage with Iran once those sanctions are dialed back. Whether it is 9 months or longer, we lose that leverage. So I am very concerned about where we are with unfreezing assets and releasing sanctions.

Many of us have spoken on the floor here about how Iran will now have billions of dollars to spend creating further chaos in the Middle East or arming Israel's enemies or developing rockets which someday might be used to deliver nuclear weapons. You can count me as one of the skeptics. I do not believe Iran will choose to do good with these newfound sources of revenue. I do not believe that they are going to be putting these resources into rebuilding roads and hospitals and infrastructure. I am that skeptic, and I think I join many here in noting what we have seen even under crippling sanctions, when Iran didn't have access to the frozen resources and funds that will be available to them under the deal, they still found a way to direct and finance acts of terrorism throughout the Middle East. Should we give them more money in their hands to do more mischief? Count me as a skeptic.

As you know, I focus a great deal on the energy issues as the chairman of the energy committee. I am very concerned about the opportunities this agreement affords Iran's oil sector—opportunities that come at the expense of America's energy producers and our overall economy in the near term. The Energy Information Administration here in Washington and the International Energy Agency in Paris estimates that lifting sanctions on Iran could raise Iranian output by some 700,000 barrels per day.

Now, we recognize that production is going to take some time to ramp up and to bring back online—perhaps well into next year and beyond—but it will come. What we do have in place and ready to go is Iran's floating storage facilities. They are ready to go now and to move that oil out onto the market. And these supplies will do what? They will work to push down global oil prices.

We know that will be a good thing for consumers everywhere, but what do we do here in this country? We ban the exports of our oil. In effect, we sanction ourselves. So we are going to let Iran have access to the global oil market, put some 700,000 barrels a day of oil out there, gain new revenues to help their economy, and also do whatever else they may do—create that havoc and chaos and mischief, and fund terrorism.

We are going to see oil tankers filling up at Kharg Island instead of Gal-

veston. They are going to be setting sail for our allies in South Korea, Japan, and elsewhere. Our diplomacy is going to benefit Iranian producers while our antiquated domestic export ban is going to harm American producers.

This misalignment—and I have outlined it in several white papers out there—can be corrected. We can correct it legislatively, and the administration can correct it. And now that the President claims he has his veto-proof margin of support for the Iran deal, I think there is even greater urgency for this Congress to move on this issue. That is another issue, but I think it is important to raise. It is just one of the many issues that I believe demonstrates that Iran is looking at this as a good deal for them. They got the most out of this negotiation and gave the least.

Iran's strategy of nuclear extortion has not been disabled. To the contrary, it has been rewarded. What do they get? What do they get? They get a pathway to nuclear weapons, ICBM program, conventional weapons, sanctions gone, and a stronger economy. It sounds like a pretty good deal for Iran. It sounds like a pretty good deal for Iran but certainly not for the security of this country and not for the security of our allies.

I suspect that many of my colleagues, even some who are voting for this agreement, concur with my conclusion that Iran is getting a better deal. We have seen a flurry of comments not only in print but we have certainly heard great discussion on the floor that this agreement is flawed, it is not what we wanted, and it is not what we would have negotiated.

The comments from colleagues supporting this say we have to take it because there is no other option here. The President has said it is this or it is war; there is no other option. If you don't like this plan, what is your plan? Then they say we can't have the administration walk away because American prestige will suffer if Congress forces the administration to walk away from this deal. This is not about American prestige, and this should not be about a President's legacy. This is about our security as a nation.

Just this morning, I met with a family with three young girls in high school from Juneau, AK. They were doing a walk-through of the Capitol, and they came over to my hideaway. We were talking, and I let them know I was finishing the comments on my statement here. We got to talking about this agreement, and they wanted to know my position on it. I said: Quite simply, I cannot support an agreement that fails to make our Nation a safer place, that fails to make the world a safer place.

It has been suggested that this agreement is better than no deal; in other words, that a bad deal is better than no deal at all. I cannot accept this. I cannot accept this, and I don't think this is a situation where we are holding out

for the perfect; to use the expression, we can't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. I am not looking for a perfect deal. I am not looking for a perfect deal, but I am demanding one that makes our Nation a safer place—safer with the deal than without—and this agreement doesn't do it. I place the blame firmly with the administration.

The President did not work with this Congress. He did not throughout the course of the negotiations try to align our expectations with the direction he was taking to determine what a good agreement might look like that we could all concur with.

So I am not surprised that this deal remains so unpopular with the American public. There are a bunch of polls out there. The latest one from Pew says only about 20 percent of the American people support this agreement. I do think it is important to note that on this floor we do have a bipartisan majority of Members in who oppose this deal. I understand that is true in the House as well. I think that is important. And I do think it is unfortunate, with the vote we took just hours ago, that we are not able to get to a straight up or down vote on the resolution of disapproval at this point in time. The whole premise of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act—something that 98 of us agreed voted for, was that we, as the representatives from our respective States around the country, would be able to speak ye or nay to this issue by way of a vote.

The American people want Iran out of the nuclear weapons business—it is pretty simple—and that means dismantlement. The American people want their President to demonstrate backbone in the negotiations, not capitulation, not appeasement—not appeasement of Iran, whose leaders seem to take continued pride in this pattern of unacceptable and often reprehensible behavior. This deal simply does not get us there. That is why I join so many others in opposition.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the privilege of the time on the floor, and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

MR. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to oppose this agreement with Iran. And they are going to have another chance.

Traveling around Wyoming during August and part of September, I talked to hundreds of people. I found four who thought maybe we ought to give this a try—until I asked them this key question. I asked: Do you trust Iran? Now, I have 100 percent of the people saying no.

A contractor who had done business in Iran said that right after he signed the contract over there, the Iranian who was working the negotiations with him said: You do realize that when you sign the contract is when the negotiations begin. That is whom we are working with on this.

Iran's nuclear program is one of the most significant threats facing the

United States and the world today. The implications of this deal will have serious consequences for the Middle East and especially our allies in the Middle East.

Russia and China are especially interested in this deal because of how it changes the international playing field. The President was so pleased that Russia signed on. Well, of course they did. They get to sell unlimited arms and technology. They gave up nothing.

Ultimately, this deal will have serious consequences for the national security of the United States. I ask you, Do you trust Iran?

Several of my colleagues said there is no other alternative. That is how it always is with a contract or a treaty or an agreement. You have to vote for or against it. I am very disappointed in our negotiators. I don't think they were negotiators.

I remember the President saying we would be able to have inspections anytime. That is just as believable as when we were going through ObamaCare and he said: If you like your insurance policy, you can keep it. Nobody got to. This is in that same category, except this is more serious. We are talking about world peace. We are talking about security.

Sanctions brought them to the table. It was leverage. It worked. Then we gave that up so we could sit down and talk to them, and then we didn't leave the table when they wouldn't agree to things that were absolutely needed. What kind of negotiation is that? That is where you trust the Iranians?

Iran's goal is to use its nuclear program to extort its neighbors and threaten its enemies, and it has made it very clear that it considers the United States their No. 1 enemy. We cannot afford to make the kind of strategic blunder that would give Iran a nuclear weapon. We should not give up the advantages we have that were working to prevent Iran's nuclear ambitions. That is why we should oppose this deal. Again I ask: Do you trust Iran?

President Obama has said that if we don't accept this deal, then the only other option is war with Iran, but this isn't true. I don't think anybody believes that. It is the President's way of trying to convince the American people that his way is the only way—just like ObamaCare—and that is not true.

One of the advantages of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act that was passed out of the Senate committee unanimously is that by requiring the President to submit the deal to Congress for review, both the House and the Senate as well as the public can see what is in the deal—kind of see what is in the deal.

I really object to the other side saying we didn't read that. We read what was available. I reviewed the deal. I have heard the administration's arguments in favor of it, and I don't believe this deal is the best way to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. I

don't think it prevents them from getting a nuclear weapon.

I have heard from experts in diplomacy, from experts in arms control and proliferation, from experts in the military, from national security and intelligence experts who say that this deal is not the only way to prevent Iran's nuclear ambitions. Do you trust Iran?

I mentioned that the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act is important because it requires the deal and all its documents to be sent to Congress for review, but I do understand there are separate side agreements between Iran and the International Atomic Energy Agency—and so far as I can tell nobody from the United States has looked at those. Those have not been reviewed by Congress because they haven't been submitted for our review. I am told these side agreements deal with the military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program—the parts of Iran's program that will allow them to launch a nuclear weapon against Israel or American forces in the Middle East or eventually, with enough work, anywhere in the world, including America. You don't sell someone a weapon whose intent is to kill you. Do you trust Iran?

I am deeply concerned that we don't have all the facts about this deal. We need the facts about Iran's military program—facts about how confident the administration can be that Iran is complying with the rules. We should not move forward with any agreement until we have a full understanding of all of the components that are part of it and are convinced it is a good deal. Do you trust Iran?

Understanding all of the components of this deal isn't just about the documents that were submitted to Congress; it is also about understanding what happens when Iran has the freedom and resources to grab for power and position in the region. Do you trust Iran?

The administration has said this deal is a pathway to security and stability. Unfortunately, this administration has consistently misjudged critical moments in the region—most recently, for not taking the Islamic State seriously and developing a real strategy to defeat it. Agreeing to this deal is yet another example of the administration misjudging the difficult and dangerous situation in the Middle East by believing Iran will not take advantage of the situation to attack our allies and undermine American interests.

There are numerous ways Iran can take advantage of this deal, such as—mentioned frequently—using the huge cash infusion that comes with this deal to support Hezbollah or buying arms from Russia. This agreement is not a pathway to peace or stability. It is Iran's springboard to grow into the Middle East's most dangerous bully.

There is even a little provision in here that any contracts entered into before snapback can't be broken. How many contracts do we think they will hurry up and do if they get the right to

do them? They will do every one they need to do—exactly what they want to do. Do you trust Iran?

For more than a decade, the United States and our allies have used sanctions effectively to prevent Iran from achieving its nuclear ambitions. Those sanctions took years to implement and demonstrated the commitment of our international partners to prevent an outcome that would be a disaster. Under this agreement, we would be giving up those sanctions in exchange for the hope that we can trust Iran. It sounds to me like we are giving up the most important tool we have to prevent a nuclear-capable Iran in exchange for nothing. Do you trust Iran?

I urge my colleagues to oppose this deal. It is not the best we can get. We will have another opportunity to vote. It ignores the reality of the complex and dangerous political situation in the Middle East, and it relies on nothing more than hope that Iran will keep its promise, despite all the times Iran has failed to do so in the past. It trades an effective system of sanctions that has worked to prevent Iran's nuclear ambition for nothing. It gives Iran everything it needs to pour money and resources into attacking our allies and making the region more dangerous. I don't trust Iran, and I didn't find anybody in Wyoming who does.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IN ECUADOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to call the Senate's attention to a situation I have spoken about previously, which is the ongoing crackdown by the Correa Government on what little remains of the independent media in Ecuador.

One of the things we have come to expect is that the press—and civil society organizations that expose corruption and challenge the officially sanctioned version of reality—are the first casualties in countries whose leaders are determined to remain in power at any cost.

Ecuador is a prime example. In 2013, President Rafael Correa issued a decree granting the government broad powers to intervene in the operations of non-governmental organizations, NGOs, including dissolving groups on the vague grounds that they have "compromise[d] public peace" or have engaged in activities that were not listed when they registered with the government. A modified version of the

decree, which maintains broad powers to close down NGOs, was adopted in August 2015.

On September 7, Ecuador's Communications Ministry opened an administrative process to "dissolve" Fundamedios, an organization that monitors freedom of expression in the country. According to information publicly available, the government contends that Fundamedios engaged in political activities by publishing information critical of the government—information that would be protected speech in any democracy.

Every politician knows that unfavorable press attention comes with the territory. Here in the United States we accept it as a necessary reality of a free press. But the Correa Government wants to punish an organization for publishing news and opinions it doesn't like. Silencing the press, like dismantling an independent judiciary, are hallmarks of dictatorship. History is replete with examples.

Fundamedios, like other independent media and human rights defenders in Ecuador, has been a target of the Correa Government for years. Its members have been subjected to a pattern of harassment and persecution for nothing more than engaging in activities that are protected by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

As long as President Correa is in power it seems that the press and civil society organizations in Ecuador will be under assault. But while any president or prime minister with the backing of the police and the armed forces can wreak havoc on the institutions of democracy, history also provides any number of examples where, in the end, the public's demand for freedom of expression and government accountability prevailed. We are seeing that today in Guatemala, and I have little doubt that the tide will similarly turn against repression in Ecuador.

Ecuador is a country blessed with wonderful people including unique indigenous cultures, with spectacular geography and extraordinary biological diversity, as found in the Galapagos Islands, and with magnificent colonial architecture. It is also a country with a history of military coups and fragile democratic institutions. It is regrettable that as President Correa solidifies his grip on power by silencing his critics, the country is taking on more and more of the characteristics of a police state.

Fundamedios has a few days to defend itself before the Communications Ministry until a final ruling is issued. Let us hope that wisdom will prevail, that the forces of repression in Ecuador will withdraw, that the right of free expression will be reaffirmed, and that Fundamedios will be allowed to continue to operate. There is still time.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for September 2015. The report compares current law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts provided in the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 11, the budget resolution for fiscal year 2016. This information is necessary to determine whether budget points of order lie against pending legislation. It has been prepared by the Republican staff of the Senate Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act.

This is the second report I have made since adoption of the fiscal year 2016 budget resolution on May 5, 2015. My first filing can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 9, 2015. The information contained in this report is current through September 8, 2015.

Table 1 gives the amount by which each Senate authorizing committee is below or exceeds its allocation under the budget resolution. This information is used for enforcing committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, CBA. For fiscal year 2015, which is still enforced under direction of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, BBA, Senate authorizing committees have increased direct spending outlays by \$7.8 billion more than the agreed upon spending levels. Over the fiscal year 2016 to 2025 period, which is the entire period covered by S. Con. Res. 11, Senate authorizing committees have spent \$3.1 billion less than the budget resolution calls for.

Table 2 gives the amount by which the Senate Committee on Appropriations is below or exceeds the statutory spending limits. This information is used to determine points of order related to the spending caps found in section 312 and section 314 of the CBA. While no appropriations bills have been enacted for fiscal year 2016, subcommittees are charged with permanent and advanced appropriations that first become available in that year.

Table 3 gives the amount by which the Senate Committee on Appropriations is below or exceeds its allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, OCO/GWOT, spending. This separate allocation for OCO/GWOT was established in section 3102 of S. Con. Res. 11, and is enforced using section 302 of the CBA. No bills providing funds with the OCO/GWOT designation have been enacted thus far for fiscal year 2016.

The budget resolution established two new points of order limiting the use of changes in mandatory programs in appropriations bills, CHIMPS. Tables 4 and 5 show compliance with fiscal year 2016 limits for overall CHIMPS and the Crime Victims Fund CHIMP,

respectively. This information is used for determining points of order under section 3103 and section 3104, respectively. No bills have been enacted thus far for fiscal year 2016 that include CHIMPS.

In addition to the tables provided by the Senate Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting additional tables from CBO that I will use for enforcement of budget levels agreed to by the Congress.

Because legislation can still be enacted that would have an effect on fiscal year 2015, CBO provided a report for both fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2016. This information is used to enforce aggregate spending levels in budget resolutions under section 311 of the CBA. CBO's estimates show that current law levels of spending for fiscal year 2015 exceed the amounts in the deemed budget resolution enacted in the BBA by \$8.0 billion in budget authority and \$1.0 billion in outlays. Revenues are \$79.8 billion below the revenue floor for fiscal year 2015 set by the deemed budget resolution. As well, Social Security outlays are at the levels assumed for fiscal year 2015, while Social Security revenues are \$170 million above levels in the deemed budget.

For fiscal year 2016, CBO estimates that current law levels are below the budget resolution's allowable budget authority and outlay aggregates by \$886.0 billion and \$526.9 billion, respectively. The allowable spending room will be reduced as appropriations bills for fiscal year 2016 are enacted. Revenues are \$104 million above the level assumed in the budget resolution. Finally, Social Security outlays are at the levels assumed in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2016, while Social Security revenues are \$2 million below assumed levels for the budget year.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate's pay-as-you-go rule. The Senate's pay-as-you-go scorecard currently shows deficit reduction of \$2.0 billion over the fiscal year 2015 to 2020 period and \$6.8 billion over the fiscal year 2015 to 2025 period. Over the initial 6-year period, Congress has enacted legislation that would increase revenues by \$3.9 billion and increase outlays by \$1.9 billion. Over the 11-year period, Congress has enacted legislation that would reduce revenues by \$1.6 billion and decrease outlays by \$8.3 billion. The Senate's pay-as-you-go rule is enforced by section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21, the fiscal year 2008 budget resolution.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement and the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1. SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (–) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

(In millions of dollars)

	2015	2016	2016–2020	2016–2025
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry				
Budget Authority	254	0	0	0
Outlays	229	0	0	0
Armed Services				
Budget Authority	–15	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs				
Budget Authority	121	0	0	0
Outlays	121	0	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Energy and Natural Resources				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	–2	0	0	0
Environment and Public Works				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	–3,160
Outlays	0	0	0	–3,160
Finance				
Budget Authority	7,322	5	13	28
Outlays	7,288	5	13	28
Foreign Relations				
Budget Authority	–20	0	0	0
Outlays	–20	0	0	0
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Judiciary				
Budget Authority	0	0	1	2
Outlays	0	0	1	2
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions				
Budget Authority	3	0	0	0
Outlays	1	0	0	0
Rules and Administration				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Intelligence				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	150	20	20	20
Indian Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Small Business				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Total				
Budget Authority	7,665	5	14	–3,130
Outlays	7,767	25	34	–3,110

TABLE 2. SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS¹
(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

	2016	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Statutory Discretionary Limits	523,091	493,491
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	9
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0	0
Defense	41	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	41
Homeland Security	0	9
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	24,678
Legislative Branch	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0	56,217
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0	4,400
Current Level Total	41	85,354
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (–) Statutory Limits	–523,050	–408,137

¹ This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.
² Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 3. SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS
(In millions of dollars)

	2016	
	BA	OT
OCO/GWOT Allocation ¹	96,287	48,798

TABLE 3. SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS—Continued
(In millions of dollars)

	2016	
	BA	OT
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0	0
Defense	0	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0
Homeland Security	0	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	0
Legislative Branch	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0	0
Current Level Total	0	0
Total OCO/GWOT Spending vs. Budget Resolution	–96,287	–48,798

BA = Budget Authority; OT = Outlays
¹ This allocation may be adjusted by the Chairman of the Budget Committee to account for new information, pursuant to section 3102 of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution of the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016.

TABLE 4. SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)
(Budget authority, millions of dollars)

	2016
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2016	19,100

TABLE 4. SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)—Continued
(Budget authority, millions of dollars)

	2016
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	0
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	–19,100

TABLE 5. SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAM (CHIMP) TO THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND
(Budget authority, millions of dollars)

	2016
Crime Victims Fund (CVF) CHIMP Limit for Fiscal Year 2016	10,800
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0

TABLE 5. SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAM (CHIMP) TO THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND—Continued
(Budget authority, millions of dollars)

2016	
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	0
Total CVF CHIMP Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	–10,800

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2015.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on

the fiscal year 2015 budget and is current through September 8, 2015. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014, pursuant to section 116 of the Bipartisan Budget Act (Public Law 113–67).

Since our last letter dated July 9, 2015, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–41). That law affects outlays and revenues for fiscal year 2015.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. SUNSHINE
(For Keith Hall, Director.)

Enclosure.

TABLE 1. SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015, AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2015

(In billions of dollars)			
	Budget Resolution	Current Level ^a	Current Over/Under (–) Resolution
On-Budget			
Budget Authority	3,026.4	3,034.4	8.0
Outlays	3,039.6	3,040.7	1.0
Revenues	2,533.4	2,453.6	–79.8
Off-Budget			
Social Security Outlays ^b	736.6	736.6	0.0
Social Security Revenues	771.7	771.9	0.2

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
^a Excludes amounts designated as emergency requirements.
^b Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2. SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015, AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2015
(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted: ^a			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,533,388
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,877,558	1,802,360	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	508,261	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	–735,195	–734,481	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,142,363	1,576,140	2,533,388
Enacted Legislation: ^b			
Lake Hill Administrative Site Affordable Housing Act (P.L. 113–141)	0	–2	0
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014 (P.L. 113–145)	0	75	0
Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (P.L. 113–159)	0	–15	2,590
Emergency Afghan Allies Extension Act of 2014 (P.L. 113–160)	5	5	6
Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 (P.L. 113–164) ^c	–4,705	–180	0
Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act (P.L. 113–183)	0	10	0
IMPACT Act of 2014 (P.L. 113–185)	22	22	0
Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (P.L. 113–235)	1,884,271	1,426,085	–178
An act to amend certain provisions of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (P.L. 113–243)	0	0	–28
Naval Vessel Transfer Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–276)	–20	–20	0
Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (P.L. 113–291)	–15	0	0
An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes (P.L. 113–295)	160	160	–81,177
Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–1)	121	121	1
Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015 (P.L. 114–4)	47,763	27,534	0
Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–10)	7,354	7,329	0
Construction Authorization and Choice Improvement Act (P.L. 114–19)	0	20	0
An act to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes (P.L. 114–25)	0	130	0
Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–27)	38	7	–1,051
Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–41) ^b	0	0	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	1,934,994	1,461,281	–79,818
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	–42,921	3,239	0
Total Current Level ^d	3,034,436	3,040,660	2,453,570
Total Senate Resolution ^e	3,026,439	3,039,624	2,533,388
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	7,997	1,036	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	79,818

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^a Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during the 2nd session of the 113th Congress but before publication in the Congressional Record of the statement of the allocations and aggregates pursuant to section 116 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–67): the Agricultural Act of 2014 (P.L. 113–79), the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014 (P.L. 113–89), the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act (P.L. 113–94), and the Cooperative and Small Employer Charity Pension Flexibility Act (P.L. 113–97).

^b Pursuant to section 403(b) of S. Con. Res. 13, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2010, amounts designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13, shall not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. The amounts so designated for 2015, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Veterans’ Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014 (P.L. 113–146)	–1,331	6,619	–42
Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–41)	0	1,147	0
Total, amounts designated pursuant to Sec. 403 of S. Con. Res. 13	–1,331	7,766	–42

^c Sections 136 and 137 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 (P.L. 113–164) provide \$88 million to respond to the Ebola virus, which is available until September 30, 2015. Section 139 rescinds funds from the Children’s Health Insurance Program. Section 147 extended the authorization for the Export-Import Bank of the United States through June 30, 2015.

^d For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the budget resolution does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

^e Periodically, the Senate Committee on the Budget revises the budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014, pursuant to section 116 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–67):

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original Senate Resolution:	2,939,993	3,004,163	2,533,388
Revisions:			
Adjustment for Disaster Designated Spending	100	43	0
Adjustment for Overseas Contingency Operations and Disaster Designated Spending	74,995	31,360	0
Adjustment for Emergency Designated Spending	0	75	0
Adjustment for the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015	11,351	3,983	0
Revised Senate Resolution	3,026,439	3,039,624	2,533,388

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2015.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2016 budget and is current through September 8, 2015. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016.

Since our last letter dated July 9, 2015, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues for fiscal year 2016: Steve Gleason Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-40); and Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-41).

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. SUNSHINE
(For Keith Hall, Director.)

Enclosure.

TABLE 1. SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016, AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2015

(In billions of dollars)			
	Budget Resolution ^a	Current Level ^b	Current Level Over/Under (-) Resolution
ON-BUDGET			
Budget Authority	3,032.8	2,146.7	-886.0
Outlays	3,091.3	2,564.4	-526.9
Revenues	2,676.0	2,676.1	0.1
OFF-BUDGET			
Social Security			
Outlays ^c	777.1	777.1	0.0
Social Security			
Revenues	794.0	794.0	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
^a Excludes \$6,872 million in budget authority and \$344 million in outlays assumed in S. Con. Res. 11 for disaster-related spending that is not yet allocated to the Senate Committee on Appropriations.
^b Excludes amounts designated as emergency requirements.
^c Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2. SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016, AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2015

(In millions of dollars)			
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted ^a			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,676,733
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,968,496	1,902,345	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	500,825	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-784,820	-784,879	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,183,676	1,618,291	2,676,733
Enacted Legislation:			
An act to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes (P.L. 114-25)	0	20	0
Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act & Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-26)	0	0	5
Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-27)	445	175	-766

TABLE 2. SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016, AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2015—Continued

(In millions of dollars)			
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Steve Gleason Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-40)	5	5	0
Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-41) ^b	0	0	99
Total, Enacted Legislation	450	200	-662
Entitlements and Mandatories: Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	962,619	945,910	0
Total Current Level ^c	2,146,745	2,564,401	2,676,071
Total Senate Resolution ^d	3,032,788	3,091,273	2,675,967
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	104
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	886,043	526,872	n.a.
Memorandum: Revenues, 2016-2025:			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	32,236,839
Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	32,233,099
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	3,740
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.
^a Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during this session, but before the adoption of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016: the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014 (P.L. 114-1); the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015 (P.L. 114-4), and the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-10).
^b Pursuant to section 403(b) of S. Con. Res. 13, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2010, amounts designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13, shall not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. The amounts so designated for 2016, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-41)	0	917	0

^c For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.
^d Periodically, the Senate Committee on the Budget revises the budgetary levels in S. Con. Res. 11, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution. The Senate Resolution total below excludes \$6,872 million in budget authority and \$344 million in outlays assumed in S. Con. Res. 11 for disaster-related spending that is not yet allocated to the Senate Committee on Appropriations:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Senate Resolution	3,032,343	3,091,098	2,676,733
Revisions:			
Pursuant to section 4311 of S. Con. Res. 11	445	175	-766
Revised Senate Resolution	3,032,788	3,091,273	2,675,967

TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS—1ST SESSION, AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2015

(In millions of dollars)		
	2015-2020	2015-2025
Beginning Balance ^a	0	0
Enacted Legislation: ^{b,c,d}		
Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-17) ^e	n.e.	n.e.
Construction Authorization and Choice Improvement Act (P.L. 114-19)	20	20
Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-22)	1	2

TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS—1ST SESSION, AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2015—Continued

(In millions of dollars)		
	2015-2020	2015-2025
Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ensuring Effective Discipline Over Monitoring Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-23)	*	*
An act to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado (P.L. 114-25)	150	150
Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act & Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-26)	-1	5
Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-27)	-640	-52
Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act (P.L. 114-30) ^f	0	0
Steve Gleason Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-40)	13	28
Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-41)	-1,552	-6,924
Current Balance	-2,009	-6,771
Memorandum:		
Changes to Revenues	2015-2020 3,900	2015-2025 -1,564
Changes to Outlays	1,891	-8,335

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
Notes: n.e. = not able to estimate; P.L. = Public Law. * = between -\$500,000 and \$500,000.
^a Pursuant to S. Con. Res. 11, the Senate Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard was reset to zero.
^b The amounts shown represent the estimated impact of the public laws on the deficit. Negative numbers indicate an increase in the deficit; positive numbers indicate a decrease in the deficit.
^c Excludes off-budget amounts.
^d Excludes amounts designated as emergency requirements.
^e P.L. 114-17 could affect direct spending and revenues, but such impacts would depend on future actions of the President that CBO cannot predict. (<http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/attachments/s615.pdf>)
^f P.L. 114-30 will cause a decrease in spending of \$5 million in 2017 and an increase in spending of \$5 million in 2019 for a net impact of zero over the six-year and eleven-year periods.

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, in a solemn ceremony today, a new visitor center and museum was opened at the site near Shanksville, PA, where 40 courageous Americans were killed 14 years ago tomorrow attempting to regain control of United Airlines Flight 93 from four hijackers. The 9/11 Commission Report makes it clear that the hijackers intended to crash Flight 93 either into the White House or the U.S. Capitol Building.

Our individual and collective memories of that horrific day remain fresh, and the pain is still very real. But in the minutes, hours, days, and years following the attacks, Americans have showed their amazing propensity for bravery, sacrifice, selflessness, and compassion in an incredible variety of ways.

Today, American men and women in this country and abroad stand at the ready to thwart the plans of those who wish to do us harm. We have an obligation to support them and their families during their missions, as well as when their missions end. Congress has a special obligation to care for those still living with the emotional and medical burdens of the attacks. As we begin to craft a new budget for our country, I will work to ensure full funding for the programs that support the first responders who risked their health in the effort to help others.

Others have said that the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 didn't test the American character; they revealed it. The terrorist attacks were

intended to crush the American spirit; instead, they galvanized it to new strengths. We came together as a nation to grieve. We came together as a nation to bury our dead and to care for those who were hurt. We came together as a nation to rebuild. And we came together as a nation to pursue those who were responsible for the attacks and bring them to justice. We have accomplished a great deal with respect to those missions, but we have so much more to do. We must never become complacent. We must never lose our resolve.

We have a larger mission. President John F. Kennedy was on his way to deliver a speech at the Trade Mart in Dallas when he was assassinated on November 22, 1963. He was going to say:

We in this country, in this generation, are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask, therefore, that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility, that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint, and that we may achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of “peace on earth, good will toward men.” That must always be our goal, and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength. For as was written long ago: “except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.”

Being “watchmen on the walls of world freedom” is an awesome responsibility. There are times when the responsibility seems more of a burden than a privilege. There are times when the world’s problems seem absolutely intractable and we grow weary of it all. There are times when we as Americans disagree whether or how we should meet that responsibility.

Today, both houses of Congress are involved in a debate about the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action—JCPOA—with respect to Iran, a State sponsor of terrorism with nuclear ambitions. We have serious disagreements about whether to support the JCPOA. It is important, as we debate this issue, to remember that no one among us is clairvoyant or has a total grasp of the truth; no ideology or philosophy has a monopoly on wisdom. No party has complete political acumen. And no group has exclusive rights to use the word “patriot”.

If we want to honor the men and women on Flight 93 and on the three other hijacked jets, if we want to honor the people in the World Trade Center and at the Pentagon, if we want to honor the brave first responders who were climbing up the steps of the Twin Towers as people were streaming down the steps, and if we want to honor the service men and women who have given their lives in defense of our Nation, let us remember that what unites us as Americans is far more important than what divides us on particular issues, even an issue as existentially crucial as restraining Iran’s worst intentions and lawlessness. We are all Americans, each with the desire to see our families, our communities, and our Nation prosper, and to promote the American

ideals of peace and freedom and justice to every corner of the Earth.

About 100 miles east of Shanksville, there is another field consecrated by the blood of Americans who gave “the last full measure of devotion”—Gettysburg. As President Abraham Lincoln said, it is our responsibility to dedicate ourselves “to the unfinished work” which others “have thus far so nobly advanced”. It is our responsibility to dedicate ourselves to the “great task” remaining before us, and that task is “a new birth of freedom”.

As we remember and mourn those who died in the 9/11 attacks and those who have died since that dreadful day 14 years ago serving as “watchmen on the walls of world freedom”, let us meet our awesome responsibility united, as Americans, all of us patriots in our own way, acknowledging that it is our privilege and it is our destiny.

OBSERVING THE 21ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, Sunday, September 13 marks the 21st anniversary of the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA. I have zero tolerance for domestic violence. No woman in this Nation should live in fear for her safety or the safety of her children. These victims need to have access to resources that can provide them with help. That is why I was proud to cosponsor this legislation when it was first enacted in 1994, and I am proud to have fought for every single one of its reauthorizations since.

The far-reaching impact of this legislation cannot be stressed enough. It has impacted the lives of millions of people—playing a crucial role in our communities by providing important services to those who are most vulnerable. Since the original VAWA legislation, millions of women have called the National Domestic Violence hotline who were desperate, who were fearful for their lives. When they called that number, they got help. I know that it saved lives.

As vice chairwoman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Commerce, Justice, Science, CJS, Appropriations Subcommittee, I fought to include \$479 million in funding in the fiscal year 2016 CJS bill for the U.S. Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women—the highest funding level ever for these programs.

What is it that these programs do? They coordinate community approaches to end violence and sexual assault. They fund victims’ services like shelters and a national toll-free crisis hotline. They provide counseling to victims of rape and sexual assault. They help prevent sexual assaults from happening on college campuses. They also fund legal assistance to victims to be able to get court orders to be able to protect themselves from the abuser or from the stalker.

Domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking are crimes

of epidemic proportions, exacting terrible costs on individual lives and our communities. Twenty-five percent of U.S. women report that they have been physically assaulted by an intimate partner during their lifetimes, one in six have been the victims of rape or attempted rape, and the cost of domestic violence exceeds \$8 billion each year. These are numbers and statistics, but they also represent real people.

In my home State of Maryland, VAWA programs have personally impacted people’s lives. For example, “Rita” who was married to “Jamie”—who was physically abusive to her, and then sadly to their four-year-old son, and had been arrested on several occasions for dealing drugs—was able to get important legal assistance through a VAWA-funded program.

Rita obtained a protective order against Jamie, pressed criminal charges against him, and he was found guilty of assault. Jamie is now where he belongs, locked behind bars.

The Sexual Assault Legal Institute, SALI, a program of the Maryland Coalition Against Sexual Assault, was able to represent Rita in her divorce proceedings and custody case. Although this case remains ongoing, through VAWA, the SALI program made it possible for Rita to get the important legal services she needed to protect herself and her son.

This story is just one of the many reasons why it is so important that we continue to invest in programs to combat domestic abuse and sexual assault, and help enable victims to rebuild their lives. This is why I want to recognize 21 years of VAWA as law today, and remember the countless number of lives it has impacted throughout the country. VAWA has put into place so many invaluable programs that are effective and relied upon by so many women and their families in Maryland and across the nation. That is the reason why I will continue to fight for it.

REMEMBERING BORIS NEMTSOV

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, last night I was honored to pay tribute to a dear friend and personal hero, the late Boris Nemtsov. Boris Nemtsov was the Russian opposition leader, former Deputy Prime Minister, and human rights activist who was murdered in February.

I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it’s a wonderful privilege to introduce a personal hero—whose courage, selflessness and idealism I find awe-inspiring—and ask him to accept an award on behalf of another personal hero, a man of very great courage and selflessness and idealism, Boris Nemtsov.

Vladimir Kara-Murza is deputy leader and co-founder with Boris of the People’s Freedom Party. He is the leading coordinator of Open Russia. In the U.S., Vladimir was a prominent and very effective advocate for

passage of the Magnitsky Act, which President Obama signed into last December.

Most recently, he has eloquently and persuasively campaigned to expand the act to impose sanctions on those Russian journalists, who are so cowed and corrupted by the Kremlin, they have become indispensable to propagating the lies and atmosphere of hate, fear and violence the regime relies on to maintain power.

Vladimir is a brave, outspoken, and relentless advocate for freedom and democracy in Russia. All of his adult life and even as a boy, he has been a steadfast champion for the rule of law, for justice, for truth, for the dignity of the Russian people. And like others in Russia who place the interests of the Russian people before their own self-interest, he has paid a price for his gallantry and integrity.

In May of this year, he grew very ill and fell into a coma. As has happened to other Putin critics, Vladimir was poisoned in order to intimidate him or worse. His family brought him to the U.S. for treatment this summer, and we are all very relieved and grateful that he is recovering, and able to be with us tonight.

Vladimir, you are an inspiration to the work of this Institute, and to me personally. Your work is crucial to the progress of freedom and justice in the world. You're a credit to your family and your country. You've kept faith with your ideals in confrontation with a cruel and dangerous autocracy.

And you have kept faith—honorably and bravely—with the example of your friend and comrade, Boris Nemtsov, who died a martyr for the rights of people who were taught to hate him but who will one day mourn his death, revere his memory, and despise his murderers.

Boris Nemtsov is a hero of the Russian Federation. He doesn't need a posthumous Gold Star to deserve that distinction. What worth is a decoration from the hands of a tyrant and the sycophants and crooks who surround him? What meaning would it have? He is beyond the calumnies and scorn and cruelty of his enemies now. Freedom salutes Boris. Justice proclaims him a hero. The truth reverts his memory.

Putin could never understand Boris. He could never appreciate how someone could be impervious to threats and slander, to the lure of corruption and the oppression of fear. A man like Putin, who all his life has stood on the wrong side of history, on the wrong side of morality, of goodness, can't comprehend the power of righteousness. He is blind to the supremacy of love. He can't see that all lies are exposed eventually, hate is overcome by love, illicit power decays, while the truth endures forever.

The people who killed Boris and the regime that protects them are the enemies of the Russian people. They rob Russia of its wealth, its hopes, its future. They deny the God-given dignity of the people they misrule. They are thieves and murderers. And they are cowards. They fear justice. They fear truth. They fear a society in which ideals and morality are the foundation of law and order.

Boris wasn't afraid. He knew his enemies. He knew what they were capable of, but he would not be oppressed. He would not be oppressed by unjust laws or by violence and fear. He was a free man, and bravely so. He was accustomed to danger. But he lived for love and justice and truth. He had been threatened repeatedly and demonized by the regime's propaganda apparatus. Yet when his enemies took his life in the shadow of the Kremlin, they found him walking in the open air, enjoying the evening, unafraid.

It was an honor to know him, and among the greatest privileges of my life to call him a friend.

For his courage, for giving the last full measure of devotion to his country and his countrymen, IRI awards the 2015 Freedom Award to the late Boris Nemtsov. May we long find inspiration in his example. May we take renewed devotion to the cause he died to advance. And may we, too, live unafraid in the open air, for love and justice and truth.

Thank you.

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF NIH'S OFFICE OF RESEARCH ON WOMEN'S HEALTH

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the NIH's Office of Research on Women's Health, which was established on September 10, 1990, to end gender bias in medical research.

It is hard to believe that 25 years ago, women were not included in protocols at the NIH. Faux science said that our reproductive systems got in the way or that we had "raging hormones."

I was here 25 years ago, as a young Senator representing the great State of Maryland. I remember this big "landmark" study coming out. It showed that aspirin could help prevent heart attacks and save lives. Everyone was so excited. A relatively cheap and widely available medication that could improve cardiovascular health—this was a huge discovery.

But then we looked closer at the study, and what did we find? We found that the study tested the effects of aspirin on more than 22,000 men, but zero women. Zero women. This big, landmark study enrolled only men. How could that be? So we took a closer look, and we found that this study—and the exclusion of women from clinical trials—was not an aberration. We found that prior to 1989 clinical trials of new drugs were routinely conducted predominantly on men, even though women consume approximately 80 percent of pharmaceuticals in the United States and make up half the population. To add fuel to the fire, a 1992 report by the U.S. General Accounting Office found that less than half of prescription drugs on the market had been analyzed for gender-related response differences.

So what we had was a system where medical research was done based on male-only clinical trials, which led to the development of diagnoses, preventive measures, and treatments that were commonly used in women, despite never having been studied on women. As you might imagine, this didn't sit well with the women in Congress. It certainly didn't sit well with me.

At that time—in 1990—a lot was going on. George Bush the elder was in the White House. The gulf war was about to begin. The Hubble Space Telescope had just been launched. We didn't have a confirmed NIH Director, and the Human Genome Project had just begun.

There was a lot going on in the world. But the women of Congress knew that we had a real problem to

solve. At the time, the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues was comprised of myself and then-Representatives Pat Schroeder, Olympia Snowe, Connie Morella, and many others. On Aug. 22, 1990, Pat, Olympia, Connie, and I sent a landmark letter to the Acting Director of NIH, Dr. William Raub, requesting a public meeting to discuss how best to improve Federal research on women's health. We wanted all the key health people there: all 12 NIH Institute Directors, then-HHS Secretary Louis Sullivan, then-Surgeon General Antonia Novello, and the beloved Dr. Ruth Kirschstein.

Let me speak a moment about Dr. Ruth Kirschstein, a woman who provided direction and leadership to NIH through much of the second half of the 20th century. She was a daughter of immigrant parents. She weathered disgraceful prejudice and stereotyping of women and Jews. But that didn't stop her. Thanks to hard work and perseverance, she went on to become a key player in the development of the polio vaccine, the first woman Director of a major Institute at NIH, and a lifelong champion of the importance of basic biomedical research and training programs that provided opportunity to all talented students. The contributions made by Dr. Ruth Kirschstein to the NIH, to women's health, and to better health for all are invaluable.

But back to September 1990. On Sept. 10, 1990, the women of Congress got our meeting. We drove out to the NIH's Bethesda campus—Connie Morella, Olympia Snowe, Pat Schroeder, and BARB all showed up. So did Time magazine and the TV cameras.

And what do you know. President Bush announced Dr. Bernadine Healy as the first female Director of the NIH. Dr. Healy was a friend, a colleague, and an adviser. She was a gifted physician and a brilliant researcher and administrator. She was also a very special advocate for women. She was deeply committed to the advancement of women in science and biomedical research.

It is hard to believe that meeting at NIH happened 25 years ago today. And it marked the official establishment of the NIH's Office of Research on Women's Health.

The NIH Office of Research on Women's Health was established to do three things: ensure that women are included in NIH-funded clinical research; set research priorities to address gaps in scientific knowledge; and promote biomedical research careers for women.

Under Dr. Healy, the NIH's Office of Research on Women's Health really came alive. She appointed Dr. Vivian Pinn as its first Director. And today the Office works in partnership with NIH's Institutes and Centers to ensure that women's health research is part of the scientific framework at NIH and throughout the scientific community. I am so proud of what they have accomplished over the past 25 years.

Thanks to the Office of Research on Women's Health, the Women's Health

Initiative was conducted. I remember when Dr. Healy came to me with the idea for this study. She needed money to get a study underway looking at post-menopausal hormone therapy. I was so proud to work on the Appropriations Committee to get Dr. Healy and NIH the money they needed. I worked hand-in-hand with Senators Kennedy, Harkin, and Specter.

The Women's Health Initiative had groundbreaking findings that led to big changes in hormone replacement treatment protocols. As a result, we have seen significant reductions in breast cancer rates. We have reduced the incidence of breast cancer by 10,000 to 15,000 cases per year. Just think, this study alone—the brainchild of Dr. Healy—has helped save 375,000 lives over the past 25 years.

But the Office of Research on Women's Health has done so much more. Today, more than half of participants in NIH-funded clinical trials are women. The office worked with the National Cancer Institute to develop a vaccine that prevents the transmission of Human Papilloma Virus, HPV, resulting in fewer cervical cancer cases. The office worked with the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases on a landmark study which showed that giving the drug AZT to certain HIV-infected women reduced risk of mother-to-child transmission of HIV by two-thirds. The office has supported major advances in knowledge about genetic risk for breast cancer and discovery of BRCA1 and BRCA2 genetic risk markers. The office codirects the NIH Working Group on Women in Biomedical Careers, which develops and evaluates policies to promote recruitment, retention, and sustained advancement of women scientists.

We have come so far over the past 25 years, but we still have a long way to go. There remain striking gender differences in many diseases and conditions, including autoimmune diseases, cancer, cardiovascular diseases, depression and brain disorders, Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, and addictive disorders. We still don't have enough information on the involvement of women in clinical research and trials. We still don't have reliable data on how drugs currently on the market affect women differently than men. And still to this day, women are often prescribed dosages devised for men's average weights and metabolisms.

As you can see, there remains work to be done. But that doesn't mean we can't take a moment to commemorate how far we have come over the past quarter century. I am immensely proud of the work done by the NIH's Office of Research on Women's Health and all those who have worked day-in and day-out to end gender bias in medical research, including Dr. Ruth Kirschstein, Dr. Bernadine Healy, Dr. Vivian Pinn, and Dr. Janine Clayton, current Director of the office. I very much look forward to what the next 25 years will bring. Thank you.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING RILEY SLIVKA

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I want to recognize Riley Slivka, of Winifred, MT. Riley is a senior at Winifred High School whose outstanding work in promoting both agriculture and film in Central Montana deserves much recognition.

Through his YouTube channel, Imagistudios, he displays the beauty of the Missouri Breaks region, near Winifred, as well as the ins and outs of running a Montana farm. Here, one can view his short film, *Harvesting Along the Edge* in Central Montana, which provides a comprehensive look at the harvesting season. The short film, with over 21,000 views in just over 2 weeks, has beautiful cinematography and exhibits the heart of Montana's agriculture community and the Winifred region.

Riley has worked all over his family farm, from running the combine to working as a semi-truck driver for harvest. Riley is planning to major in agricultural communications and film. In the spring of 2014, Riley placed ninth in the country in the BPA digital media competition in Anaheim, CA.

I am thrilled to recognize Riley for his contributions in promoting our State's No. 1 industry through film in Montana.●

RECOGNIZING THE HENDERSON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE'S 70TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize the 70th anniversary of an important entity to Southern Nevada, the Henderson Chamber of Commerce. I am proud to honor this chamber that contributes so much in support of local businesses and Henderson's economy and job market.

Without a doubt, this city's businesses, both small and large, have a great impact on our State's growth. Through the dedication and hard work of the Henderson Chamber of Commerce, Henderson's business community continues to strive and maintain a high quality of life for residents. Even when Nevada's economy took a difficult turn, the Henderson Chamber of Commerce intervened, fighting to help local businesses stay on their feet. It helped owners maneuver through an adverse economic climate with innovation, creativity, and ingenuity. To say this chamber has had a positive impact on Southern Nevada would be an understatement. The strong foundation it has built will be felt for years to come.

Aside from helping local businesses expand and thrive, the Henderson Chamber of Commerce also offers entrepreneurs opportunities in networking, marketing, business development programs, ribbon cutting ceremonies, and career openings. The chamber has 7 members serving on the executive board and 16 others on the

board of directors. I am thankful for their leadership and for the great things they are doing for businesses in Southern Nevada.

For the past 70 years, the Henderson Chamber of Commerce has demonstrated absolute dedication to the great State of Nevada and to the Henderson business community. Without the hard work of those that have served this chamber, the city of Henderson would not have demonstrated the excellent growth that we see today. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Henderson Chamber of Commerce on its 70th anniversary and in thanking it for all it does to press on and find ways to make the Nevada business community the best it can be.●

CONGRATULATING MARIA SHEEHAN

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Maria Sheehan on her retirement after serving as president of Truckee Meadows Community College, TMCC, for 7 years. It gives me great pleasure to recognize her years of hard work and commitment to making this institution the best it can be.

Ms. Sheehan began working at TMCC in 2008 and took over the top leadership position at the community college that same year in July in the midst of a tumultuous economic downturn. Her leadership at the institution brought stability, creating a reliable administration and increased opportunity for students. During her career, Ms. Sheehan contributed greatly to the growth of TMCC, adding new buildings to the facility, including the Health Science Center at the Redfield Campus. She led the institution as it opened its Veterans Resource Center, an incredible resource for veterans wanting to go back to school after their service. She also spearheaded the complete renovation of the college's Applied Technology Center, providing students with the technical training and education needed to help grow Nevada's skilled workforce. In addition, student success rates doubled throughout her tenure. No words can adequately thank her for her great contribution to Nevada's students. Her positive legacy will continue on for years to come.

As the husband of a teacher, I understand the important role academic institutions play in enriching the lives of Nevadans. Ensuring students throughout the Silver State are prepared to compete in the 21st century is critical for the future of our country. The State of Nevada is fortunate to be home to educators like Ms. Sheehan.

I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in thanking Ms. Sheehan for her dedication to enriching the lives of Nevada's students and in congratulating her on her retirement. She exemplifies the highest standards of leadership and service and should be proud of her long and meaningful career. I

wish her well in all of her future endeavors and in her pursuit of volunteering in Central America.●

RECOGNIZING MEREDITH JONES

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the outstanding service of Meredith Jones, the president and CEO of the Maine Community Foundation, who is stepping down after 16 years of service. Meredith has greatly strengthened the Foundation through her hard work and dedication, and she has helped Maine citizens immensely.

As a nonprofit that seeks to boost Maine's economy through investing in education, health, and leadership, the Maine Community Foundation has greatly benefited from Meredith's time as president and CEO of the organization. Her work has helped to shape policies that will have a tangible impact on Mainers for years to come.

Meredith dedicated much of her career to public service, working for both the Maine Health Care Association and the Maine Development Foundation before her time at the Maine Community Foundation. With her background in strategic planning, grantmaking, and fund development initiatives, Meredith was more than equipped to take over as president and CEO in January of 2009.

Meredith not only successfully navigated the foundation through the economic downturn of 2008–2009 but also helped the Maine Community foundation reach new heights. During Meredith's time, the foundation made over \$160 million in grants and scholarship awards, as well as increased charitable funds from \$190 million to more than \$420 million. Meredith worked to prioritize downtown revitalization, higher education, and leadership development, all of which will have a tangible impact on Maine's future.

I would like to join the Maine Community Foundation in recognizing and thanking Meredith for her dedication to the great State of Maine. I cannot speak highly enough of Meredith and her successful tenure at the foundation. The State of Maine owes Meredith a great deal for her years of leadership and support, and I wish Meredith all the best in the next chapter of her life.●

RECOGNIZING THE 133RD ANNIVERSARY OF MOUNT ZION AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

● Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate and honor Mount Zion African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, SC, for their 133rd anniversary. In 1882, Zion Presbyterian merged with the Central Presbyterian Church on Meeting Street, and a group from Emmanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church purchased the Glebe Street property. They came together to organize a new congregation and named their church the Mount Zion African Methodist Episcopal

Church. It was founded under the leadership of Rev. N.B. Sterrett, D.D. Rev. John Taylor is currently the pastor at Mount Zion A.M.E. Mount Zion A.M.E. Church has greatly influenced the community with faith, peace and prayer. Their honorable legacy will forever be appreciated. On September 13, 2015, the Mount Zion A.M.E. Church will celebrate 133 years of remarkable worship. I acknowledge, with pleasure, the church's influence in Charleston, and therefore recognize their growth and success.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting nominations which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001—PM 23

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared in Proclamation 7463 with respect to the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001, is to continue in effect for an additional year.

The terrorist threat that led to the declaration on September 14, 2001, of a national emergency continues. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect after September 14, 2015, the national emergency with respect to the terrorist threat.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, September 10, 2015.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 5:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1359. An act to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communication was laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and was referred as indicated:

EC-2764. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Tax Treatment of Identity Protection Services Provided to Data Breach Victims" (Announcement 2015-22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 35. A bill to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-139).

S. 248. A bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act (Rept. No. 114-140).

S. 465. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe (Rept. No. 114-141).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. ERNST, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2021. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

S. 2022. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of special pension for Medal of Honor recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2023. A bill to ensure greater affordability of prescription drugs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ISAKSON:

S. 2024. A bill to expand the boundary of Fort Frederica National Monument in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 2025. A bill to promote the protection and conservation of United States ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes ecosystems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2026. A bill to foster bilateral engagement and scientific analysis of storing nuclear waste in permanent repositories in the Great Lakes Basin; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 2027. A bill to increase the penalties for fentanyl trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. REED):

S. 2028. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, to advance the ability of credit unions to promote small business growth and economic development opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. LEE):

S. Res. 251. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the congressional review provision of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 does not apply to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action announced on July 14, 2015, because the President failed to transmit the entire agreement as required by such Act, and that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action would only preempt existing Iran sanctions laws as “the supreme Law of the Land” if ratified by the Senate as a treaty with the concurrence of two thirds of the Senators present pursuant to Article II, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution or if Congress were to enact new implementing legislation that supersedes the mandatory statutory sanctions that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action announced on July 14, 2015, purports to supersede; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 255

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 255, a bill to restore the integrity of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 477

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 477, a bill to terminate Operation Choke Point.

S. 520

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 520, a bill to amend the Neotropical Mi-

gratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act.

S. 525

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 525, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) to reform the Food for Peace Program, and for other purposes.

S. 540

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make loan guarantees and grants to finance certain improvements to school lunch facilities, to train school food service personnel, and for other purposes.

S. 571

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 571, a bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 579, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to strengthen the independence of the Inspectors General, and for other purposes.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 786

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 786, a bill to provide paid and family medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 890

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Sen-

ator from Virginia (Mr. KAIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction from the gift tax for gifts made to certain exempt organizations.

S. 968

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 968, a bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease.

S. 1082

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1082, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1099, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market.

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1099, *supra*.

S. 1387

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1387, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes.

S. 1539

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program.

S. 1555

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from Washington

(Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1555, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Filipino veterans of World War II, in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II.

S. 1559

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a sponsor of S. 1559, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1562, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 1603

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1603, a bill to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

S. 1617

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1617, a bill to prevent Hizballah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1632

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1632, a bill to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram.

S. 1651

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1651, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1668

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1668, a bill to restore long-standing United States policy that the Wire Act prohibits all forms of Internet gambling, and for other purposes.

S. 1676

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1676, a bill to increase the number of graduate medical education positions treating veterans, to improve the compensation of health care providers, medical directors, and directors of Veterans Integrated Service Networks of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1766

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1766, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge characterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual orientation of the member, and for other purposes.

S. 1789

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1789, a bill to improve defense cooperation between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

S. 1831

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1831, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 1933

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1933, a bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to encourage the efforts of countries in sub-Saharan Africa to develop an appropriate mix of power solutions, including renewable energy, for more broadly distributed electricity access in order to support poverty reduction, promote development outcomes, and drive economic growth, and for other purposes.

S. 1961

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1961, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the treatment of the United States territories under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1972

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1972, a bill to require air carriers to modify certain policies with respect to the use of epinephrine for in-flight emergencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1982

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1982, a bill to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund the Wall of Remembrance.

S. 1996

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1996, a bill to streamline the employer reporting process and strengthen the eligibility verification process for the premium assistance tax credit and cost-sharing subsidy.

S. 2015

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2015, a bill to clarify the treatment of two or more employers as joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. RES. 143

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 143, a resolution supporting efforts to ensure that students have access to debt-free higher education.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. ERNST, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2021. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I wish to introduce the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2015 or the Fair Chance Act. This bipartisan bill has the support of Senators JOHNSON, BALDWIN, ERNST, and BROWN, and I thank them for their support. Today, a bipartisan House companion bill to the Fair Chance Act has also been introduced. I thank Congressmen CUMMINGS, ISSA, JACKSON LEE, BLUMENAUER, WATSON COLEMAN, RICHMOND, CONYERS, and SCOTT for their leadership on this issue.

Everyone deserves the dignity of work and the opportunity for a second chance to earn a living. But far too many Americans who return home from behind bars have to disclose convictions on their initial employment application or initial job interview that often serve as insurmountable barriers to employment. This legislation would ensure that people with convictions, who have paid their debt to society and want to turn their lives around, have a fair chance to work.

By encouraging Federal employers to focus on an individual's qualifications and merit, and not solely on past mistakes, the Fair Chance Act would remove burdensome and unnecessary obstacles that prevent formerly incarcerated people from reaching their full potential and contributing to society. It would also help reduce recidivism, combat poverty, and prevent violence

in our communities by helping people get back to work.

In the last 30 years, our prison population has exploded. Since 1980, the Federal prison population has grown by nearly 800 percent and our total prison population exceeds more than 2.2 million people. Taxpayers are wasting billions of dollars on overcrowded prisons that crush priceless human potential with lengthy prison terms that have failed to make our communities safer. Yet, more than 90 percent of those sentenced to prison eventually get out and return home. Indeed, over 600,000 people are released from prison each year.

Equally troubling, a high number of Americans living in our communities have criminal convictions. About 70 million people in the U.S. have been arrested or convicted of a crime. That means, almost one in three adults in the U.S. has a criminal record. In fact, in the Nation's capital alone an estimated 1 in 10 D.C. residents has a criminal record.

The American Bar Association has identified over 44,500 "collateral consequences"—or legal constraints—placed on what individuals with records can do once they have been released from prison. Of those, up to 70 percent are related to employment.

Without a job, it is impossible to provide for oneself and one's family. Yet, thousands of people with criminal convictions reenter society each year without employment. According to a recent New York Times/CBS News/Kaiser Family Foundation poll, men with criminal records account for about 34 percent of all nonworking men between the ages of 25 and 54. In addition, a landmark study by Professor Devah Pager, of Harvard University's Department of Sociology, found that a criminal record reduces the likelihood of a callback or a job offer by nearly 50 percent for men in general. African-American men with criminal records have been 60 percent less likely to receive a callback or job offer than those with criminal records. In the land of opportunity, a criminal conviction should not be a life sentence to unemployment.

Today, a criminal conviction is a modern day scarlet letter that—because of the so-called "War on Drugs"—has had a disproportionate impact on communities of color. For example, African-American men with a conviction are 40 percent less likely to receive an interview. And the likelihood that Latino men with a record will receive an interview or be offered a job is 18 percent smaller than the likelihood for white men.

Creating employment opportunities for our returning citizens benefits public safety. With little hope of obtaining a decent paying job, returning citizens are often left with few options but to return to a life of crime. A 2011 study in the Justice Quarterly concluded that the lack of employment was the single most negative determinant of recidivism. A report by the Bureau of

Justice Statistics found that of the over 400,000 state prisoners released in 2005, 67.8 percent of them were re-arrested within 3 years of their release. And 76.6 percent were re-arrested within 5 years of their release.

Creating employment opportunities for our returning citizens also strengthens our economy. Poor job prospects for people with records reduced our nation's gross domestic product in 2008 between \$57 billion and \$65 billion. With an integrated global economy that is becoming more and more competitive, it is imperative that we encourage sound policy that promotes the gainful employment of Americans.

A formerly incarcerated person—and later President—named Nelson Mandela once said, "For to be free is not merely to cast off one's chains, but to live in a way that respects and enhances the freedom of others." The American criminal justice system is predicated on this ideal, the belief that an individual who has committed a crime can, and should be, reformed into a productive member of society over their time of imprisonment. The ideal that, once released from prison, that individual should have the opportunity to enrich himself and his community upon his reentry into society.

The Fair Chance Act would help fix unemployment barriers for formerly incarcerated people and bring America closer to truly being a land of opportunity for all. It would ban the Federal Government—including the executive, legislative, and judicial branches—from requesting criminal history information from applicants until they reach the conditional offer stage. This bill strikes the right balance. It would allow qualified people with criminal records to get their foot in the door and be judged on their own merit. At the same time, the legislation would allow employers to know an individual's criminal history before the job applicant is hired.

This bill would also prohibit Federal contractors from requesting criminal history information from candidates for positions within the scope of Federal contracts until the conditional offer stage. Companies that do business with the Federal Government and receive Federal funds should espouse good hiring practices. The Fair Chance Act would permit Federal contractors to inquire about criminal history earlier in the application process if a candidate would have access to classified information.

The legislation includes important exceptions for sensitive positions where criminal history inquiries are necessary earlier in the application process. Exceptions are included for positions involving classified information, sensitive national security duties, armed forces, and law enforcement jobs, and for when criminal history information for a job is legally required prior to a conditional offer.

Finally, this bill would require the Department of Labor, U.S. Census Bu-

reau, and Bureau of Justice Statistics to issue a report on the employment statistics of formerly incarcerated individuals. Currently, no comprehensive tracking of data on the employment histories of people with convictions exists. This provision would change that and allow us to better understand the scope of the problem people with convictions face when trying to find a job.

Many of the reforms in this bill have been urged for years. In 2011, then-Attorney General Eric Holder called for making the Federal Government a model employer. And the White House's My Brother Keeper's Initiative has endorsed fair chance reforms. Earlier this year, I was proud to join 26 other Senators in a letter to the President urging an executive order that would ban Federal contractors from asking job applicants about their criminal histories. But more must be done.

States and localities have led the way on providing people with convictions meaningful job opportunities, and the Federal Government must catch up. So far 18 States, including Georgia and Nebraska, and over 100 cities and counties have taken steps to prohibit government agencies from asking job applicants about criminal convictions until later in the process.

Some of the Nation's largest companies already have fair chance policies. Companies such as Wal-Mart, Target, Starbucks, Koch Industries, Home Depot, and Bed, Bath and Beyond, have reserved the criminal history inquiry until later in the hiring process. These companies know that creating economic opportunity for people with criminal history is not just good policy, it's good business.

This bipartisan legislation has the support of numerous groups, including the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Employment Law Project, the Center for Urban Families, Bend the Arc Jewish Action, and the National Black Prosecutors Association.

We are a nation built on liberty and justice for all. Once a person's sentence has ended, they should not continue to be forever shackled by their past. That turns the concept of justice upside down. It is contrary to who we are and what we stand for.

President George W. Bush once said that "America is the land of second chance, and when the gates of the prison open, the path ahead should lead to a better life." But far too often the road back into the community is paved with poverty, hopelessness, and unemployment. When President Obama commuted the offenses of 46 drug offenders earlier this year, he also affirmed that "we have to ensure that as [formerly incarcerated people] do their time and pay back their debt to society, that we are increasing the possibility that they can turn their lives around."

The ideal that America is a place that values second chances is bipartisan and rooted deeply in our country's history, and the opportunity to turn one's life around is a fundamental principle of justice. With the introduction of this important criminal justice reform legislation, we aim to fulfill the promise of our great democracy and make access to the American Dream real for thousands of Americans who have paid their debts to society.

The Fair Chance Act would give so many Americans a fair chance to obtain Federal jobs or work with Federal contractors. It would improve public safety, boost our economy, and adhere to our shared values of liberty and justice for all. I urge my fellow Senators to join me in supporting this important criminal justice reform bill.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 251—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PROVISION OF THE IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015 DOES NOT APPLY TO THE JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION ANNOUNCED ON JULY 14, 2015, BECAUSE THE PRESIDENT FAILED TO TRANSMIT THE ENTIRE AGREEMENT AS REQUIRED BY SUCH ACT, AND THAT THE JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION WOULD ONLY PREEMPT EXISTING IRAN SANCTIONS LAWS AS “THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND” IF RATIFIED BY THE SENATE AS A TREATY WITH THE CONCURRENCE OF TWO THIRDS OF THE SENATORS PRESENT PURSUANT TO ARTICLE II, SECTION 2, CLAUSE 2, OF THE CONSTITUTION OR IF CONGRESS WERE TO ENACT NEW IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION THAT SUPERSEDES THE MANDATORY STATUTORY SANCTIONS THAT THE JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION ANNOUNCED ON JULY 14, 2015, PURPORTS TO SUPERSEDE

Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. LEE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 251

Whereas the United States Government has enacted and enforced multiple statutes and regulations that impose comprehensive sanctions on Iran and on companies and individuals doing business with Iran;

Whereas Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution provides that the President “shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur”;

Whereas Article VI, clause 2 of the Constitution provides that “This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all

Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land”;

Whereas, on April 28, 2015, 39 Senators voted for Senate Amendment 1150, the purpose of which was “To declare that any agreement reached by the President relating to the nuclear program of Iran is deemed a treaty that is subject to the advice and consent of the Senate”;

Whereas, according to subsection (a)(1) of section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2160e), as added by section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, which the President signed into law as Public Law 114–17 on May 22, 2015, “[n]ot later than 5 calendar days after reaching an agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership the agreement, as defined in subsection (h)(1), including all related materials and annexes”;

Whereas subsection (h)(1) of such section 135 defines the “agreement” that the President “shall” transmit to Congress not later than 5 calendar days after reaching an agreement with Iran to include all “annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future”;

Whereas such section 135 further provides that a 60-day congressional review period will commence upon the President's transmittal of the agreement, including all annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future;

Whereas, on July 14, 2015, the Secretary of State announced a multilateral agreement with Iran and six other nations, labeled the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), in Annex II of which the United States purports to agree that “[t]he United States commits to cease the application, and to seek such legislative action as may be appropriate to terminate, or modify to effectuate the termination of, all nuclear-related sanctions as specified in Sections 4.1-4.9 below,” and Sections 4.1-4.9 specifies the following United States statutes: “the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (ISA), as amended by Section 102 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (CISADA) and Sections 201–207 and 311 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (TRA); CISADA, as amended by Sections 214–216, 222, 224, 311–312, 402–403, and 605 of TRA and Section 1249 of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (IFCA); the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (NDAA), as amended by Sections 503–504 of TRA and Section 1250 of IFCA”;

Whereas the United States statutes specified in sections 4.1 through 4.9 of Annex II, of which the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action purports to provide for United States agreement to “cease the application,” may only be superseded by a Senate-ratified treaty or by new legislation;

Whereas the United States statutes and regulations concerning Iran sanctions include section 2 of CISADA, in which Congress made comprehensive findings of fact concerning Iran, which remain true and accurate today, including that “[t]he illicit nuclear activities of the Government of Iran, combined with its development of unconventional weapons and ballistic missiles and its

support for international terrorism, represent a threat to the security of the United States, its strong ally Israel, and other allies of the United States around the world”;

Whereas Congress also found in section 2(10) of CISADA that “[e]conomic sanctions imposed pursuant to the provisions of this Act, the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by this Act, and the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), and other authorities available to the United States to impose economic sanctions to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons, are necessary to protect the essential security interests of the United States”;

Whereas, based on the above and other similar statutory findings since 1979, the United States enacted ISA, CISADA, section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), the IFCA, and the TRA, as well as various preceding statutes that each of the named laws amended over time, and, taken as a whole, those Acts of Congress directed and authorized the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Defense, and Energy, and other Federal agencies, to promulgate and enforce implementing regulations, which they have done under the guidance of multiple executive orders and under close congressional oversight;

Whereas the Department of Justice has prosecuted, or entered into non-prosecution agreements with, corporations and individuals for Iran sanctions violations under this body of law;

Whereas existing legislation includes mandatory sanctions that may only be repealed or amended by law, including CISADA section 104, which provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations to prohibit or restrict correspondent accounts for foreign financial institutions that knowingly engage in a prohibited activity, and TRA section 202, which provides that the President shall impose statutorily prescribed sanctions with respect to persons that own, operate, control, or insure vessels used to transport crude oil from Iran to another country;

Whereas the President's authority to waive statutorily prescribed sanctions is limited, conditional, and circumscribed by law;

Whereas the period of five days for the President to transmit to Congress the “agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran,” as defined in section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as added by section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, began to run on July 14, 2015, and by July 19, 2015, the President had transmitted to Congress only part of the “agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran” reached five days earlier;

Whereas the Administration publicly acknowledged on July 22, 2015, that at least two side agreements existed that had not yet been provided to Congress, specifically between the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and Iran, but has steadfastly refused to provide those agreements;

Whereas such section 135 provides that the President “shall” transmit to Congress any agreement with Iran, “including all related materials and annexes,” defined under such section to include “side agreements”—with no statutory exceptions for either secret or unavailable (to the United States) side agreements—within five days of reaching such an agreement; and

Whereas, as a result, the President has never fully transmitted to Congress the “agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran” as defined by such section 135, and specifically did not transmit the full agreement within the timeline mandated by law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the congressional review provision under section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2160e), as added by section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-17), does not apply to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action announced on July 14, 2015, because the President failed to comply with the transmission to Congress provisions of such section 135;

(2) because the President did not transmit to Congress “all related materials and annexes” within five days of reaching agreement with Iran, the statutory congressional review provided for in such section 135 did not occur, at least not in the manner envisioned by the members of Congress who voted for Public Law 114-17;

(3) in light of the President’s failure to submit the entire “agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran,” including side agreements, to Congress within five days, the congressional review provision of such section 135 by its own terms was not applicable to the partial agreement that the President submitted to Congress, known as the JCPOA, and therefore in order for the substance of what was submitted to Congress to become “the supreme Law of the Land” pursuant to Article VI, clause 2 of the Constitution, it would need to be either treated by the Senate as a treaty “provided two thirds of the Senators present concur” pursuant to Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, or Congress would need to enact new implementing legislation that supersedes the mandatory statutory sanctions that the JCPOA purports to supersede;

(4) the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (CISADA), section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81), the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (IFCA), and the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (TRA) remain “the supreme Law of the Land” unless and until a Senate-ratified treaty or duly enacted statute repeals or otherwise supersedes them and becomes “the supreme Law of the Land” pursuant to Article VI, clause 2 of the Constitution; and

(5) the Senate, which has the power to consent to treaties under Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, has not and does not consent to the JCPOA, which is therefore not “the supreme Law of the Land,” and the President therefore has a constitutional duty to ensure that the Iran sanctions laws, including CISADA, section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81), IFCA, and TRA, continue to be faithfully executed.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2649. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2650. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2651. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2652. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2653. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2654. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2655. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2649. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:
This Act shall become effective 14 days after enactment.

SA 2650. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “14 days” and insert “13 days”.

SA 2651. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:
This Act shall become effective 12 days after enactment.

SA 2652. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care

Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “12 days” and insert “11 days”.

SA 2653. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:
This Act shall become effective 10 days after enactment.

SA 2654. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “10 days” and insert “9 days”.

SA 2655. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “9” and insert “8”.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Achieving the Promise of Health Information Technology: Improving Care Through Patient Access to Their Records.”

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Jamie Garden of the committee staff on (202) 224-7675.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor,

and Pensions will meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Biosimilar Implementation: A Progress Report from FDA.”

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Jamie Garden of the committee staff on (202) 224-7675.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jon Greenert, a military fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress and for the debate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF THE ENFORCEMENT INSTRUCTION ON SUPERVISION REQUIREMENTS FOR OUTPATIENT THERAPEUTIC SERVICES IN CRITICAL ACCESS AND SMALL RURAL HOSPITALS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 188, S. 1461.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1461) to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 1461

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF ENFORCEMENT INSTRUCTION ON SUPERVISION REQUIREMENTS FOR OUTPATIENT THERAPEUTIC SERVICES IN CRITICAL ACCESS AND SMALL RURAL HOSPITALS THROUGH 2015.

Section 1 of Public Law 113-198 is amended—
(1) in the section heading, by inserting “AND 2015” after “2014”; and

(2) by striking “calendar year 2014” and inserting “calendar years 2014 and 2015”.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1461), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS, PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE, AND COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY ACT OF 2015

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 190, S. 1629.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1629) to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1629) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1629

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “District of Columbia Courts, Public Defender Service, and Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITIES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION TO COLLECT DEBTS AND ERRONEOUS PAYMENTS FROM EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 17 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 11-1733. Collection, compromise, and waiver of employee debts and erroneous payments

“(a) COLLECTION OF DEBTS AND ERRONEOUS PAYMENTS MADE TO EMPLOYEES.—

“(1) AUTHORITY TO COLLECT.—If the Executive Officer determines that an employee or former employee of the District of Columbia Courts is indebted to the District of Columbia Courts because of an erroneous payment made to or on behalf of the employee or former employee, or any other debt, the Executive Officer may collect the amount of the debt in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) TIMING OF COLLECTION.—The Executive Officer may collect a debt from an employee under this subsection in monthly installments or at officially established regular pay period intervals, by deduction in reasonable amounts from the current pay of the employee.

“(3) SOURCE OF DEDUCTIONS.—The Executive Officer may make a deduction under paragraph (2) from any wages, salary, compensation, remuneration for services, or other authorized pay, including incentive pay, back pay, and lump sum leave payments, but not including retirement pay.

“(4) LIMIT ON AMOUNT.—In making deductions under paragraph (2) with respect to an employee, the Executive Officer—

“(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), may not deduct more than 20 percent of

the disposable pay of the employee for any period; and

“(B) upon consent of the employee, may deduct more than 20 percent of the disposable pay of the employee for any period.

“(5) COLLECTIONS AFTER EMPLOYMENT.—If the employment of an employee ends before the Executive Officer completes the collection of the amount of the employee’s debt under this subsection, deductions may be made—

“(A) from later non-periodic government payments of any nature due the former employee, except retirement pay; and

“(B) without regard to the limit under paragraph (4)(A).

“(b) NOTICE AND HEARING REQUIRED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), prior to initiating any proceeding under subsection (a) to collect any debt from an individual, the Executive Officer shall provide the individual with—

“(A) written notice, not later than 30 days before the date on which the Executive Officer initiates the proceeding, that informs the individual of—

“(i) the nature and amount of the debt determined by the District of Columbia Courts to be due;

“(ii) the intention of the Courts to initiate a proceeding to collect the debt through deductions from pay; and

“(iii) an explanation of the rights of the individual under this section;

“(B) an opportunity to inspect and copy Court records relating to the debt;

“(C) an opportunity to enter into a written agreement with the Courts, under terms agreeable to the Executive Officer, to establish a schedule for the repayment of the debt; and

“(D) an opportunity for a hearing in accordance with paragraph (2) on the determination of the Courts—

“(i) concerning the existence or amount of the debt; and

“(ii) in the case of an individual whose repayment schedule is established other than by a written agreement under subparagraph (C), concerning the terms of the repayment schedule.

“(2) PROCEDURES FOR HEARINGS.—

“(A) AVAILABILITY OF HEARING UPON REQUEST.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Executive Officer shall provide a hearing under this paragraph if an individual, not later than 15 days after the date on which the individual receives a notice under paragraph (1)(A), and in accordance with any procedures that the Executive Officer prescribes, files a petition requesting the hearing.

“(B) BASIS FOR HEARING.—A hearing under this paragraph shall be on the written submissions unless the hearing officer determines that the existence or amount of the debt—

“(i) turns on an issue of credibility or veracity; or

“(ii) cannot be resolved by a review of the documentary evidence.

“(C) STAY OF COLLECTION PROCEEDINGS.—The timely filing of a petition for a hearing under subparagraph (A) shall stay the commencement of collection proceedings under this section.

“(D) INDEPENDENT OFFICER.—An independent hearing officer appointed in accordance with regulations promulgated under subsection (e) shall conduct a hearing under this paragraph.

“(E) DEADLINE FOR DECISION.—The hearing officer shall issue a final decision regarding the questions covered by the hearing at the earliest practicable date, and not later than 60 days after the date of the hearing.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply to a routine intra-Courts adjustment of pay that is attributable to a clerical or administrative error or delay in processing pay documents that occurred within the 4 pay periods preceding the adjustment or to any adjustment that amounts to not more than \$50, if at the time of the adjustment, or as soon thereafter as practical, the Executive Officer provides the individual—

“(A) written notice of the nature and amount of the adjustment; and

“(B) a point of contact for contesting the adjustment.

“(c) COMPROMISE.—

“(1) AUTHORITY TO COMPROMISE CLAIMS.—The Executive Officer may—

“(A) compromise a claim to collect a debt under this section if the amount involved is not more than \$100,000; and

“(B) suspend or end collection action on a claim described in subparagraph (A) if the Executive Officer determines that—

“(i) no person liable on the claim has the present or prospective ability to pay a significant amount of the claim; or

“(ii) the cost of collecting the claim is likely to be more than the amount recovered.

“(2) EFFECT OF COMPROMISE.—A compromise under this subsection shall be final and conclusive unless obtained by fraud, misrepresentation, presenting a false claim, or mutual mistake of fact.

“(3) NO LIABILITY OF OFFICIAL RESPONSIBLE FOR COMPROMISE.—An accountable official shall not be liable for an amount paid or for the value of property lost or damaged if the amount or value is not recovered because of a compromise under this subsection.

“(d) WAIVER OF CLAIM.—

“(1) AUTHORITY TO WAIVE CLAIMS.—Upon application from a person liable on a claim to collect a debt under this section, the Executive Officer may, with written justification, waive the claim if collection would be—

“(A) against equity;

“(B) against good conscience; and

“(C) not in the best interests of the District of Columbia Courts.

“(2) LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY.—The Executive Officer may not waive a claim under this subsection if the Executive Officer—

“(A) determines that there exists, in connection with the claim, an indication of fraud, misrepresentation, fault, or lack of good faith on the part of the employee, the former employee, or any other person that has an interest in obtaining a waiver of the claim; or

“(B) receives the application for waiver later than 3 years after the later of the date on which the erroneous payment was discovered or the date of enactment of this section, unless the claim involves money owed for Federal health benefits, Federal life insurance, or Federal retirement benefits.

“(3) DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR WAIVER.—A decision by the Executive Officer to deny an application for a waiver under this subsection shall be the final administrative decision of the District government.

“(4) REFUND OF AMOUNTS ALREADY COLLECTED AGAINST CLAIM SUBSEQUENTLY WAIVED.—If the Executive Officer waives a claim against an employee or former employee under this section after the District of Columbia Courts have been reimbursed for the claim in whole or in part, the Executive Officer shall provide the employee or former employee a refund of the amount of the reimbursement upon application for the refund, if the Executive Officer receives the application not later than 2 years after the effective date of the waiver.

“(5) EFFECT ON ACCOUNTS OF COURTS.—In the audit and settlement of accounts of any

accountable official, full credit shall be given for any amounts with respect to which collection by the District of Columbia Courts is waived under this subsection.

“(6) VALIDITY OF PAYMENTS.—An erroneous payment or debt, the collection of which is waived under this subsection, shall be a valid payment for all purposes.

“(7) NO EFFECT ON OTHER AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the authority of the District of Columbia under any other statute to litigate, settle, compromise, or waive any claim of the District of Columbia.

“(e) REGULATIONS.—The authority of the Executive Officer under this section shall be subject to regulations promulgated by the Joint Committee.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 17 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“11-1733. Collection, compromise, and waiver of employee debts and erroneous payments.”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to any erroneous payment made or debt incurred before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE UNIFORMS FOR PERSONNEL.—Section 11-1742(b), District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “In carrying out the authority under the preceding sentence, the Executive Officer may purchase uniforms to be worn by nonjudicial employees of the District of Columbia Courts whose responsibilities warrant the wearing of uniforms if the cost of furnishing a uniform to an employee during a year does not exceed the amount applicable for the year under section 5901(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code (relating to the uniform allowance for employees of the Government of the United States).”.

SEC. 3. AUTHORITIES OF COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DEVELOP AND OPERATE PROGRAMMATIC INCENTIVES FOR SENTENCED OFFENDERS.—Section 11233(b)(2)(F) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24-133(b)(2)(F), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “sanctions” and inserting “sanctions and incentives”.

(b) PERMANENT AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT GIFTS.—Section 11233(b)(3)(A) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24-133(b)(3)(A), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT GIFTS.—The Director may accept, solicit, and use on behalf of the Agency any monetary or nonmonetary gift, donation, bequest, or use of facilities, property, or services for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Agency.”.

(c) PERMANENT AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT AND USE REIMBURSEMENTS FROM DISTRICT GOVERNMENT.—Section 11233(b)(4) of such Act (sec. 24-133(b)(4)) is amended by striking “During fiscal years 2006 through 2008, the Director” and inserting “The Director”.

SEC. 4. AUTHORITIES OF PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE.

(a) ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF SERVICES OF VOLUNTEERS.—Section 307(b) of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2-1607(b), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “the Service may accept public grants and private contributions made to assist it” and inserting “the Service may accept and use public grants, private contributions, and voluntary and uncompensated (gratuitous) services to assist it”.

(b) TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES AS EMPLOYEES OF SERVICE FOR PURPOSES OF LIABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 303(d) of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2-1603(d), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “employees of the District of Columbia” and inserting “employees of the Service”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the District of Columbia Courts and Justice Technical Corrections Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-274; 112 Stat. 2419).

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2015, AND TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2015

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Friday, September 11, for a pro forma session, with no business conducted; further, that when the Senate adjourns on September 11, it next convene on Tuesday, September 15 at 1 p.m.; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, with the time until 6 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today's session on the McConnell substitute amendment No. 2640 and H.J. Res. 61 ripen at 6 p.m., Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:02 p.m., adjourned until Friday, September 11, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

UNITED NATIONS

CASSANDRA Q. BUTTS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SEVENTIETH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

BARBARA LEE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SEVENTIETH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SEVENTIETH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

CHRISTOPHER ALEXANDER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
FELEKE ASSEFA, OF VIRGINIA

ANDREA BERTON, OF MINNESOTA
HAROLD BRAYMAN, OF VIRGINIA
CLINTON BREWER, OF GEORGIA
JOSHUA BURKE, OF ILLINOIS
MOHMOUD CHIKH-ALI, OF TEXAS
NATHANIEL DONOHUE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RACHEL DURAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PHILIP FINIELLO, OF CALIFORNIA
MARIXELL GARCIA, OF FLORIDA

REINALDO GARCIA, OF VIRGINIA
SUSAN HETTLEMAN, OF NEW YORK
RYAN HOLLOWELL, OF NEW JERSEY
CHRISTIAN KOSCHIL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MONIKA KROL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOSHUA LEIBOWITZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
HECTOR MALDONADO, OF VIRGINIA
CARLA MENENDEZ MCMANUS, OF THE DISTRICT OF CO-
LUMBIA

SUZANNE PLATT, OF VIRGINIA
DEVIN RAMBO, OF FLORIDA
JANET ROBERTSON, OF CALIFORNIA
LEON SKARSHINSKI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOSHUA STARTUP, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SHERISSE STEWARD, OF MARYLAND
SHARI STOUT, OF ILLINOIS
SEAN TIMMINS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
TIPTEN TROIDL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING POLISH HERITAGE DAY

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to recognize the fourth annual Polish Heritage Day in Michigan City, Indiana. In honor of this special occasion, a commemorative event, the Polish Heritage Festival, will take place on Sunday, September 13, 2015, at the International Friendship Gardens in Michigan City.

During the inaugural festival in 2012, Michigan City Mayor Ron Meer proclaimed the 15th of September as Polish Heritage Day to honor and recognize the contributions made by Polish-American members of the local community.

The Polish Heritage Festival commences with a Polish-English mass in the Symphony Garden. Festivities continue with a performance by Wesoly Lud, a Polish folk dance ensemble, which includes regional costumes made in Poland. Each dance performance by the Chicago troupe incorporates ornate, custom aprons and headdresses for the ladies and embroidered vests and traditional hats for the men. The event also includes savory Polish food from Cavalier Inn of Hammond and Polish baked confectionaries from Bakers Dozen of South Bend.

A special honor, the Polish Ambassador Award, is presented during the festival to bestow recognition and respect on a deserving individual who has acted as an influential promoter of Polish heritage and culture.

For the past three years, the Polish Heritage Festival has applied proceeds from the event to local scholarships and soup kitchens, and also for the restoration of the Polish Garden at the International Friendship Gardens.

The Polish community has had an immense impact on life in Northwest Indiana, through its religious presence, as in the blessing of baskets prior to the Easter holiday and day-long weddings culminating with polka music and large dinners. Traditional Polish cuisine handed down from generation to generation, including pierogi, kielbasa, and paczki, is popular dining fare within the region due to the vast influence of Polish culture throughout Northwest Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing the fourth annual Polish Heritage Day in Michigan City, Indiana. Members of the Polish community have played an important role in enhancing the quality of life and culture of Northwest Indiana, and for that, they are to be commended.

HONORING RICH SCHLESIGER

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit this statement to honor the memory of Humboldt County Sheriff's Office Corporal Rich Schlesiger, who passed away on September 7, 2015. A native of Humboldt County, California, Mr. Schlesiger began his law enforcement career in the Siskiyou County Sheriff's Office in 1991. He was hired by the Humboldt County Sheriff's Office as a deputy sheriff in 1995 and worked in the Hoopa area for a year before being reassigned to Main Station Patrol Operations in Eureka.

Mr. Schlesiger served as bailiff for Humboldt County Superior Court beginning in 1999, and become a rotational detective in 2001. In 2005, Mr. Schlesiger was promoted to permanent investigator. Between 2005 and 2013 he investigated several high-profile homicide cases which resulted in successful prosecutions.

In 2013, Mr. Schlesiger accepted a position as Eel River deputy, working with the Bear River Band of Rhonerville Rancheria and the community of Loleta, and earned the respect and gratitude of many of the area's citizens. He was promoted to the rank of sheriff's corporal in 2014. Through his career, Mr. Schlesiger also served with distinction as a SWAT team member.

Mr. Schlesiger was forced to retire due to illness on December 30, 2014, and passed away less than a year afterward. His many contributions to law enforcement and public safety will be remembered for years to come. It is with deep respect that we mourn the passing of Mr. Rich Schlesiger and extend condolences to his family. His presence will be sorely missed.

RECOGNIZING THE DENCO AREA 9-1-1 DISTRICT

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Denco Area 9-1-1 District as they celebrate their 25th Anniversary. Previously known as the Denton County Area Emergency Communication District, Denco was authorized by the Texas Legislature, established in Denton County through local election on August 25, 1987 with the strong support of county and local officials, and commenced operation on August 18, 1990.

Denco established the first emergency response telecommunications system with 9-1-1 service for Denton County. This vital organization has provided ground-breaking service for North Texas citizens by delivering efficient

and effective response for those caught in emergency situations. They also have provided annual educational programs to 68,000+ school-aged children regarding the proper use of a 9-1-1 call.

As a leader in emergency assistance, Denco is to be commended for their numerous accomplishments and enhancements to their infrastructure and service capability over the years. They were the first district in Texas to provide a 24/7 response program.

I am honored to join Denco in celebrating this important milestone, a significant achievement in their history as well as an event to be noted and appreciated by the communities they serve. As a worthwhile organization committed to ensuring the safety of Denton County residents, I am proud to represent the Denco Area 9-1-1 District in the U.S. House of Representatives.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF AIR FORCE SENIOR AIRMAN JACQY RAMSEY

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank Jacqy Ramsey, for his service to our nation in the United States Air Force.

Jacqy enlisted in the Air Force in May 1966 and reported for Basic Military Training (BMT) at Lackland AFB, TX. Following BMT, he completed Pneudraulic Repairman Course and was the Honor Graduate of Aircraft Pneudraulic Repair Tech School. In August 1966 he reported to 36th Troop Carrier Squadron (TAC) at Langley Air Force Base, Virginia.

Senior Airman Ramsey distinguished himself amongst his peers as a Pneudraulics Repairman in the 36 TAC. On 13 February 1967, en route to Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, the C-130 on which Ramsey was a passenger experienced landing gear failure when the left main landing gear failed to extend. All efforts by the flight and maintenance crews failed to extend the landing gear. He discerned the problem, left his seat, and went to the aid of the flight crew. Due to his experience and knowledge of the gear system, he skillfully released the emergency release handle, lowered the landing gear, and locked it in place. His quick thinking and knowledge allowed the aircraft to make a safe landing.

His personal awards include the National Defense Service Medal, Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, and the Air Force Good Conduct Medal. After receiving an Honorable Discharge from the United States Air Force in May 1972, Senior Airman Ramsey went on to work for IBM for 30 years.

A handyman and inventor, Senior Airman Ramsey built his own home, is skilled in construction, electrical, plumbing, and mechanical work. He also designed and built from scratch

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

a wood boiler system that heats and provides hot water for his home. To fuel it, he built a large wood splitter that can split logs up to 2 feet in diameter. As a grandfather, he taught his grandsons how to work and drive heavy equipment.

Jacqy excelled while in the Air Force as well as during his career at IBM and I am honored to pay tribute to this Veteran. I know that Jacqy's wife, Arlene; his daughters Amy Manuel, 44; Emilee Haskins, 42; Jackie Sherer, 40; and Bridget Sibley, 40; his grandchildren; Miranda Updegraff, 22; Chandler Manuel, 19; Coleman Manuel, 18; Conner Manuel, 16; Cyron Manuel, 13; Merrit Manuel, 10; Nathanael Haskins, 18; Samuel Haskins, 14; Emma Haskins, 12; Meredith Haskins, 11; Eli Haskins, 6; Ben Haskins, 3; Zachary Sherer, 15; Moriah Sherer, 13; Xander Sherer, 9; Logan Sibley, 15; and Raegan Sibley, 4; and great-grandson Emmett Updegraff, 1, are all proud of Jacqy. I am thankful and proud of all of our Veterans like Jacqy who have selflessly given so much in service to our great nation.

RECOGNIZING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF SIGMA NU'S BETA THETA CHAPTER AT AUBURN UNIVERSITY

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I along with my Alabama colleague, Congressman MIKE ROGERS, rise today to recognize the 125th anniversary of the Beta Theta chapter of Sigma Nu Fraternity. The Beta Theta chapter is located on-campus at Auburn University in our home state of Alabama.

Sigma Nu Fraternity was founded on January 1, 1869, on the campus of Virginia Military Institute in Lexington, Virginia. The Beta Theta chapter of Sigma Nu was chartered by the High Council on September 18, 1890, and is the 27th charter granted by the High Council. The chapter has been continuously operating on Auburn's campus since that day.

For the last 125 years, members of Auburn's Sigma Nu fraternity have made a lasting impact on their city, state, and country. Sigma Nu members have served in our nation's military to protect freedom at home and abroad in every war since 1890. Members of the fraternity have been leaders in business, medicine, law, politics, and community service.

The Knights of Sigma Nu Fraternity at Auburn have also made a lasting impact on their campus. From community service to leadership roles in student organizations, Sigma Nu has contributed to the betterment and well-being of Auburn University.

Most importantly, the men of the Beta Theta Chapter of Sigma Nu have a proud history of upholding their guiding ethical values of love, honor, and truth over the last 125 years.

So Mr. Speaker, Congressman ROGERS and I are proud to recognize the Beta Theta Chapter of Sigma Nu Fraternity, and we look forward to their continued positive impact at Auburn University and throughout our great nation.

RECOGNIZING JIM A. COFFEY

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jim A. Coffey who is retiring after 30+ years of dedicated public service with the University of North Texas Police Department. Promoted to captain in 2007, Coffey has served within the UNT Police Department in multiple capacities. He is recognized as a consummate law enforcement professional, an event management expert, a public speaker regarding crime prevention and esteemed mentor to aspiring police officers. Coffey is an integral part of the university community and widely known by students and professors for his passion and dedication for his job.

As an alumnus of UNT, Coffey has come full circle, beginning his tenure as a part-time student and transitioning into a full-time staff member in the police department. As he progressed through the ranks from Communications Officer to Support Service Division Captain, he made a positive impact on his colleagues and will leave a lasting legacy on the UNT campus. His résumé boasts numerous awards, honors and positions of leadership, including UNT Police Department Certificate of Merit, UNT Staff Council Chair, Leadership Denton graduate, Officer of the Year in 1988, and Excellence in Public Service Award in 2003.

I and my staff appreciate the assistance and support we have received from Captain Coffey over many years of working with UNT. I am honored to represent him in the U.S. House of Representatives, and I gladly join the UNT administration, faculty and his police department colleagues in celebrating Captain Jim Coffey's excellent service and wishing him well in his future endeavors.

HONORING JEFF PATTISON ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET ASSISTANT AT THE NH STATE HOUSE

HON. FRANK C. GUINTA

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my congratulations to Jeff Pattison on his retirement after 32 years in the Office of the Legislative Budget Assistant at the New Hampshire State House, and thank him for the outstanding work he did during his career.

Mr. Pattison's continuous progression within the Legislative Budget Assistant's Office during his time as a public servant exemplifies his intelligence, positive attitude, and commitment to providing lawmakers with the necessary resources for crafting a budget. The hours he spent volunteering his time as a member of the Laconia Parks and Recreation Commission have also been invaluable, and his leadership will be sorely missed within the Laconia community.

It is with great admiration that I congratulate Mr. Pattison on his retirement, and wish him the best on all future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF SACRED HEART HOSPITAL IN PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 100th anniversary of Sacred Heart Hospital in Pensacola, Florida. For a century, the dedicated doctors, nurses, health care professionals, and staff of Sacred Heart have provided world-class services to residents of Northwest Florida, saving countless lives and serving as an integral part of the Northwest Florida community.

Sacred Heart Hospital, which opened its doors on August 31, 1915, is rooted in its founding as a partnership between local citizens and the Daughters of Charity. Its original mission to provide compassionate care to all in the community continues to serve as the hallmark of its success. In the hospital's first location, on Twelfth Avenue, a group of dedicated professionals staffed a 125 bed facility. Despite facing myriad challenges—ranging from hurricanes, a flu epidemic, the Great Depression, and both World Wars—Sacred Heart never wavered in its commitment to excellence, providing unparalleled care to Northwest Florida residents. During the Great Depression, the hospital often served patients who had no other means to cover medical services, and Sacred Heart's school of nursing, located next door to the original facility, trained more than 700 nurses to help serve the community.

In the 1960s, when a growing community brought increased need for expanded health care services, Sacred Heart was there to answer the call. After assiduous planning, Sacred Heart moved to its current location on Ninth Avenue on March 13, 1965. In addition to expanding the hospital's overall capacity, Sacred Heart also built a series of units to provide specialized care to the community. Shortly after opening its new facility, Sacred Heart Children's Hospital was established in 1969, serving as the sole facility in Northwest Florida wholly dedicated to the treatment of infants and children. That same year, the hospital opened a coronary care unit, carrying out its first open heart surgery in 1972, and in the 1980s the hospital expanded further, opening a pediatric intensive care unit, family care centers, the Sacred Heart Surgical Center, and the Ann L. Baroco Center for Breast Health. In subsequent years, the hospital continued to grow, adding a new MRI facility, heart-catheterization facility, outpatient diagnostic center, outpatient surgery facilities, and the James H. Baroco Cancer Care Center, as well as the new Children's Hospital, Women's Hospital, Regional Heart and Vascular Institute, the Nemours Children's Clinic, and the Sacred Heart Cancer Clinic.

To help mark the growth of the hospital, from its humble beginnings to a truly regional network, the hospital officially renamed itself Sacred Heart Health System in 1996. This change accurately reflects the care that Sacred Heart provides throughout both Northwest Florida and South Alabama. Today, Sacred Heart's health network provides care at all stages of life—from award-winning pediatric

services to care at the Haven of Our Lady of Peace nursing home—across eight Gulf Coast counties. Sacred Heart's Pensacola location has continued to grow, most recently adding the Bayou Tower in 2014 to expand the hospital's capacity in Pensacola to 566 beds. In addition, Sacred Heart further expanded to meet the health care needs of Okaloosa and Walton Counties by constructing Sacred Heart on the Emerald Coast—a 58 bed hospital in Destin, Florida—as well as Sacred Heart Hospital on the Gulf—a 19 bed community hospital in Gulf County, in Port St. Joe, Florida. Today, a century after its founding, Sacred Heart has 78 facilities serving hundreds of thousands of residents along 350 miles of the Gulf Coast.

While Sacred Heart Hospital and the community it serves have grown exponentially since it first opened its doors, Sacred Heart's dedication to its patients and commitment to compassionate care have never wavered. Sacred Heart's tremendous success is a testament to the thousands of individuals that have worked tirelessly over the last 100 years to serve Northwest Florida.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am honored to recognize and celebrate the Centennial Anniversary of Sacred Heart Hospital. My wife Vicki and I congratulate all those who have worked at Sacred Heart over the course of its history, and wish Sacred Heart all the best as it continues to serve the Gulf Coast community for the next 100 years and beyond.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MRS.
JUDY KERN FAZIO

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my Colleagues, Congressman PETE AGUILAR, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, Congressman XAVIER BECERRA, Congressman AMI BERA, Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY, Congressman KEN CALVERT, Congresswoman LOIS CAPPAS, Congressman TONY CÁRDENAS, Congresswoman JUDY CHU, Congressman PAUL COOK, Congressman JIM COSTA, Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, Congressman JEFF DENHAM, Congressman MARK DESAULNIER, Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO, Congressman SAM FARR, Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI, Congresswoman JANICE HAHN, Congressman MIKE HONDA, Congressman JARED HUFFMAN, Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER, Congressman DARRELL ISSA, Congressman STEVE KNIGHT, Congressman DOUG LAMALFA, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, Congressman TED LIEU, Congressman ALAN LOWENTHAL, Congresswoman DORIS MATSUI, Congressman KEVIN MCCARTHY, Congressman TOM MCCLINTOCK, Congressman JERRY MCNERNEY, Congresswoman GRACE NAPOLITANO, Congressman DEVIN NUNES, Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI, Congressman SCOTT PETERS, Congressman DANA ROHRBACHER, Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, Congressman ED ROYCE, Congressman RAUL RUIZ, Congresswoman LINDA SANCHEZ, Congresswoman LORETTA SÁNCHEZ, Congressman ADAM SCHIFF, Congressman BRAD SHERMAN, Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER, Congressman ERIC SWALWELL,

Congressman MARK TAKANO, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, Congresswoman NORMA TORRES, Congressman DAVID VALADAO, Congressman JUAN VARGAS, Congresswoman MIMI WALTERS, and Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, to honor the life of Mrs. Judy Kern Fazio, the wife of former Congressman Vic Fazio, who passed on August 7, 2015. Judy was a very strong woman who managed the home and a career while working in various positions in Washington, DC. We honor Judy's legacy of working in Democratic politics, being a devoted mother, and wife who supported her husband's political pursuits.

A 32-year resident of Arlington, VA, Judy was born November 13, 1943 in St. Louis, MO. The daughter of Mable and Jacob Neidhardt, she moved from Missouri to California as a young girl, and graduated from Sacramento City College. She became active in local Democratic politics, volunteering for Phil Isenberg's Sacramento mayoral race, George McGovern's presidential campaign and eventually, Vic Fazio's State Assembly run where the two first met. They were married in 1983.

Judy went on to work in the California district office for her husband before moving to Washington, DC. She remained active in national politics, working in development and fundraising for the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee and the Center for National Policy. Before her retirement in 1998, she worked for Arter & Hadden, a Cleveland-based law firm with offices in Washington.

A devoted wife, mother, and grandmother, Judy was also a world traveler and a voracious reader. A consummate hostess, an invitation to the Fazio home meant a great meal, a beautiful home, and a lively conversation. She managed the home and a career, becoming a self-taught gourmet cook while working various positions in Washington, DC.

She is survived by her husband Vic, her children Kevin and Kristie; her stepdaughter Dana; three granddaughters, Kendra Kern, Karly Kern and Keira Jeske, and her sister Carol Davidson. She was preceded in death by stepdaughter Anne Noel Fazio.

Today, The California Congressional Delegation salutes and honors the extraordinary life of Mrs. Judy Kern Fazio. We join all of Judy's loved ones in celebrating her incredible life. She will be deeply missed.

A MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO PAUL
GOLDENBERG

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Paul I. Goldenberg of La Habra, California, a kind, generous and highly respected man who was a pioneer in the field of television sales and marketing.

The son of Jewish immigrants from Russia and Austria, Paul was born in Los Angeles, California on April 22, 1928. After his graduation from Dorsey High School, Paul began his university studies at the University of California, Los Angeles at the young age of 16, but after two weeks, he decided that college

was not for him, and dropped out. After serving in the United States Army as a photographer, he enrolled in a television repair course. In 1952, Paul borrowed \$1000 from a relative to open his very own TV repair shop on the corner of Hollywood Boulevard and Vermont Avenue in Los Angeles.

Mr. Goldenberg expanded his business in 1960 when he opened a store in La Habra, California, selling TVs and other household appliances. Throughout the decades, Paul turned his humble store into the largest single store television retailer in the United States. Through his vision of the future role that television would play, Paul invested heavily into large projection TVs and home video players. It was not long before he became known as the self-proclaimed champion of big screen TV sales, "The King of the Big Screen." Paul was a skilled salesman and marketer who had genuine concern for his customers, and he enjoyed resolving customers' issues, and ensuring that his employees provided top notch customer service.

A generous man, Paul was proud of his philanthropic endeavors, and after his retirement, he dedicated himself even more to his charitable efforts. During his lifetime, he gave over \$20 million to over 173 non-profit and charitable organizations, including the Los Angeles Jewish Home for the Aging, the CHP 11-99 Foundation, and the City of Hope, a comprehensive cancer center in Duarte. Paul awarded college scholarships to Sonora High School students in La Habra and funded annual educational trips to Washington, DC for students at his alma mater, Dorsey High School. Described as a rescuer and a practical psychologist, Paul often lent support and advice to family and friends during their times of tribulation and crisis. A classic film lover since his childhood, he had a great sense of humor, and was an avid storyteller.

Paul passed away on August 13, 2015. He is survived by his son, Douglas Goldenberg, and a granddaughter, Lucy Goldenberg. I ask all members to join me in remembering Paul I. Goldenberg, a captain of his industry, and a man of great virtue and generosity.

RECOGNIZING THE MARSHALL
FAMILY AS THE 2015 OKALOOSA
COUNTY FLORIDA, OUTSTANDING
FARM FAMILY OF THE YEAR

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to recognize the Marshall Family from Baker, Florida, for being selected as the 2015 Okaloosa County, Florida, Outstanding Farm Family of the Year.

Marshall Farms has been a family affair for four generations, and their immense contribution to the Okaloosa County agricultural community is evidenced by their selection as the Outstanding Farm Family of the Year—the second time the family has received this honor. Today, the family's Row-Crop farm, led by James and his son, Nick, covers over 2400 acres and consists of cotton, peanuts, and corn. As leaders in the community in the use of advanced technology, the Marshall family understands the importance of time and efficiency and was among the first to use Precision Agriculture to sample, fertilize, and lime,

as well as new Grid Soil Sampling and GPS-guided planting. Though always working to grow their farming operations, the Marshall family also understands the importance of community involvement, as demonstrated by its constant willingness to work with the Extension and Okaloosa County Farm Bureau, sharing agricultural techniques, and providing tours and agricultural awareness days.

The family's involvement in their local community is not limited to their work on their farm. James and Nick support the community through their service to myriad agricultural organizations. James served on the Farm Service Agency (FSA) Committee for 13 years and as past president of committee and past director on the Farm Credit Board. Nick is the current Vice President of the Florida Peanut Producers Association, member of the Okaloosa County Farm Bureau Board, and was a past board member of the Okaloosa County FSA Committee. Nick and his family also are active members of Crosspoint Methodist Church.

Together, James; his wife of 36 years, Helen; Nick; and his wife of 6 years, Maryann are pillars of our agriculture community. Nick hopes one day to pass the values instilled in him to his two children, Landon and Emery.

Mr. Speaker, Northwest Florida and our Nation share a proud agricultural tradition built by the hard work of farmers and their families. The Okaloosa County Outstanding Farm Family of the Year Award is a reflection of the Marshall's tireless work and their dedication to family and farming. On behalf of the United States Congress, I would like to offer my congratulations to the Marshall family for being outstanding in their field. My wife Vicki and I extend our best wishes for their continued success.

A TRIBUTE TO THE PORTO
FAMILY

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Porto family of Burbank, California, who are being recognized by the Glendale Memorial Hospital Foundation for their contributions to the Dignity Health Glendale Memorial Hospital.

The success of the Porto family stems from humble beginnings in Manzanillo, Cuba. After Fidel Castro's violent revolution erupted in Cuba in the 1950s, Raul Sr. and his wife, Rosa requested permission to leave the country. As they waited for their response, however, Raul Porto Sr. was fired from his job and sentenced to compulsory manual labor. Rosa Porto was also let go from her job, forcing her to find a new way to support herself and their three children; Betty, Raul Jr., and Margarita. Rosa, a talented baker, responded to the challenges facing her by refining her recipes and selling her cakes to friends and neighbors in Cuba, establishing a devoted client base. The Porto family's request to leave the country was eventually approved, and they entered the United States in the early 1960s.

When they stepped off the plane in America, the Portos had next to nothing except their solid work ethic, Rosa's extraordinary baking skills and the hope for a better life.

Rosa's reputation as a skilled baker had preceded her and she found her first customer at the airport. While Raul Sr. found work as a mechanic, Rosa baked and sold cakes from their home, until their home could no longer accommodate the demand, and they opened a bakery in the Echo Park area of Los Angeles that quickly flourished. After diligently working two jobs, Raul Sr. joined Rosa at the bakery fulltime. As they were growing up, their three children had learned the business and upon their college graduations, each took on a more specific role—Raul Jr. managing financing and new product development, Betty co-managing the business with her father, and Margarita joining her mother in the cake decorating area.

As the years went on, their business grew in size and menu items, and they now have three branches in the Los Angeles area. With plans to open additional branches throughout Southern California, Porto's Bakery will continue to be family-owned and operated while maintaining the high quality their customers expect, following Rosa's motto, "quality is the number one ingredient."

Porto's Bakery has contributed to the development of the local economy by creating hundreds of local jobs and serving thousands of consumers, and has been generous in giving back to their community by supporting many worthwhile organizations including the Glendale Memorial Hospital Foundation, American Red Cross, Los Angeles Mission College and Union Rescue Mission. The Porto family's success is a clear demonstration that the American Dream is attainable for all.

I hereby ask all Members of Congress to join me in honoring the Porto family for their dedicated service to the community.

IN MEMORIAM OF DANA MAGNESS
CLEMONS

HON. JOHN RATCLIFFE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I submit this memorial to honor Dana Denise Magness Clemons, a dedicated and outstanding citizen of Fannin County, Texas, who passed away on April 26, 2015 at the too young age of 37 after bravely battling pancreatic cancer. Although her life was tragically shortened, Dana profoundly impacted so many youth in her community. She committed her career to protecting and serving those who were less fortunate, and she left a legacy of caring and love for the lives she touched.

Dana was born in Sherman, TX on August 10, 1977 to Jerry and Brenda (Brown) Magness. She was a member of the Class of 1995 Sam Rayburn High School and graduated with a degree in Criminal Justice and Sociology from Southeastern Oklahoma State University. Dana married Kevin Clemons on September 12, 2003 in Telephone, TX, and she is the mother of Destynie and Kyler Clemons.

Dana dedicated her enormous energies and talents to helping those in her family and her community. She was a staunch advocate for children in need, and she protected our society's most vulnerable citizens throughout her 12 years of employment with Child Protective Services, Children's Medicaid, and Temporary

Aid for Needy Family programs in the State of Texas. While Dana logged many hours investigating reports of abuse or neglect, she encountered dangerous situations. Despite personal risk, she put children's safety and well-being as a top priority. She was honored to receive the Fannin County Children's Advocacy Center's "Team Member of the Year" for her work, a prestigious and well-deserved award.

In December 2013, she joined Adult Probation Services which she felt was her true calling. Due to her illness, she was unable to fully complete her career goals. However, she had a strong impact on those she served.

In addition, Dana had a true giving spirit. If she noticed a special need for a child, she would purchase equipment or shoes so the child could participate in sports or other activities. Many children were benefactors of her anonymous generosity.

Her most important role was that of mother to her two children, Destynie and Kyler. Dana was a wonderful mother who instilled values, virtue, respect and old fashioned manners. Most of all, she taught her children to pray and to trust in God. During her journey with cancer, she modeled how to meet challenges head on, with courage and strong faith.

Dana's heritage includes a family of community servants. While serving with the Texas Farm Bureau, her grandfather, Royce Magness, spent many hours in Washington, DC advocating for American farmers. Dana's father, Jerry Magness, and uncle, David Magness, are County Commissioners in the Great State of Texas. Her mother, Brenda Magness, and grandfather jointly dedicated more than 60 years of service to our Great Nation's Veterans.

So I ask my colleagues to join me today in celebrating the life of Dana Denise Magness Clemons. She left a strong legacy of service and dedication to those in need, and she modeled how to face challenges with courage and faith. God bless her children and her family, and I know her spirit will live on through them.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 125TH AN-
NIVERSARY OF AKRON CHILD-
REN'S HOSPITAL

HON. MARCIA L. FUDGE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Akron Children's Hospital for 125 years of incredible service to the children, their families, and the communities of Northeast Ohio. Akron Children's has grown from a volunteer nursery begun by a handful of resourceful women into the largest pediatric healthcare system in Northeast Ohio, caring for almost 800,000 patients and families each year.

Thank you to President Bill Considine for more than 35 years of service. President Considine has led Akron Children's through a period of great growth, expanding the hospital's service to twenty-seven Ohio counties.

We live in an interesting and exciting time for health care. Millions of Americans gained access to affordable health insurance during the last year. Yet, although Northeast Ohio is home to some of the best health care systems in the country, if not the world, on this day of

celebration we must renew our focus on the most vulnerable among us, our children.

From its humble beginnings as Akron's Day Nursery to its newly constructed critical care tower, Akron Children's Hospital has served Northeast Ohio with the highest standards, earning the distinction of Best Children's Hospital in seven of ten specialties for 2015 by U.S. News and World Report. The Hospital is a pillar in the community, offering more than 100 advocacy, education and outreach programs to strengthen the health and well-being of our children. The recently completed Kay Jewelers Pavilion, which houses a new neonatal intensive care unit, emergency department, outpatient surgery center and special delivery area, increases Akron Children's capacity to provide world-class care and furthers its commitment to the City of Akron and the region.

As Ohio continues to address the unacceptable growth in health disparities across ethnic and racial groups, including the unacceptable infant mortality rate, I look forward to working with Akron Children's Hospital in the years to come.

A TRIBUTE TO NEIGHBORHOOD
LEGAL SERVICES OF LOS ANGELES
COUNTY'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County upon its 50th Anniversary.

Since its inception in 1965, Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County (NLSLA) has provided much-needed free assistance to impoverished individuals throughout the Los Angeles area. Serving more than 100,000 people annually, NLSLA focuses on four key issues: housing, health, equal access to justice, and economic security. The firm encourages a holistic approach, working with attorneys, doctors, and other specialists throughout the Los Angeles area to address those issues that disproportionately affect the poor.

In addition to its standard services, NLSLA's practice areas are sustained by a series of special projects. These projects include the Shriver Housing Project—Los Angeles, The Wellness Center at Historic General Hospital, Kamenir Health Advocacy Fund, Self-Help Centers, Medical Legal Community Partnerships, and the Dickran Tevziran Fellowship Program. Many of these programs have received national recognition.

Under the exceptional leadership of longtime Executive Director Neal Dudovitz and his dedicated staff, NLSLA has become one of the most respected public interest law advocacy groups in California. The organization has made incredible strides towards lessening the consequences of poverty in Los Angeles' low-income communities, both through systemic policy changes and through working with individuals.

Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County has spent the past 50 years advocating for those whose voices may otherwise be lost in the legal system. I ask all members

to join me in congratulating Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County upon its 50th anniversary.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. HELEN
SULLIVAN

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mrs. Helen Sullivan on being recognized as Agriculturist of the Year by the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce.

In an effort to celebrate the agriculture industry that dominates the Central Valley and recognize individuals and organizations within the industry that truly make a difference, the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce hosts a Salute to Agriculture Banquet each year. On September 11, 2015, the Chamber will host its 21st Annual Salute to Agriculture.

Mrs. Sullivan, whose relatives immigrated to the United States from Portugal and Croatia, was born on October 3, 1950 in Hanford, California. Born and raised on a family farm in Hanford, Mrs. Sullivan took over the family business in 1982 with her husband, Patrick. Over the years, Mrs. Sullivan has farmed multiple crops, including cotton, tomatoes, almonds, and walnuts.

In addition to running her farm, Mrs. Sullivan serves as the Board Director for the Kings County Farm Bureau, sits on the board for the Participatory Learning on Agriculture and Nutrition through Technology (PLANT) Foundation, and participates in Citizens for California High Speed Rail Accountability (CCHSRA) and the Burris Park Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Mrs. Helen Sullivan on being honored as Agriculturist of the Year.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE RESPECT FOR NATIVE AMERICANS
IN PROFESSIONAL SPORTS ACT
OF 2015

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Respect for Native Americans in Professional Sports Act of 2015, a bill that would prohibit professional sports leagues that promote or allow a member club or franchise connected with that league to promote the use of the term "Redskins" from receiving an exemption from federal antitrust laws. The name has already been found to be disparaging by the United States Patent and Trademark Office in connection with its use by the National Football League's (NFL) Washington football team.

On June 18, 2014, the United States Patent and Trademark Office, in a landmark decision (*Blackhorse v. Pro Football, Inc.*), found the name used by the Washington football team to be disparaging to Native Americans and not deserving of trademark protection, and canceled federal trademark protection for the "Redskins" name. This decision was most re-

cently affirmed by a federal district court in July 2015.

The NFL is the nation's largest sports league, generating almost \$10 billion annually. Under current federal law, the NFL is able to negotiate broadcast rights for the entire league instead of separately for each individual team without running afoul of federal antitrust laws. This exemption is a great benefit for smaller market teams, which would otherwise be unable to convince major networks to pay for or broadcast those games nationally and would significantly reduce revenue for these teams. My bill would deny this benefit to the NFL, and any professional sports league that uses the slur "redskins" as a team name or a promotional tool.

Federal antitrust laws should no longer offer substantial benefits to multibillion dollar leagues that profit from a name that has been officially found to be a racial slur, and is degrading to many Americans. This bill would revoke all federal antitrust exemptions for professional sports leagues that choose to continue to use the offensive and derogatory term "Redskins."

Over 300 tribes and two million Native Americans, as well as religious and human rights organizations, have called on NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell and Daniel Snyder, the Washington football team owner, to change the team's name because it is an insult to indigenous people. In addition, several media outlets around the country no longer print or use the term "Redskins" when referring to the Washington football team because the term is offensive.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

CONGRESSIONAL MEMORIAL TRIBUTE FOR COL. JAMES LOFTUS
FOWLER, USMC OF ALEXANDRIA,
VA

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Marine Colonel James Loftus Fowler, known as father of the Marine Corps Marathon who died on January 20, 2015, at the age of 84.

On September 14, 2015, the Marine Corps Marathon building, located on Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA will be named Fowler Hall in recognition of the Marine whose "one big idea" helped make "The People's Marathon" an enduring event hosted annually in our nation's capital.

It was in October of 1975 that Colonel Fowler and his superior, Marine General James Ryan, received approval to establish the Marine Corps Reserve Marathon to promote physical fitness and showcase the organizational skills of the U.S. Marine Corps while generating community goodwill.

They intended the Marine Corps Marathon would not only provide an opportunity for runners to qualify for the time-honored event in Boston, but that the Marine Corps Marathon could, over time, improve on the public's perception of military members following the Vietnam War.

While initially under command of the Marine Corps Reserve, the Marathon was reauthorized under the Active Duty Marine Corps in

1978, as it officially became the Marine Corps Marathon. With just under 2,000 runners completing the Marathon during the first two years, the Marine Corps Marathon grew to encompass thousands more runners from across the globe. Each October, Marines and Sailors do us proud by joining together to coordinate the MCM, which has expanded to include a full weekend of events.

Today, the Marine Corps Marathon registers 30,000 participants and is recognized as one of the largest and most-organized marathons in the world.

"I could not have predicted that 30,000 would be running the race," Colonel Fowler said as he saw the event grow. "I wanted a safe race and one where no one would get lost. There were enough problems to handle. You don't foresee all of the problems but you deal with them the best you can. I think it's been good for the Marine Corps and the participants."

Fowler also believed the Marine Corps should not present prize money "because that changes the nature of the race."

"As Marine Corps Marathon founder, Colonel Fowler will be remembered for his powerful impact and for initiating the unique partnership between the U.S. Marine Corps, the running community and the public at large," said MCM Director Rick Nealis.

On Sunday, October 25, the Marine Corps Marathon will celebrate its 40th anniversary in Arlington, VA and our nation's capital with thousands lining the streets to cheer the participants.

Runners and spectators alike will attend the event to also honor our men and women in uniform both past and present who defend our nation's freedoms.

While "The People's Marathon" will continue to spark personal dedication, patriotism and enthusiasm of its participants for many years to come, the Marine Corps Marathon will continue to echo Colonel Fowler's intent to encourage physical fitness, showcase the United States Marine Corps and generate community spirit throughout this great nation.

IN RECOGNITION OF KAHN,
SOARES, AND CONWAY, LLP

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kahn, Soares, and Conway, LLP (KSC) on being recognized as Ag Supporter of the Year by the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce.

In an effort to celebrate the agriculture industry that dominates the Central Valley and recognize individuals and organizations within the industry that truly make a difference, the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce hosts a Salute to Agriculture Banquet each year. On September 11, 2015, the Chamber will host its 21st Annual Salute to Agriculture.

Kahn, Soares, and Conway, LLP was established 35 three years ago in an effort to provide the agriculture industry with more effective legal representation. The firm, which is based in Hanford, California, is well-known for its work with agriculture-related cases, environmental and water law, labor relations, and legislative representation.

Agriculture is the lifeblood of the Central Valley and the community is very fortunate to have a legal firm with such expertise and dedication at their disposal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in commending Kahn, Soares, and Conway, LLP for their service to the agriculture industry and congratulating them on being honored as Ag Supporter of the Year.

COMMEMORATING THE ONE HUNDRED FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF PARIS INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the one hundred fiftieth anniversary of the Paris Independent Schools in Paris, Kentucky. On September 1, 1865, the Paris City Schools opened its doors in the old Bourbon Academy Building, which had been used as a hospital by the Union Army in the Civil War. The first superintendent was Professor Julius Herrick. Records indicate that in 1875 total enrollment was 225 students.

Over the last one hundred and fifty years, the school system has grown in numbers of students, added facilities, organized a Parent Teacher Organization, added libraries, and made numerous educational advancements. Many prominent educators have devoted their careers to educating the children of Paris, Kentucky. A few of the more well-remembered names include Sarah Blanding, who later became dean at the University of Kentucky and Cornell University and President of Vassar College. Blanton Collier taught and coached football and basketball at Paris High School for sixteen years before serving in World War II, becoming head football coach at the University of Kentucky and the Cleveland Browns, and being named as All American coach. Harry Lancaster was an assistant coach at Paris High School before he became an assistant basketball coach at the University of Kentucky under Coach Adolph Rupp, head baseball coach, and athletic director. These are just three of the hundreds of outstanding teachers that have taught the students of Paris.

Paris Independent Schools have been known over the years for high academic achievement, strong music programs, and great athletic teams. They provide well rounded educational opportunities for all students. A strong education is vital in opening doors to young people and providing them hope for a good life. For one hundred and fifty years, Paris Independent Schools have focused on excellence in education. I am honored to commemorate their 150th anniversary and wish them all the best in the future.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF GEISINGER HEALTH SYSTEM

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Geisinger Health System as it celebrates the 100th anniversary of its establishment. Geisinger Health System is an integrated health services organization within my congressional district that is widely admired for its development of innovative care models and its advances in the use of electronic health records and telemedicine.

Over a century ago, Abigail Geisinger, the organization's founder, made the intentions for her namesake quite clear when she said, "Make my hospital right; make it the best." The fact that the first Geisinger Medical Center opened earlier than expected in order to serve its community in the wake of a typhoid emergency in 1915 is indicative of the very organization Ms. Geisinger envisioned, and that legacy continues to this day.

Due to the dedicated commitment of its employees, the health system has grown from the original medical center in Danville into a physician-led, integrated health services organization that is respected both nationally and worldwide. In fact, Geisinger serves more than 2.6 million residents throughout 44 counties in central, south-central, and northeast Pennsylvania—many of whom live in rural, medically underserved areas.

Comprised of approximately 23,500 employees, a 1,200 member multi-specialty group practice, hospitals, research centers, an alcohol and chemical dependency treatment center, and a health plan, Geisinger provides the Commonwealth with a patient care mission that is second to none. Furthermore, the health system leverages an estimated \$8.9 billion annually, revenue that has positively impacted Pennsylvania's economy, and remains integral to statewide development.

Mr. Speaker, I am humbled to join Geisinger Health System in commemorating its 100th anniversary, and remain eternally grateful for the many services the organization provides to my constituents. I wish the organization many more successful years to come.

HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EAST BAY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ALLIANCE

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the 25th anniversary of the East Bay Economic Development Alliance, also known as the East Bay EDA. On October 15, 2015, East Bay EDA will celebrate its many achievements and partnerships that have helped advance the economic vitality of the Bay Area's East Bay region.

East Bay EDA is a cross-sector partnership guided by the expertise, resources, and passion of its public, private, and non-profit leaders, who are focused on regional, sustainable

solutions to attract, retain, and grow businesses in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Founded in 1990 after a thoughtful and strategic process to create a collaborative approach to economic development opportunities and challenges, East Bay EDA continues today as a strong regional voice for strengthening the economy, building a qualified workforce, and enhancing the high quality of life in the East Bay.

East Bay EDA's unique structure of cross-sector leadership, its development of region-specific research, its advocacy that benefits business growth and workforce development, and its efforts to champion employer-led engagement for education that leads to careers makes it an impactful organization for strategic business development. International, domestic, and regional businesses depend on East Bay EDA to provide access to business resources, access to investments and incentives, regional marketing, business-to-business connections, leadership introductions, and land use and infrastructure support to help businesses succeed and create quality jobs. East Bay EDA invests in sustainable strategies to build talented and local workforces to meet tomorrow's job opportunities that require strong STEM education foundations.

On a personal note, I salute my friend and colleague, Chairman of the EDA, Supervisor Carson. His dedication to the residents of the East Bay is both commendable and inspirational. Furthermore, as a former entrepreneur, he understands the diverse needs of the business community, which helps to successfully execute the East Bay EDA's mission of making the East Bay a world-recognized location to grow businesses. He has been consistently re-elected as the Chairman for 22 years because of his passion and leadership for business development.

On behalf of the residents of California's 13th Congressional District, I congratulate East Bay EDA on 25 years of exemplary service as it continues to support the changes in the East Bay economy brought about by technology, environmental stewardship, and global challenges. I wish the East Bay EDA well as it seeks to make the East Bay the premier region for business opportunity, innovation, and the quality of life.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
ALBERT WESS

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding individual, Mr. Albert Wess, of Paris, Kentucky. Mr. Wess, a part of the Greatest Generation, answered his nation's call to service during World War II. Today it is my honor to recognize him before the House of Representatives.

Mr. Wess was born in North Middletown, Kentucky. During World War II he was a member of the United States Army. He served his country as a truck driver in the famous "Red Ball Express". He and his fellow drivers delivered munitions and supplies to the Army front lines in Europe, following General George Patton. They supplied troops fighting in the Battle of the Bulge and the many battles that fol-

lowed. The brave convoy drivers traveled at night with no lights, making it more difficult for German planes to strafe the convoys and destroy the trucks and supplies.

Mr. Wess worked in the steel mills of Ohio for a time after his military service ended. He then moved back to Bourbon County, where he worked at the Lexington Army Depot for thirty two years. After retirement, he worked for Wilson's Drug for more than nineteen years. Mr. Jones and his late wife have four children. He continues to be active in his church, Seventh Street Christian Church in Paris.

The bravery of Mr. Wess and his fellow men and women of the United States Army is heroic. Because of his courage and the courage of individuals from all across Kentucky and our great nation, our freedoms have been preserved for our generation and for future generations. He is truly an outstanding American, a patriot, and a hero to us all.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM CLAY FORD,
JR.

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable leader from my home state of Michigan, William Clay Ford, Jr. Mr. Ford is being honored in Detroit on September 10, 2015 by the USC Shoah Foundation Institute with its 2015 Ambassador for Humanity Award. The USC Shoah Foundation Institute says that "The Ambassador for Humanity Award is reserved for individuals who embody the Institute's values and mission to promote tolerance and mutual respect." Bill Ford is undoubtedly such a person, and it is fitting that he receives this honor.

Bill Ford is the Executive Chairman of Ford Motor Company, which was founded by his great-grandfather, Henry Ford. He worked his way up in the company, where he started at the age of 22 as a product planning specialist, and throughout the years he has mastered the complexities of the company and the auto industry. His leadership at Ford has reflected a twofold commitment—to building the world's best automobiles, while at the same time being a strong corporate citizen in the communities where its facilities are located and in society at large. As a lifelong champion of environmental stewardship, Bill Ford has led Ford Motor Company's efforts to develop and broaden the use of new, environmentally-friendly technologies in its vehicles and to lessen the environmental impact of its manufacturing, from increasing the use of post-consumer product in its plastic parts to leading the restoration of the Ford Rouge Center, which the company says is "the world's largest brownfield reclamation project."

Bill Ford's passion for protecting the environment is matched by his commitment to ensuring that our communities are strengthened by the vital educational, healthcare, and cultural institutions which serve them. One of the important efforts that he and Ford Motor Company are involved with is a partnership with the USC Shoah Foundation Institute's IWitness educational program. IWitness provides educators and students with firsthand

audio and visual accounts from survivors of and witnesses to the Holocaust as well as genocides in Armenia in the early twentieth century, in Nanjing, China in 1937, in Cambodia in the 1970s, and in Rwanda in 1994. These testimonies enable students to learn from history in a deeply personal way, and encourage them to act to oppose and prevent future acts of genocide. Thanks to the commitment of Mr. Ford and the Ford Motor Company, the Institute's IWitness program will be expanded to more schools and students throughout Metro Detroit.

When the award was announced, Steven Spielberg, who founded the USC Shoah Foundation Institute, captured so well the importance of the IWitness program and of Bill Ford's leadership when he said, "Reaching people when they're young is the key to changing the world with testimony . . . the commitment of Bill Ford and the Ford Motor Company to support new approaches to learning, to provide scholarships, and to help deserving students attain higher education make him a great ambassador, and I am proud to recognize him for his efforts."

Mr. Speaker, President John F. Kennedy once said "For of those to whom much is given, much is required." Bill Ford, who has committed so much of his time, talents, and financial resources into strengthening our communities in Southeast Michigan, truly exemplifies this spirit. I encourage my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on so deservedly receiving the 2015 Ambassador for Humanity Award from the USC Shoah Foundation Institute.

RECOGNIZING LARRY DALE ON
FOURTEEN YEARS LEADING THE
ORLANDO SANFORD INTERNATIONAL
AIRPORT AND MANY
DECADES OF SERVICE TO COM-
MUNITY AND COUNTRY

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay recognition to a great friend, dedicated public servant and outstanding community leader: Mr. Larry Dale of Sanford Florida.

Larry is retiring as President and CEO of the Orlando Sanford International Airport this month after 14 years in this leadership position. His work and efforts over the years helped make that airport one of the economic engines in the 7th Congressional District. Since 2001, when Larry took the helm, the airport has significantly improved its operations and expanded services. Orlando Sanford International Airport now serves over 2.2 million passengers a year, with thousands employed. The airport is also consistently in the top 30 busiest airports in the world in terms of total flight operations, recently being awarded the U.S. ANNIES Award for Fastest Growing U.S. Airport in 2014 for facilities serving between 2 million and 5 million passengers.

Mr. Dale has been a leader in the aviation industry during his tenure, advancing national and state issues and establishing Orlando Sanford International Airport as a top innovator in aviation operations and security. In 2010, he was awarded the Florida Department

of Transportation Aviation Professional of the Year award.

Larry Dale also served as Mayor of the City of Sanford from 1996 to 2001 after being active in community affairs for years. Larry served on the Sanford Port Authority Board of Directors, East Central Florida Regional Planning Council, Seminole Community College Board of Trustees, 18th Circuit Judicial Nominating Commission, Lake Mary Volunteer Fire Department and continues to serve the region on MetroPlan Orlando and the Seminole County Development Advisory Board.

The recipient of the Boy Scouts of America Service Award and the Seminole County Chamber of Commerce Lifetime Achievement Award, Larry has been actively involved in Seminole County affairs for three decades. He has been a successful real estate developer, broker and contractor, civic leader, elected official, airline transportation pilot and certified law enforcement officer.

As Larry Dale retires this month, I know that I am joined by my colleagues from Central Florida in thanking him for his service and wishing him well in the future. Now, he will be able to spend time with his five children, nine grandchildren and his great-grandson hunting, fishing and, of course, flying airplanes.

Mr. Speaker, once again I congratulate Larry Dale on his many accomplishments in his community, the State of Florida, and our nation.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
CAPTAIN MATTHEW ROLAND

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a true American hero, Air Force Captain Matthew D. Roland, from Lexington, Kentucky. Captain Roland gave his life in service to his country when he was killed in Afghanistan on August 26, 2015.

Captain Roland graduated in 2006 from Lexington Catholic High School, where he was a member of the National Honor Society and ran cross country. He was recognized as a born leader, motivated and dedicated to all that he did. Roland was also an Eagle Scout. He earned an appointment to the United States Air Force Academy, where he graduated in 2010.

Captain Roland was a special tactics officer at the 23rd Special Tactics Squadron in Afghanistan. He completed the rigorous special tactics training program in 2012, then was a team leader who supervised combat preparedness training for a thirty five member team. He deployed three times in his five years of service, serving in many locations around the world.

Colonel Wolfe Davidson, 24th Special Operations commander, described Roland and fellow hero Forrest as "incredible warriors who not only volunteered to join our nation's Special Operations Forces, but earned their way to the tip of the spear in defense of our nation."

Captain Roland is survived by his parents, retired Air Force Colonel Mark Roland and Barbara Roland, and his sister, Erica.

The tragic loss of this brave man is felt by all who knew him. Along with a grateful nation,

I honor his legacy, embrace his family, and say thank you for his ultimate sacrifice for American freedom.

RECOGNIZING THE CHARLIE
COMPANY

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Charlie Company, a unit of the United States Marine Corps Reserves, who this year celebrates the 65th anniversary of the first time they left the United States to fight for our country in Korea. As a Colonel in the Ohio National Guard, I understand and appreciate the dedicated service of the Charlie Company.

The Charlie Company was formed on September 1, 1947 comprised of many World War II Marines who wanted to continue their service. After the Korean War began, the 177 man Company was sent from Fort Hayes in Columbus to Camp Pendleton in California to complete training. By November of 1950, the men were sent out to South Korea.

The Charlie Company faced combat action within two weeks of being in South Korea. One of the toughest battles they fought in was in the mountains of North Korea near the Chosin Reservoir, where they were ambushed and outnumbered by the Chinese Army. After several days, the Marines finally broke free. Five men were killed in action and over 45 Purple Hearts were given to the Company. Members of the Company also earned additional medals such as the Silver Star and Bronze Star.

The Charlie Company has had an incredible history of serving our country bravely in battle and continues to serve today. I am honored to recognize and thank the former and current members of the Charlie Company for the service they provide our nation.

HONORING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF GUGLIELMO WINERY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, the Santa Clara Valley, or Silicon Valley, is home to many successful businesses that were founded by immigrants. I rise today to recognize one such business, Guglielmo Winery, which is celebrating the ninetieth anniversary of its establishment this year. In 1908, Emilio Guglielmo departed from the small town of Susa, in the Piedmont region of Italy, in search of the American dream. Upon his arrival in San Francisco, Emilio began working at a tannery, and his wife Emilia worked at a French laundry. After fifteen years of hard work, the Guglielmos had set aside enough to purchase fifteen acres in Morgan Hill, where they established their winery. Emilia and Emilio passed the winery down to their son George W. and his wife Madeline in 1945. Guglielmo Winery is now in its third generation of family ownership—jointly managed by

Emilio's grandsons George E., Gene, and Gary—and holds title as the oldest continuously operating family-owned winery in the Santa Clara Valley. On September 12, Guglielmo Winery will celebrate this significant milestone in traditional Guglielmo fashion: with friends, family, and wine. I congratulate them on this significant milestone and wish the Guglielmos many years of fruitful harvests.

HONORING THE LIFE OF EDWIN
GREEN LANE III

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the life of a public servant from Kentucky's Sixth District, Edwin "Ed" Green Lane III. Mr. Lane was a successful business owner, a member of Lexington's city council, a philanthropist, and a leader in the community.

Ed Lane founded Lane Consultants in 1981, a commercial real estate brokerage based in Lexington. Later he added Lane Communications Group, publisher of several magazines and e-newsletters. Best known of these is The Lane Report, a highly respected magazine for Kentucky business news. He was well known as a strong voice for the business community in Lexington and indeed all across Kentucky.

Councilmember Lane was elected to represent Lexington's 12th District on the Urban County Government Council in 2005. He was known for focusing on sound financial policy and for thoroughly analyzing budget numbers and their long term effect for the city. Councilmember Lane was a strong advocate for his district and brought business expertise and experience to the council. He will be deeply missed in Lexington's government.

In addition to his business and governmental interests, Councilmember Lane served on the boards of numerous business, arts, government, and civic organizations. He gave generously of his time and resources.

Ed Lane loved his work in business and in government. He was an artist, art collector, and photographer. Ed was an avid cook and enjoyed entertaining. He loved gardening, reading, fast cars, and, yes, politics. He always had a strong work ethic and an enthusiasm for life. He was energetic and optimistic in all that he did. Ed fought cancer bravely for over two years ago, only sharing his diagnosis with close family members. He is survived by two daughters, Susan Brett Lane and Katharine Meredith Lane.

Ed Lane was a great American who gave of himself in many ways to better his community and his nation. He will be sorely missed, but the world is a better place because of the impact made by Edwin Green Lane III.

CONSTITUTION WEEK

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following proclamation:

Whereas, it is the privilege and duty of the American people to commemorate the two hundred and twenty-eighth anniversary of the drafting of the Constitution of the United States of America by the Constitutional Convention; and

Whereas, it is fitting and proper to officially recognize this magnificent document and the anniversary of its creation; and

Whereas, public law 915 guarantees the issuing of a proclamation each year by the President of the United States of America designating September 17 through 23 as constitution week;

Now, therefore, I, TOM RICE by virtue of the authority vested in me as representative of the Seventh District of the state of South Carolina, do hereby proclaim September 17 through 23, 2015 to be Constitution week and ask our citizens to reaffirm the ideals the Framers of the Constitution had in 1787.

IN CELEBRATION OF ALLISON
TRANSMISSION'S CENTENNIAL
ANNIVERSARY

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Allison Transmission in celebration of its 100th anniversary. The company has a rich history in Indianapolis, but its accomplishments can be seen globally. It is my privilege to honor this strong Hoosier company as it celebrates 100 years of excellence.

Since its founding in 1915, Allison Transmission has become the largest manufacturer of fully automatic transmissions and a leader in hybrid-propulsion systems for city buses. The company's heritage traces back to when James Allison, co-founder of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway and part owner of several racing teams, founded the Indianapolis Speedway Team Company.

While at first the company was focused on racecars, the company switched gears after the start of World War I and put all of its resources toward helping the United States military. In 1920, the name was changed to Allison Engineering Company. For its first couple of decades, Allison primarily manufactured engines and service parts for the military, but in 1946 Allison entered the commercial transmission field and would later go on to create the world's first fully automatic transmission. Since then, Allison Transmission has produced over 5 million transmissions and over 1 million fully automatic transmissions.

The company is a leader in innovative technological advancements and is responsible for multiple groundbreaking inventions. In addition to the world's first fully automatic transmission, one of its most notable inventions is steel-backed bronze bearings, which extend the service life of aircraft engines and were famously used in Charles Lindbergh's Spirit of St. Louis in 1927.

Allison Transmission has strong roots in Indianapolis and its headquarters remains there today. The company now has an international presence with over 2,700 employees, a market presence in more than 80 countries, and approximately 1,400 independent distributor

and dealer locations worldwide. Allison transmissions can be found in cities and rural areas across the globe in a wide variety of applications such as buses, trains, cars, trucks, and airplanes.

James Allison founded the company under 5 key values: innovation, quality, integrity, customer focus, and teamwork. These values have led the company to its many achievements and remain evident today through the hard work and dedication of its employees. The company's commitment to providing high-quality services that improve efficiency and make work as easy as possible for their customers is manifested in the unrivaled reliability and durability of their transmissions.

In addition to all of Allison's achievements in the manufacturing world, they also have a robust history of community involvement. As part of their centennial celebration, Allison Transmission will be sponsoring a variety of community activities, including the building of a house for a family in need, sponsoring an essay contest for students at James A. Allison Elementary School in Speedway, and awarding 100 scholarships to local college students. The company has also earned the prestigious Centennial Business Award of the Indiana Historical Society.

On behalf of the citizens of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District, I would like to congratulate Allison Transmission on the celebration of its centennial anniversary. I am proud to represent a city that is home to exemplary businesses such as this one. I wish Allison Transmission all the best as it embarks on its next 100 years of excellence.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MR.
GEORGE BUCHANAN

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding individual, Mr. George Buchanan, of Lexington, Kentucky. Mr. Buchanan, a part of the Greatest Generation, answered his nation's call to service during World War II.

Mr. Buchanan grew up in Hazel Green on a small subsistence farm. There were three boys in his family, all of whom served in WWII. Following high school, young George got a job in a drugstore, working behind the soda fountain. He was drafted shortly after the Pearl Harbor attack. Because of his drugstore experience he was chosen to be a medic, despite a great fear of the sight of blood and passing out several times during training. He completed his training and became a surgical technician 861. He was assigned to the 97th QM Battalion, where they packed onto the Aquitania for a very rough North Atlantic crossing.

Mr. Buchanan landed on Omaha Beach just a few days following the D-Day invasion. He and other medics treated the sick and wounded. They also checked the dead, tagged them, and took them to the morgue. They saw hundreds who were shot, burned, and mangled. His unit traveled across Europe, through France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Germany, and Czechoslovakia, continuing to treat the sick and wounded, tagging the dead and taking

them to the morgue. They lived in foxholes along the way and showered about once a month when they got a clean change of clothes. During the Battle of the Bulge, the medics were armed for the first time as they were surrounded by German troops. They were thankful to be rescued by General Patton's troops.

Mr. Buchanan never forgot all the death and injury he witnessed in the war. He went on to attend the University of Kentucky, where he met his future wife Margaret. They settled in Lexington and had four children. Buchanan enjoyed a long career with Commonwealth Life Insurance, where he rose to a prominent level and earned numerous awards. He and Margaret were charter members of Crestwood Christian Church where both were very active. Buchanan was also an active member of the YMCA, serving as a board member and a donor. He was awarded the prestigious Red Triangle Award for service by the YMCA. He was able to make a visit back to Normandy in recent years.

After a full and productive life, Mr. Buchanan passed away on July 20, 2015 at the age of 94. The bravery of Mr. Buchanan and his fellow men and women of the United States Army is heroic. Because of his courage and the courage of individuals from all across Kentucky and our great nation, our freedoms have been preserved for our generation and for future generations. He was truly an outstanding American, a patriot, and a hero to us all.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,151,096,731,763.19. We've added \$7,524,219,682,850.11 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

CONGRATULATING BATAVIA
TOWNSHIP

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Batavia Township on their bicentennial anniversary and celebration.

For 200 years, Batavia Township has stood at the center of Clermont County and has lived up to its motto, "The Heart of Clermont!".

Since its initial survey in 1788 and its incorporation in 1815, Batavia Township has been an industrial leader in Clermont County. From roller coaster production to the manufacturing of food and consumer products, Batavia Township boasts a wide diversity of commerce.

Home to the University of Cincinnati East, a higher education leader in the county, and the Clermont County Airport, a hub of economic activity, the township is central to the region's continued growth.

The township is also home to a wide array of outdoor recreational activities from its new Williamsburg-Batavia Bike Trail to the East Fork State Park, which hosts some of the region's finest rowing competitions and camping options.

I am honored to represent Batavia Township today, an area of the state with a rich history and strong community. Again, I congratulate Batavia Township on this historic milestone, and I wish the township the very best over their next 200 years.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MR.
MIKE BACH

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding Kentuckian and a prominent member of the agriculture industry. Mr. Mike Bach, of Owingsville, Kentucky, served for twenty-eight years as an officer in the United States Army. For four years, he worked as a sales agent for a farm machinery distributor and in 1978 purchased several farms. In 1996 he inherited the family farm in Bath County. Currently Mr. Bach operates B&E Farms along with his wife Mary and son Steven. His farm covers 2,000 acres of beautiful Kentucky farmland in Bath County, where he operates a cow and calf farm and his son Steven raises 1,000 acres of row crops.

In addition to his own farm operation, Mr. Bach is an active leader in Kentucky agriculture. He is past president of the Kentucky Cattlemen's Association and currently serves on the board. He is program chair of the Montgomery County Cattlemen's Association. Bach serves on the board of the Bath County Farm Bureau. Mr. Bach understands the need to educate and encourage the next generation of farmers and as part of that commitment, he serves on the Kentucky 4-H Foundation Board.

Mr. Bach's love of farming and dedication to the agriculture industry in Kentucky were recently recognized by his selection as a member of the Bath County Agriculture Hall of Fame. This honor was well deserved and Bach is a role model to farmers of the future.

In addition to his agriculture interests, Bach is a member of the Association of Officers for the U.S. Army Reserve and is a lifetime member of the National Rifle Association. He enjoys working with old farm equipment.

I am honored today to recognize the accomplishments of Mr. Mike Bach, who has great love for his country and great love for the land. He exemplifies all the men and women across our nation who work hard every day in a job they love—the American Farmer.

“LOVE MOM AND DAD”

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, “Love Mom and Dad,” are the words stenciled on a piece of cardboard, attached to a 36-foot-tall beam known as the “Last Column.” Mom and Dad are Arnold and Rosemary Roma of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who lost their son, Keith on September 11, 2001. Serving as a make shift memorial, the column was covered with personal messages from first responders who lost loved ones. Arnold, “Dad,” retired NYPD and several Port Authority Police officers spray painted “KR FP2” in honor of Keith Roma, son and friend, of Fire Patrol 2.

Presently, the “Last Column” stands as an exhibit at the 9/11 Museum in New York City. On Christmas Eve 2001 Arnold helped uncover the body of his son from the ruins of the North Tower. The Roma's considered themselves fortunate as they were able to bring their son home for a proper good bye.

Following the attacks on September 11, 2001, we would say “good bye” to 343 New York Firefighters, 72 Law Enforcement Officers, and one New York Fire Patrolman, Keith Roma. As September 11th approaches, we are reminded to express appreciation for the sacrifice paid by these first responders and their families.

Today, in the midst of many conversations regarding the state of law enforcement in our country, we still find ourselves saying “good bye.” Those conversations must also include, “Thank you.”

HONORING 100 YEARS OF SERVICE
OF THE CASCADE FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. GLENN GROTHMAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Fire Department of Cascade, Wisconsin on 100 years of service to their community. The Cascade Fire Department has a long and proud history of providing fire protection services to the Village of Cascade, the Town of Lyndon, and the Town of Mitchell.

On September 2, 1915, a group of citizens met in Cascade to discuss the formation of a fire department. This newly formed department started out with just \$681 worth of firefighting equipment. Over the next several years, they acquired more advanced firefighting equipment and learned advanced firefighting practices to make firefighting safer and more effective to make our communities safer.

I am grateful to the members of our local fire departments who put their lives on the line to keep their communities healthy and safe. The towns and villages across America continue to enjoy peace of mind knowing that their own community members are willing to step up and protect their neighbors. I join with the people of Cascade, Lyndon, and Mitchell to offer a heartfelt thank you to the Cascade Fire Department for their service. It is a privi-

lege to represent such fine public safety officers in Congress.

RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH
ANNIVERSARY OF TAYLOR DANCE

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Taylor Dance Program and celebrate its founder, Joy Squire. Since 1966, Joy has made it her life's mission to promote awareness and appreciation of the art of dance across Southeast Michigan.

Joy understands the importance of kindness in instruction, as evidenced by the affection of her hundreds of students from more than 30 metropolitan Detroit communities across generations. From the very first class she taught, Joy has always sought to awaken and promote the creative gifts that exist in each student. She has nurtured the talents of dancers of all ages, even supporting scholarship opportunities for her pupils to attend prestigious dance programs across the country.

It should be no surprise then that Joy has been noted for her excellence by the Downriver Council for the Arts and has been inducted into the Taylor Sports and Recreation Hall of Fame. Her dedication to keeping the Taylor Dance Program a place for high-quality, affordable dance instruction has led to it being named one of the “premier” dance training centers in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to honor Joy Squire and the Taylor Dance Program for inspiring generations of students in Southeast Michigan toward reaching their full potential. I thank her for her devotion to the community and wish her many more years of success.

H.J. RES. 64

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 64—Disapproving of the agreement transmitted to Congress by the President on July 19, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran.

First, I would like to commend all the individuals from the Obama Administration and their counterparts across the globe for the tireless work they put into this agreement.

Since the Iranian revolution in 1979, this is the closest our country and the international community have come to signing a peace agreement.

That progress did not come without significant sacrifice of personal and professional time.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I am unable to support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

While I commend all those involved and recognize the importance of a comprehensive nuclear agreement with Iran, I do not believe that is what we are getting.

For the past 30 years, the international community has been subjected to Iranian threats and bully behavior.

The international community has had to tolerate Iran's constant threats to destroy the State of Israel, our staunch ally.

For too long, the community of nations has dealt with Iran's funding of terrorism throughout the Middle East and the world.

I am unable to support a deal that would allow the Iranian regime to continue to perpetrate these actions without any repercussions.

It is important to mention that these are not just my beliefs.

Since the announcement in July, my office has received hundreds of contacts from constituents opposing the Iran agreement.

In the month of August, I held townhalls, hosted meetings and conducted constituent visits.

The majority of those interactions affirmed the people in our district do not trust Iran.

The State of Israel should not have to worry about more threats and potentially expanded attacks funded by Iranian petro-dollars.

The United States shouldn't have to provide relief to a regime that continues to call for our destruction and that of our allies.

I believe the delay and dismantlement of Iran's nuclear program is a laudable goal, perhaps one of the most important in the world.

I also believe that we should work to alleviate the pressures and foster the goals of the Iranian people.

The young people in Iran are being held accountable for the actions of an autocratic, religiously motivated panel of leaders.

However, we cannot ignore 30 years of unrelenting threats and condemnable behavior for a decade or less of nuclear concessions.

In Texas, perception is often reality and if you are perceived as a bully, then you'll be treated as one.

We spent too many years bringing Iran to the table through sanctions and diplomatic pressures.

We cannot easily forget the history between the two countries but we can hopefully work towards a better situation.

As long as our friends and allies in the Middle East and around the world feel the threat

of Iranian influence, our job as the United States is to hold the regime accountable in every way possible.

It is my hope we work together to block this deal and use its framework to get a better deal.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.J. Res. 64.

WOMEN'S HEALTH
ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

HON. RENEE L. ELLMERS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, please remove Member MCSALLY as a cosponsor of H.R. 3443 as she was added inadvertently by my staff when cosponsoring another bill of ours, H.R. 3339.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6543–S6612

Measures Introduced: Eight bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2021–2028, and S. Res. 251. **Pages S6604–05**

Measures Reported:

S. 35, to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana. (S. Rept. No. 114–139)

S. 248, to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act. (S. Rept. No. 114–140)

S. 465, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe. (S. Rept. No. 114–141) **Page S6604**

Measures Passed:

Outpatient Therapeutic Services Supervision Requirements: Senate passed S. 1461, to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S6610**

District of Columbia Courts, Public Defender Service, and Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency Act: Senate passed S. 1629, to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia. **Pages S6610–11**

Measures Considered:

Hire More Heroes Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Pro-

tection and Affordable Care Act, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S6544–96

Pending:

McConnell Amendment No. 2640, of a perfecting nature. **Page S6544**

McConnell Amendment No. 2641 (to Amendment No. 2640), to change the enactment date. **Page S6544**

McConnell Amendment No. 2642 (to Amendment No. 2641), of a perfecting nature. **Page S6544**

McConnell Amendment No. 2643 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 2640), to change the enactment date. **Page S6544**

McConnell Amendment No. 2644 (to Amendment No. 2643), of a perfecting nature. **Page S6544**

McConnell motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 2645, to change the enactment date. **Page S6544**

McConnell Amendment No. 2646 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 2645), of a perfecting nature. **Page S6544**

McConnell Amendment No. 2647 (to Amendment No. 2646), of a perfecting nature. **Page S6544**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 58 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 264), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on McConnell Amendment No. 2640. **Page S6581**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the motion to invoke cloture on the joint resolution, be withdrawn. **Page S6581**

A motion was entered to close further debate on McConnell Amendment No. 2640, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of September 10, 2015, a vote on cloture will occur at 6 p.m., on Tuesday, September 15, 2015. **Pages S6581–82**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the joint resolution, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the

Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of McConnell Amendment No. 2640. **Page S6582**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 1 p.m., on Tuesday, September 15, 2015, Senate resume consideration of the joint resolution, with the time until 6 p.m., equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees; and that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today's session on McConnell Amendment No. 2640, and on the joint resolution, ripen at 6 p.m., on Tuesday, September 15, 2015. **Page S6611**

Pro Forma—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate adjourn until 9:30 a.m., on Friday, September 11, 2015, for a pro forma session, with no business conducted; and that when the Senate adjourns on September 11, 2015, it next convene at 1 p.m., on Tuesday, September 15, 2015. **Page S6611**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM-23) **Page S6604**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Cassandra Q. Butts, of the District of Columbia, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Seventieth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Barbara Lee, of California, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Seventieth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Christopher H. Smith, of New Jersey, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Seventieth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

A routine list in the Foreign Service.

Pages S6611–12

Messages from the House: **Page S6604**

Executive Communications: **Page S6604**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6605–06**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6606–09**

Additional Statements: **Pages S6603–04**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S6609**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Pages S6609–10**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S6610**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—264) **Page S6581**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 7:02 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Friday, September 11, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6611.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 20 public bills, H.R. 3470–3489; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 414–416, were introduced. **Pages H5941–42**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H5943–44**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows: H.R. 511, to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–260). **Page H5941**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Young (IA) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5869**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:13 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H5878**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Reverend Andrew Walton, Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church, Washington, DC. **Page H5878**

Finding that the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015: The House agreed to H. Res. 411, finding that the President has not complied

with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, by a yea-and-nay vote of 245 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 492. **Pages H5891–H5911**

H. Res. 412, the rule providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 411) and providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3461) and (H.R. 3460) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 243 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 491, after the previous question was ordered. **Pages H5882–91**

Approving the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran: The House considered H.R. 3461, to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran. Further proceedings were postponed. **Pages H5911–35**

H. Res. 412, the rule providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 411) and providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3461) and (H.R. 3460) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 243 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 491, after the previous question was ordered. **Pages H5882–91**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the emergency declared in Proclamation 7463 with respect to the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001 is to continue in effect for an additional year—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 114–58). **Page H5891**

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate and message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appear on pages H5875–76 and H5882.

Senate Referrals: S. 1603 was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Armed Services. S. 349 was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. **Page H5939**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5891 and H5911. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:52 p.m.

Committee Meetings

OPTIMIZED FLEET RESPONSE PLAN

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing entitled “Optimized Fleet Response Plan”. Testimony was heard from Rear Admiral Jeffrey A. Harley, U.S. Navy, Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Operations, Plans, and

Strategy (OPNAV N3/5B); and Captain Thom Burke, U.S. Navy, Director, Fleet Readiness (N43).

THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION’S DEAL WITH IRAN: IMPLICATIONS FOR MISSILE DEFENSE AND NONPROLIFERATION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled “The Obama Administration’s Deal with Iran: Implications for Missile Defense and Nonproliferation”. Testimony was heard from Frank Klotz, Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration; Robert M. Scher, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Strategy, Plans, and Capabilities, Department of Defense; Christopher J. Almont, Senior Defense Intelligence Expert, Iran and the Arabian Peninsula, Middle East/Africa Regional Center, Defense Intelligence Agency; Vice Admiral James Syring, USN, Director, Missile Defense Agency; and Major General Steven M. Shepro, USAF, Vice Director for Strategic Plans and Policy, J5, Joint Staff.

PREVENTING AND RESPONDING TO SEXUAL ASSAULT ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training held a hearing entitled “Preventing and Responding to Sexual Assault on College Campuses”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a markup on H.R. 702, to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions. H.R. 702 was forwarded to the full committee, without amendment.

PRESERVING RETIREMENT SECURITY AND INVESTMENT CHOICES FOR ALL AMERICANS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations; and Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises, held a joint hearing entitled “Preserving Retirement Security and Investment Choices for All Americans”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CHINA’S ADVANCE IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere; and Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, held a joint hearing entitled “China’s Advance in Latin America and the Caribbean”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications held a markup on Committee Print of the “Promoting Resilience and Efficiency in Preparing for Attacks and Responding to Emergencies Act”. The Committee Print of the “Promoting Resilience and Efficiency in Preparing for Attacks and Responding to Emergencies Act” was reported to the full committee, as amended.

THE STATE OF COMPETITION IN THE HEALTH CARE MARKETPLACE: THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT’S IMPACT ON COMPETITION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law held a hearing entitled “The State of Competition in the Health Care Marketplace: The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act’s Impact on Competition”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES: COMMERCIAL APPLICATIONS AND PUBLIC POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet held a hearing entitled “Unmanned Aerial Vehicles: Commercial Applications and Public Policy Implications”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 538, the “Native American Energy Act”; H.R. 1541, the “PRISM Act”; H.R. 1644, the “STREAM Act”; H.R. 1880, the “Albuquerque Indian School Land Transfer Act”; H.R. 2130, the “Red River Private Property Protection Act”; H.R. 2168, the “West Coast Dungeness Crab Management Act”; and H.R. 2288, to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 538, H.R. 1880, and H.R. 2168. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 1541, H.R. 1644, H.R. 2130, and H.R. 2288.

GSA: ARMY FEE ASSISTANCE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “GSA: Army Fee Assistance”. Testimony was heard from Carol Fortine Ochoa, Inspector General, General Services Administration; Stephanie L. Hoehne, Director, Family and Morale, Welfare and Recreation, G9, Installation Management Command, U.S. Army; Gerard

Badorrek, Chief Financial Officer, General Services Administration; and public witnesses.

EXAMINING VULNERABILITIES OF AMERICA’S POWER SUPPLY

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Oversight; and Subcommittee on Energy, held a joint hearing entitled “Examining Vulnerabilities of America’s Power Supply”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a markup on Committee Print of the “Surface Transportation Research and Development Act of 2015”; and H.R. 2886, the “Future Transportation Research and Innovation for Prosperity Act”. The Committee Print of the “Surface Transportation Research and Development Act of 2015” and H.R. 2886 were forwarded to the full committee, as amended.

A REVIEW OF LICENSING AND CREDENTIALING STANDARDS FOR SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS: DO BARRIERS STILL REMAIN?

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing entitled “A Review of Licensing and Credentialing Standards for Servicemembers and Veterans: Do Barriers Still Remain?”. Testimony was heard from Teresa W. Gerton, Acting Assistant Secretary, Veterans’ Employment and Training Service, Department of Labor; Frank C. DiGiovanni, Director, Force Readiness and Training, Department of Defense; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 692, the “Default Prevention Act”; and H.R. 3442, the “Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2015”. H.R. 692 and H.R. 3442 were ordered reported, without amendment.

WORLD WIDE CYBER THREATS

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “World Wide Cyber Threats”. Testimony was heard from John O. Brennan, Director, Central Intelligence Agency; James R. Clapper, Director, National Intelligence; James Comey, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation; Admiral Michael S. Rogers, Director, National Security Agency; and Lieutenant General Vincent Stewart, Director, Defense Intelligence Agency.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, hearing entitled “Oversight

of Federal Facility Cleanup under CERCLA”, 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Strengthening Medicaid Program Integrity and Closing Loopholes”, 9:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Federal Lands, hearing on H.R. 3036, the “National 9/11 Memorial at the World Trade Center Act”, 9 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Environment, hearing entitled “State Perspectives: How EPA’s Power Plan Will Shut Down Power Plants”, 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Friday, September 11

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, September 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Complete consideration of H.R. 3461—To approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of H.R. 3460—To suspend until January 21, 2017, the authority of the President to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1252
 Barr, Andy, Ky., E1252, E1253, E1254, E1255, E1256
 Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E1255
 Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E1247, E1248
 Byrne, Bradley, Ala., E1248
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1255
 Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E1256
 Ellmers, Renee L., N.C., E1257

Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E1256
 Fudge, Marcia L., Ohio, E1250
 Green, Gene, Tex., E1256
 Grothman, Glenn, Wisc., E1256
 Guinta, Frank C., N.H., E1248
 Huffman, Jared, Calif., E1247
 Jones, Walter B., N.C., E1251
 Lee, Barbara, Calif., E1252
 Levin, Sander M., Mich., E1253
 Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E1249, E1254
 Mica, John L., Fla., E1253

Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1248, E1249
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E1251
 Ratcliffe, John, Tex., E1250
 Rice, Tom, S.C., E1254
 Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E1249, E1250, E1251
 Stivers, Steve, Ohio, E1254
 Valadao, David G., Calif., E1251, E1252
 Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E1247
 Wenstrup, Brad R., Ohio, E1255
 Wittman, Robert J., Va., E1247



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.fdsys.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.