

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 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 reinstituted 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-

nomic 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 gentleman, 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 nonproliferation 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 nonproliferation 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
Amodel	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Babin	Hardy	Poliquin
Barletta	Harper	Pompeo
Barr	Harris	Posney
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
Curbelo (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	Troott
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
Fox	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	Pascarella
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 F.	Heck (WA)	Polis
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Himes	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Rangel
Bustos	Honda	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Hoyer	Richmond
Capps	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Israel	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Carney	Jeffries	Rush
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda T.
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sarbanes
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Kennedy	Schiff
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Schrader
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Clay	Kind	Scott, David
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Serrano
Clyburn	Kuster	Sewell (AL)
Cohen	Langevin	Sherman
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Sinema
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sires
Cooper	Lawrence	Slaughter
Costa	Lee	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Levin	Speier
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Swalwell (CA)
Cummings	Lipinski	Takai
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Takano
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Lowey	Titus
Delaney	Lujan Grisham	Tonko
DeLauro	(NM)	Torres
DeBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Tsongas
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Van Hollen
Deutsch	Lynch	Vargas
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Doggett	Matsui	Vela
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum	Velázquez
Duckworth	McDermott	Visclosky
Edwards	McGovern	Walz
Ellison	McNerney	Wasserman
Engel	Meeks	Schultz
Eshoo	Meng	Waters
Esty	Moore	Maxine
Farr	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Foster	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Fudge	Neal	
	Nolan	

## 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