With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting my Patriot Week resolution.

□ 1715

## ALOHA SPIRIT

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, a week ago, a man walked into a church in South Carolina and, in cold blood, gunned down nine worshippers. His actions were motivated by ignorance and hate. Throughout history and also in present day, unfortunately, there has been so much terror and suffering caused by ignorance and hate.

Mr. Speaker, in order to truly transcend racism, we must do more than remove slurs from our national vocabulary. In Hawaii, my home State, that consciousness is known as the aloha spirit—the consciousness of love and respect for all others, regardless of differences such as race, religion, gender, or nationality.

Understanding this truth is the path to peace. I would like to quote Mahatma Gandhi who said:

> There must be a recognition of the existence of the soul apart from the body, and of its permanent nature, and this recognition must amount to a living faith; and, in the last resort, nonviolence does not avail those who do not possess a living faith in the God of love.

## RECOGNIZING CAROLINE ROBERTSON

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

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize a truly inspirational individual from my district. Caroline Robertson is a 12-year-old girl from Potters Hill, North Carolina. We met last October at an event in Beulaville. She was born with Trisomy 18, a rare chromosomal disorder.

Despite her diagnosis, Caroline has maintained a positive outlook on life, choosing to live every minute of every day. Last year, Caroline was crowned a ''Dream Angel'' by the North Carolina Outstanding Little Miss Pageant. She is using her crown to help raise awareness for handicapped children throughout North Carolina.

Earlier this year, Caroline hosted a fundraiser called Bikers, Tea, and Tiaras to raise money for Children's Miracle Network Hospitals. There were over 35 crown titles in attendance, including Miss North Carolina 2014, Beth Stovall.

Caroline has had to overcome more adversity in 12 years than most of us will in a lifetime. She is a true inspiration to all around her, and I am honored to know her.

I would like to thank her for her work as a Dream Angel, and I know she will continue to accomplish great things in the years to come.

## NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, it seems like every day there is a startling headline about a new concession to Iran in the nuclear negotiations. We are undeniably cascading further and further from where these talks started just 19 months ago.

With the latest deadline for the deal only 5 days away, I fear and expect that even more damaging concessions to the Iranians are on the way. It doesn't need to be this way. We don't have to accept it, and we must make sure that our voices continue to be heard by the administration on this historic issue.

We know that upon reaching a deal—any deal—there will be a full on PR blitz to try to sell this agreement. When that happens, we must stand strong and avoid the temptation to simply go along with the ''thrill of the deal.''

Instead of getting swept up in the momentum, we must not flinch from the simple, foundational idea that we have dedicated ourselves to all along, preventing Iran from having any path to a nuclear weapon. We can do it if we stick together.

## SUPREME COURT ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOOLENAAR). 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, it has been a big day over at the Supreme Court and a big day for the Constitution as the Constitution has taken a rather profound hit.

I understand the rules, Mr. Speaker. The rules are made clear. We will not impugn anybody's integrity and office up here, so I am not talking about an individual, I am talking about how completely dishonest, disingenuous, and how much affront to the Constitution and pure candor the majority's opinion is at the Supreme Court.

Nothing is more of an indictment against the majority opinion than at the end of the opinion itself. The majority indicted themselves with their own words.

At the end of the majority opinion, the majority says, ''In a democracy, the power to make the law rests with those chosen by the people. Our role is more confined''—and then quotes from Marbury v. Madison—''to say what the law is.''

The Court today goes on to say: ''That is easier in some cases than in others. But in every case we must respect the role of the legislature, and take care not to undo what it has done. A fair reading of legislation demands a fair understanding of the legislative plan.

''Congress passed the Affordable Care Act to improve health insurance markets, not to destroy them. If at all possible, we must interpret the Act in a way that is consistent with the former, and avoids the latter. Section 36B can fairly be read consistent with what we see as Congress' plan, and that is the reading we adopt.''

The judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Fourth Circuit is affirmed.

That majority opinion is an indictment of the majority. The Constitution is worthless—absolutely worthless—when we have a majority of the Supreme Court that makes up law or in this case says: Do you know what? We know what Congress passed, we have read it, and we get it.

It makes exceedingly clear that unless a State sets up a State exchange for health care, then that State will be punished by not getting subsidies. That was debated, and that was included by the majority of the House and Senate without a single Republican vote, not a single Republican vote.

As the former chair of Ways and Means told some of our Members: We don't need your vote, and we don't want your input.

They did it as one party, jamming this down the throats of the Republican Party and the majority of the American people. That is why they lost the majority in November 2010.

They made it very clear. If you don't set up a State exchange, you don't get the subsidies in your State. God bless all the States that stood up and said: No, this is wrong. A majority of the American people didn't want this. You passed this without any input from nearly a majority of the constituents that are represented by Republicans. You didn't care that it was the most partisan a bill that has ever passed in Congress. You didn't care. You forced it. It is bad for Americans, and we are not going to help you by setting up a State exchange. Yes, we understand the law is very clear. Our State doesn't get the subsidies from the Federal Government—those are called bribes to be more literal—our State won't get the bribes that you throw back at us that came from our taxpayers if we don't set up the State exchanges. We understand that.

So what happens? The people that passed that bill and the President that helped pass the bill and forced it through and signed it realized they had made a major mistake, and rather than come and get Republicans to fix the disaster they had created, the President who had indicated he has a pen and he has a phone, decided: That allows me to make law, create new law, and change law completely that I have already signed into law because I got a pen and a phone, I can just change it upon my whim.

The President basically decided, through his administration, they decided that they would set up Federal exchanges. Even though the law was

very unequivocal, those States get no subsidies. They decided we better start giving them subsidies. If I sound sensitive about this, Mr. Speaker, it is because I am.

This disaster of a healthcare bill that costs so many of my constituents the health insurance they liked because they were lied to every time they were told by anybody if you like your policy you can keep it, that was a lie, and when people were told, Nobody that is in this country illegally will ever get insurance under ObamaCare, that was a lie.

When they were told, If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor, no matter who told it to them, that was a lie. They were all lies.

We found out later they talked about it within the White House and decided: Well, the best thing to do is not to tell everybody that they stand a good chance of losing their own health insurance and losing their doctor and losing their hospital and losing their particular policy that may keep them alive. Let's don't tell them that. Let's just say, if you like your doctor, if you like your health care, you can keep it.

The bill passed. It was a bad bill, and now, we have a Supreme Court that has entered into the fiction and the fraud that this opinion can somehow act like the law was equivocal when it was very unequivocal.

God bless Antonin Scalia and Clarence Thomas at the—well, the minority opinion, as it says here, I have a copy of the whole opinion, including the dissent, Justice Scalia with Justice Thomas and Justice Alito join, dissenting.

That dissent starts by saying the Court holds that when the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act says ''exchanges established by the State,'' it means ''exchanges established by the State or the Federal Government.''

That is, of course, quite absurd, and the Court's 21 pages of explanation make it no less so.

The dissenting opinion also states in answer to the question of whether someone who buys insurance on an exchange established by the Secretary gets the tax credit, he says: ''You would think the answer would be obviously.''

Obviously, there would hardly be a need for the Supreme Court to hear a case about it. In order to receive any money under section 36B, an individual must enroll in an insurance plan through ''an exchange established by the State.'' The Secretary of Health and Human Services is not a State.

Further down, he says: ''Words no longer have meaning if an exchange that is not established by a State is 'established by the State.' ''

Further down he quotes: ''The plain, obvious, and rational meaning of a statute is always to be preferred to any curious, narrow, hidden sense that nothing but the exigency of a hard case and the ingenuity and study of an acute and powerful intellect would discover.''

That quote is from Lynch v. Alworth-Stephens Company.

□ 1730

Under all the usual rules of interpretation, in short, the government should lose this case, but normal rules of interpretation seem always to yield to overriding principle of the present Court: the Affordable Care Act must be saved.

Mr. Speaker, the trouble this Nation is in when we have a President who makes law at the sound of his voice, at the stroke of his pen, without going through Congress, and then that is aggravated exponentially by a Supreme Court that enters into the charade.

As the Court said on page 5 of its dissent, adopting the Court's interpretations means nullifying the term ''by the State,'' not just once, but again and again throughout the act.

It goes on to point out that the term ''by the State'' is mentioned seven times throughout the bill and that the majority on the Court, they could care less about the Constitution, they could care less about their oath. They feel their job is to uphold anything that this President and the former Democratic majority sent to them, regardless of how badly it requires them to ax the Constitution.

Page 12 of the dissent says: ''For its next defense of the indefensible, the Court''—talking about the majority—''turns to the Affordable Care Act's design and purposes.''

Well, obviously, they need to turn to something because the law was very clear. To get the subsidies, a State had to set up an exchange.

Page 13 of the dissent says: ''Having gone wrong in consulting statutory purpose at all, the Court goes wrong again in analyzing it.''

Page 15 of the dissent says: ''Compounding its errors, the Court forgets that it is no more appropriate to consider one of a statute's purposes in isolation than it is to consider one of its words that way.''

Page 16 of the dissent says: ''Worst of all, for the repute of today's decision, the Court's reasoning is largely self-defeating.''

It goes on to explain why.

Page 18 of the dissent says: ''The Court's decision reflects the philosophy that judges should endure whatever interpretive distortions it takes in order to correct a supposed flaw in the statutory machinery. That philosophy ignores the American people's decision to give Congress 'all legislative powers' enumerated in the Constitution, citing article I, section 1. They made Congress, not this Court, responsible for both making laws and mending them.

''This Court holds only the judicial power, the power to pronounce the law as Congress has enacted it. We lack the prerogative to repair laws that do not work out in practice, just as the people lack the ability to throw us out of office if they dislike the solutions we concoct. We must always remember, therefore, that our task is to apply the text, not to improve upon it.''

The dissent actually cites precedent for that very language.

Trying to make its judge-empowering approach seem respectful of Congressional authority, the Court asserts that its decision merely ensures that the Affordable Care Act operates the way Congress meant it to operate.

First of all, what makes the Court so sure that Congress meant tax credits to be available everywhere? Those are great questions that the dissent asks, even though they are rhetorical.

The Supreme Court struck a blow for tyranny today. I predicted this for quite some time because when you have someone who is Solicitor General under the Obama administration and who has the job of advising—well, first of all, defending legislation and defending acts that the administration wanted defended in court, but of course, part of that means, as any good lawyer will tell you, that attorney that defends you in court must give you advice about that which he or she may have to defend in court.

Either we had a Solicitor General go before the Senate and lie that there had never been any discussions about the Affordable Care Act, about ObamaCare, in the presence of the Solicitor General, or the Solicitor General was completely incompetent.

Everybody that voted for that Solicitor General should have their heads examined because either a lie or incompetence should have been enough to keep a former Solicitor General from going on to the Supreme Court of the land. It didn't happen. That person went on the Court.

It also is reprehensible for judges, Justices, on the Supreme Court to flaunt the law, disobey perhaps one of the most critical laws assigned to the court, in order to participate in an opinion in which they want to change the law.

Apparently, since the Supreme Court didn't come down with a decision regarding same-sex marriage today, that should be coming out next week. So far, there has been no notice that the two Justices that perform same-sex weddings would be disqualifying themselves as 28 U.S.C. section 455 says.

With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I have a chart.

28 U.S.C. section 455 says very clearly in A part—there is an A part that would disqualify judges, or Justices, and then there is a B part that may as well, but A is a certainty.

''Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself''—that can be male or female—''in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.''

That is the law. When we have two Supreme Court Justices that, so far, have given no indications of anything but that they are going to intentionally knowingly violate that law and participate in a majority opinion,

then we have to wonder how much longer this little experiment in a democratic republic will last. I would submit not much longer.

The laws of Moses, the Bible, helped found this country. When all seemed lost and nothing appeared to be agreeable to a majority in the constitutional convention, they took a recess to go worship God at the Reformed Calvinist church in Philadelphia.

We still have part of what the preacher prayed, what he spoke. He seemed to make a real difference because they came back. As Alexander Hamilton noted—someone not noted for being spiritual—he noted that, clearly, the finger of God was involved in bringing together people that could not agree in such an incredible document.

We turn our back once again today, as a majority of the Supreme Court did, on the clear meaning, clear statement of the law. So far, I hope and pray they will have a change of heart and not disobey the law in order to try to change law overriding State constitutions, as it may.

I hope and pray they will have a change of heart and they will disqualify themselves, anyone on the Supreme Court, who clearly, not just might reasonably be questioned, but they clearly were biased and partial when it comes to same-sex marriage. Hopefully, they will disqualify themselves, and we will get an opinion by a more objective Court; but if they don't, we are looking at a constitutional crisis of incredible proportions.

Does a country have to follow a law created out of whole cloth by a majority of unelected judges who violate the law itself in order to create new law? I think the answer is: No, you don't have to follow that kind of law.

There is no question that the persecution of Christians who practice their religion, as set out in the Bible, will be forced to subject themselves to persecution, as this administration already has shown.

It doesn't matter if you are a nun and you have devoted your entire life to helping the poor and the downtrodden, your little sister of the poor; it doesn't matter to this administration.

They are going to drag you through the muck, through the devastation of having to go to court, all because you happen to believe what the Founders believed, the huge majority since, heck, over a third of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were actually ordained Christian ministers, and then the great work by churches to force the Constitution to mean what it said so that slavery was eliminated, the great work of an ordained Christian minister named Martin Luther King, Jr., in pushing the issue of civil rights for one and all, so that one day, hopefully, we can have people judged not by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character.

The things Martin Luther King, Jr., believed in, that he was ordained and preached, the things those abolitionist churches believed with all their hearts, if the Supreme Court does what the indications are they will likely do, they would be persecuted for their beliefs, our very Founders would be persecuted for their beliefs. This isn't about slavery. We did away with that. It is tragic.

No one, no matter what their sexual preference is, should be discriminated against; but when it comes to marriage, it is the building block, the foundational building block established by nature itself, by nature's God, by the law of Moses, the Moses imprint that exists above my head here in this Chamber, that exists on the southern wall of the chamber of the Supreme Court, and is the law as Jesus laid it out regarding marriage when he quoted Moses.

We are coming into some difficult days, and I am afraid this decision today that mocks the law, both case law and the written law, we are coming into some difficult days.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), my friend.

□ 1745

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the discussion going on about today's Supreme Court decision, and I, too, am very troubled by what I read today. To me, there are a couple of big issues at play here.

One is accountability and how this Congress 5 years ago rammed through legislation without reading it. We all remember the famous line: ''Pass it to find out what is in it.'' The American people continue to find out what is in it. I heard the President talking today about this law's being woven into the fabric of the country. What is being woven into the fabric of the country are higher premiums, higher deductibles, less choice, more Washington, more bureaucrats, more forcing people to violate their consciences. That is not the way we need to be going.

Now we see how the Supreme Court for the second time has allowed, really, a lack of accountability. When we saw in the NFIB case how they said, ''Oh, it is not a penalty; it is a tax,'' there were people in this Chamber who argued for the Affordable Care Act in saying there are no taxes here. Then the Supreme Court absolved them of that responsibility by saying, ''Oh, it is a tax. We will keep it in place.'' Here today is clear language that subsidies would go to only those exchanges that were established by the State.

There is a serious problem here, and it is not just with Congress' not being held accountable for the laws it passes; there is a separation of powers issue here as we see another branch of the government invade the lawmaking responsibility that this Congress has. Again, I want to talk about Justice Scalia's dissent here.

''The Court's decision reflects the philosophy that judges should endure whatever interpretive distortions it takes in order to correct a supposed flaw in the statutory machinery. That philosophy ignores the American people's decision to give Congress 'all legislative powers' enumerated in the Constitution.''

That is what the Constitution says.

''They made Congress, not this Court, responsible for both making laws and mending them. This Court holds only the judicial power—the power to pronounce the law as Congress has enacted it. We lack the prerogative to repair laws that do not work out in practice, just as the people lack the ability to throw us out of office''—that is, the Supreme Court—''if they dislike the solutions we concoct.''

This is the Congress' responsibility to amend the laws, not the Supreme Court's. The dissent continues:

''Rather than rewriting the law under the pretense of interpreting it, the Court should have left it to Congress to decide what to do about the Act's limitation of tax credits to State exchanges . . . The Court's insistence on making a choice that should be made by Congress both aggrandizes judicial power and encourages congressional lassitude.''

Mr. Speaker, it is the Congress' job to make law. It is the Court's job to interpret the law, not to rewrite the law as it did in the NFIB case and not to rewrite the law as it did today.

I thank the gentleman for raising these very serious issues as to what happened with the Court today.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the gentleman's observations.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I knew when I stood with Mr. ROTHFUS in the Senate Chamber in recent years past, in support of a filibuster, that I would enjoy standing with him on other occasions, and I appreciate so much his observations.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to finish with this observation from John Adams, 1776 July. He is writing to Abigail. In the last paragraph, he writes:

''You will think me transported with enthusiasm''—in talking about the Declaration of Independence—''but I am not. I am well aware of the toil and blood and treasure that it will cost to maintain this Declaration and support and defend these States. Yet, through all the gloom, I can see the rays of ravishing light and glory. I can see that the end is worth more than all the means, that posterity will triumph in that day's transaction even though we may regret it, which I trust in God we shall not.''

For this to stand as a country, as a democratic Republic as created, it takes courage and it takes integrity, and we didn't get that from the Supreme Court today.

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

## AN AGREEMENT WITH IRAN MUST BAR ITS PATH TO NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the deadline is bearing down on us for the President's nuclear agreement with Iran. So, at this moment, Congress must send the administration a strong message: In order to be acceptable, any agreement must bar every Iranian path to nuclear weapons.

This means the deal must last for decades. There has been a lot of reporting of stopgap deals that would try to restrict Iran in the short term while giving it a blank check after just some 10 years. Such an agreement would be absurd, Mr. Speaker. Given Iran's longstanding nefarious quest for nuclear weapons and its government's genocidal anti-Semitism, I and the vast majority of my colleagues in Congress would never accept such a bad deal.

Iran will also have to dismantle its current nuclear infrastructure and turn over nearly all of its stockpile of uranium. Iran prefers to merely ''disconnect'' its 19,000 centrifuges. That is totally unacceptable —coming from the Iranian Government with its murderous threats to annihilate the State of Israel and its obsessive hatred of Jews worldwide. It is estimated that centrifuges could be reconnected in a matter of mere months—and so they must be dismantled, and the core should be removed from the Arak heavy water reactor.

It also means there can be no lifting or a reduction of sanctions until the International Atomic Energy Agency, or IAEA, certifies that Iran has complied with its commitments under the agreement; and IAEA inspectors must be granted access to any and all suspected sites. This access must be unimpeded, Mr. Speaker, meaning that the IAEA must be able to conduct inspections at military sites as well. The rule must be full access—anytime, anywhere.

Iran must also fully account for its past efforts to develop nuclear weapons. Unless it does so, there is no way to establish a baseline from which to measure its current capacities and potential future violations and responsibly gauge a ''breakout time.''

Mr. Speaker, these are minimum criteria. In order to get congressional approval, any deal the President presents to Congress will have to have met them. The Nuclear Agreement Review Act gives Congress the authority to review any agreement with Iran and to pass a joint resolution barring any statutory sanctions relief. The administration and the Iranian Government need to know that the vast majority of my colleagues will be as firm as I am in insisting on them. I am certainly prepared to vote against any agreement that does not meet these criteria.

Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration has shown itself far too weak in dealing with Iran. For example, last week, Secretary Kerry said that the United States is ''not fixated'' on Iran's explaining its past behavior—a significant backtracking on his earlier insistence on this crucial point.

In fact, throughout June, we have been reading disturbing reports of administration weakness in the negotiations on a whole range of issues—from demanding access to potential nuclear sites to signaling a willingness to repeal non-nuclear-related sanctions. Just yesterday, five of the President's top former Iran advisers wrote an open letter, warning that the agreement ''may fall short of meeting the administration's own standard of a 'good' agreement.'' The letter outlined concerns about concessions at the same time that Ayatollah Ali Khamenei appeared to back away from other preliminary understandings.

There are many other signs of the administration's weakness, Mr. Speaker, in its dealings with Iran. Fundamentally, it refuses to speak truths that are obvious to everyone: that the Iranian Government has made itself the enemy of the United States and the genocidal enemy of the State of Israel, and that our goal must always be to prevent it from acquiring or manufacturing nuclear weapons now and long into the future. A nuclear Iran would be a grave threat to our country and an existential threat to Israel, our closest ally. That is intolerable. The administration seems to no longer recall that Iran is the leading sponsor of Hezbollah and Hamas.

Mr. Speaker, the case of Pastor Saeed Abedini is another sad sign of administration weakness toward Iran. Saeed Abedini is an American citizen. He was in Iran in 2012, visiting family and building an orphanage, when he was taken prisoner. As a matter of fact, he had been given permission by the Iranians to do just that. Twelve years before, he had converted to Christianity and, later, was involved in the home church movement in Iran. Knowing about his conversion and earlier engagement in home churches, Iranian authorities approved his 2012 trip, approved his orphanage building, and then imprisoned him. He has been in prison ever since then and has suffered immensely from beatings that have caused internal bleeding, death threats, solitary confinement, and more. His wife, Naghmeh, who is also an American and has been a heroic champion for her husband and their two children, has also suffered. I have chaired two hearings when we have heard from Naghmeh, who told the compelling story of her husband, of her love for her husband, of the gross injustice that he has been forced to suffer. It is time the administration made this a priority and a very, very important matter in the nuclear negotiations.

The administration is not doing enough to secure his release. There is no doubt about it. The administration does little more than raise his case and those of other American prisoners on the sidelines of the nuclear negotiations because it sees the prisoners as sideline issues. This is an American citizen, unjustly imprisoned now for over 1,000 days—and tortured—in Iran, and the administration has a few marginal conversations with Iranian officials and considers that good enough. It is deeply disturbing. It ought to be a central priority.

Mr. Speaker, it is also a very alarming sign of what we might expect the administration to present us with when we return to session in early July. That is why Congress' responsibility is to be prepared to maintain a much firmer line on the outcome of these negotiations—when we review the agreement—than the administration seems to be taking.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a couple of excerpts from today—they were released today—from the State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2014, which reads in pertinent part:

''The most significant human rights problems were severe restrictions on civil liberties, including the freedoms of assembly, speech, religion, and press; limitations on the citizens' ability to change the government peacefully through free and fair elections; and disregard for the physical integrity of persons whom authorities arbitrarily and unlawfully detained, tortured, or killed.

''Other reported human rights problems included: disappearances; cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, including judicially sanctioned amputation and flogging; politically motivated violence and repression; harsh and life-threatening conditions in detention and prison facilities, with instances of deaths in custody; arbitrary arrest and lengthy pretrial detention, sometimes incommunicado; continued impunity of the security forces; denial of fair public trial, sometimes resulting in executions without due process; the lack of an independent judiciary; political prisoners and detainees; ineffective implementation of civil judicial procedures and remedies; arbitrary interference with privacy, family, home, and correspondence; severe restrictions on freedoms of speech, including via the Internet, and press; harassment and arrest of journalists; censorship and media content restrictions; severe restrictions on academic freedom; severe restrictions on the freedoms of assembly and association.''

□ 1800

That is just a few of the catalog of horrors being imposed upon Iranians and people like our own American citizens being held in custody, like Pastor Saeed Abedini.