

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on this very solemn day, where we commemorate those that gave their lives, I rise on behalf of the Safe Climate Caucus to bring to the House another unfortunate new reality. More frequent flooding is going to be occurring now because of climate change.

We are already seeing sea level rise; that is without doubt, and that has resulted in the frequency of nuisance flooding in coastal communities. Cities across America are experiencing nuisance flooding. There is a rise in nuisance flooding between 1960 and the present of up to 900 percent throughout the country. From 300 to 900 percent, it is more often.

When rising sea levels combine with natural climate patterns like this year's El Nino, even higher rates of nuisance flooding will occur.

For example, in my district, nuisance flooding threatens my entire Long Beach Peninsula and the Alamos Bay. Flooding roads mean a loss of work or school days, and eroded beaches can have a negative impact on property values.

Today's floods are tomorrow's high tides. That is why Congress must act on climate change.

GREAT RUN BY THE COON RAPIDS LITTLE LEAGUE TEAM

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, you can't get much more American than Little League baseball, and in that spirit, I want to congratulate the Coon Rapids Little League baseball team for their great run this year.

After winning their district and then emerging victorious at the Minnesota State tournament, Coon Rapids came up just one game short at the Midwest Regional Tournament from making the Little League World Series.

While Coon Rapids didn't make it to Williamsport, Pennsylvania, their deep run had the community abuzz with baseball fever. The dedication of these 11- and 12-year-olds to spend their summers at practices and tournaments is outstanding. The skills that baseball often develops—focus, commitment, and hard work—will surely serve these young players in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the coaches, the parents, the family members, and the players of the Coon Rapids Little League team should be very proud of their tenacity and their effort. I want to congratulate them. They make their community proud.

REMEMBERING 9/11

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this morning, we had a moment of silence, but we recognize today 14 years of memories. All of us remember where we were when terrorists attacked our Nation 14 years ago, murdering 2,977 of our fellow Americans and shocking the conscience of our country and of the world.

None of us will ever forget the tears, the sorrow, and the loss of that day; but neither will we ever forget the extraordinary acts of heroism, the first responders who rushed headlong into burning towers, the passengers who stormed the cockpit, and the Air National Guard pilot who was prepared to ram her fighter into a hijacked airliner to stop the next attack.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the stories that our children and grandchildren must hear, along with those of the brave men and women who donned our Nation's uniform in the years since, when they ask us to explain what happened on September 11, 2001.

Today, Mr. Speaker, as we mourn the victims of the September 11 attacks and pay tribute to the heroes of that day, we should honor them by renewing the sense of unity we felt that morning and in the weeks and months that followed.

America, Mr. Speaker, is strongest when we stand together in defense of our common ideals—individual freedom, tolerance, equality, justice—which the perpetrators of those acts found so objectionable and which were the real objects of their attack.

As we gather, Mr. Speaker, to mark this anniversary, let us remember that our greatest rebuttal to those who attacked us, as well as the most fitting tribute to all those we lost, is to keep defending these principles that bind us together as Americans and that will always be the enduring source of our strength.

God bless those who we lost, and we commit to their memory and to their cause.

SUSPENSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE, SUSPEND, REDUCE, PRO- VIDE RELIEF FROM, OR OTHER- WISE LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO AN AGREEMENT RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 412, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3460

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SUSPENSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE, SUSPEND, REDUCE, PROVIDE RELIEF FROM, OR OTHERWISE LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO AN AGREEMENT RE- LATED TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, prior to January 21, 2017, the President may not—

(1) waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions described in subsection (b) or refrain from applying any such sanctions; or

(2) remove a foreign person listed in Attachment 3 or Attachment 4 to Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury.

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are—

(1) the sanctions described in sections 4 through 7.9 of Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action; and

(2) the sanctions described in any other 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.

(c) JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action” means the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, by Iran and by the People's Republic of China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States, with the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 2 hours, 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 1 hour controlled by the minority leader or her designee.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous materials on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, which would prohibit the President from waiving Iran sanctions and prevent the implementation of this fatally flawed agreement.

Last night, we spent many hours debating this agreement. We heard from

Members on both sides of the aisle, Members who have deep concerns about where we are headed.

Mr. Speaker, let's be very clear. This isn't just a bad deal; it is a disastrous deal. It is a disaster for the United States; it is a disaster for our allies and friends in the region, including Israel.

When you think about it, when we think about the letter that we sent—84 percent of us in this House signed a letter asking for four critical things in this negotiation—we got rolled on every one of the four. Iran won on every point.

Iran gets to keep its nuclear infrastructure. The Obama administration collapsed on the issue of verification. We don't have anywhere, anytime inspections in here. We have got self-inspections by the Iranian regime with respect to Parchin, which is the one military site where we know—we know—that the Iranians, because of 1,000 pages of documents, did most of their bomb work.

They say now: No, no, no, we will do the inspections. We will turn that stuff over, but nobody is going into our military sites.

That is the argument they are making.

The sunset clause in this means that key parts of this deal expire at the end of the deal. We have got permanent sanctions relief for the Iranian regime, relief that is going to go into their military, in exchange for temporary constraints on Iran's nuclear program.

The restrictions on Iran's missile program designed to deliver those weapons—now, this came up in the eleventh hour of this negotiation. No one anticipated it being in the agreement. At the eleventh hour, the Russians came forward and, on behalf of the Iranians, said: We want the lifting of the sanctions, international sanctions, that the community has on the ICBM program and on the arms transfers with respect to Iran.

Unbelievably, we ended up getting rolled on this as well. As the Secretary of Defense told Congress, the I in ICBM stands for intercontinental, meaning flying from Iran to the United States. That is why—that is why—we never wanted this lifted.

It also provides resources and legitimacy to the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps, the very same organization that has killed 500 U.S. troops in Iraq.

This nuclear deal really needs to be put in a larger context of the administration's Iran policy. It is very dangerous; it is very risky, and I would say it is doomed to fail as a policy, given the fact that we haven't seen any adjustment out of Iran other than a recommitment on the part of the regime in Iran where they say: We are not going to be bound by any of the ballistic missile constraints. We don't intend to follow that, and by the way, we are advancing new ballistic missiles and targeting and putting that into the hands

of Hezbollah and into the hands of Hamas.

That is the messaging we have seen this week out of Iran.

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

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

Mr. Speaker and Members, I strongly oppose H.R. 3460 because it is another attempt to derail diplomacy and set the United States on the path to war. H.R. 3460 suspends until January 21, 2017—meaning through the rest of President Obama's term—the authority of the President to waive, suspend, or reduce sanctions pursuant to the Iran nuclear agreement.

This legislation was introduced less than 48 hours ago and has had absolutely no committee process. While the Foreign Affairs Committee has held 30 hearings since the announcement of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action in November 2013, this legislation has never even been a topic of committee discussion.

This is not a serious attempt to legislate. Put simply, it is a political attack on the President of the United States in an attempt to derail a good deal that is in the best interest of our Nation.

The Iran deal represents the cumulative efforts of countless diplomats. After imposing some of the toughest sanctions in history, the P5+1—the U.S., the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Russia, and China—were able to bring Iran to the table and strike a deal that achieves our core strategic objectives.

President Obama and Secretary of State Kerry deserve our respect and thanks for this achievement. They kept together a coalition that forced Iran to make serious concessions in how they operate their domestic nuclear programs.

We did not get everything that we wanted, but we achieved a verifiable deal that is our best hope to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

The details of the deal are commendable. Among other things, Iran will reduce its uranium stockpile by 98 percent and lower its enrichment level below weapon levels. This will increase the "breakout time"—or how long it takes to create a weapon—to 1 year.

In addition, the International Atomic Energy Agency will oversee testing and inspections, and cheating will be severely punished with snapback provisions that reimpose the crippling sanctions that brought Iran to the table.

Unfortunately, it appears that the majority does not understand progress in diplomacy. Those who are trying to undermine this historic agreement are motivated by the same naive approach to negotiation that has paralyzed this Congress. This time, unless they get everything they want, they will not accept a deal that forestalls war and prevents Iran from becoming a nuclear power.

This intransigence may be new in its degree, but it is an old and regretful

approach taken by critics of diplomacy. I remember, almost 30 years ago, when a President late in his second term reached out his hand in peace. His attempts to constrain and ultimately reduce nuclear stockpiles were mocked.

□ 0930

I rarely saw eye to eye with that President, but nearly three decades later, I am glad that he stood up when he did. That President was Ronald Reagan. When he signed the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty with Mr. Gorbachev, he faced the same fury we see today. However, 28 months later, the Soviet Union was replaced by a growing number of free and independent states, and 28 years later, the United States is still standing and remains as strong as ever.

The lesson in all of this is that diplomacy is rarely clean, and it develops in its own time. There are stops and starts. Things move forward, sometimes backwards, and even often sideways; but, repeatedly, we have shown that a step in the direction of peace will be met in kind. Whether a Republican or a Democratic President seeks that peace, Congress has an obligation to support those efforts.

I am proud of our President's efforts to forge a new path with Iran. The Iran deal prevents Iran from developing a bomb, creates a new foundation for further diplomacy, and stands as part of a proud tradition of progress.

I urge my colleagues to carefully consider and oppose H.R. 3460.

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

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

I would just make the point that, with respect to Ronald Reagan, when President Reagan was presented with a bad deal at Reykjavik, while in his negotiations with the Russians, at that point, he walked away from that deal. He pushed away from the deal because, in his mind, we could come back and get a better deal if we stood our ground.

This was not the circumstance with respect to our negotiations with Iran. With the Iranian negotiations, we had four points that this Congress—84 percent of us in a letter to the Secretary of State—laid out. Those points were that it was supposed to be anywhere, anytime inspections; it was supposed to last multiple decades; we were not supposed to lift the sanctions up front but do it over the entirety of the agreement in order to get compliance, to ensure we had compliance; and it was to make certain that those 12 questions that the IAEA had asked were answered.

These were all important because, again, as Reagan pointed out to the Russians—and threw their own expression back to them—he said: There is an old Russian expression, "trust, but verify," and that is what we need to apply to the agreement.

That is the last point I would make here, the verification component of it, when you have side agreements which Congress has not seen and those side agreements, in the case of Parchin—where we have ample evidence of their past bomb work—allow the Iranians to do their own inspections. I mean, I always thought it was going to be international inspectors who did the international inspections, not the Iranians, themselves.

For these reasons, I do not think it is analogous. I think, in fact, we should do what Reagan did at Reykjavik, which is to push back and say, no, we need a better deal, and we need a deal with verification—trust, but verify.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE), who served our country with distinction as a U.S. Navy SEAL.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, this is not a Democrat or a Republican issue. This is an American issue.

We are talking about Iran and injecting billions of dollars into Iran. The Marine barracks were Iran. At least 500 troops, whom I served with in Iraq, died as a result of Iran. Iran is not our friend. They are our enemy, at least this regime. You cannot say that Hezbollah or Hamas, as surrogates of Iran, would not do the same on 9/11 as what occurred today in 2001.

Let's look at this deal.

General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said under no circumstances should we give missile technology to Iran; yet, in 5 years, we relax the sanctions for conventional weapons to include missile systems, to include the same missile systems that Iran has given to Hamas directly—at least 1,000 of them—and as many as 10,000 into Israel from Gaza.

In 8 years, we will relax the sanctions on ICBMs. There is only one purpose for an ICBM, and that is to strike America. In 10 years—remember?—part of the deal is dismantle for dismantle. Dismantle the sanctions, and Iran was going to dismantle their nuclear facilities, their capabilities, and their ambitions. In 10 years, the centrifuges that are not dismantled come out. They are upgraded. Then, in 13 years, by experts, Iran will have the capability of having at least 100 nuclear-tipped ICBMs.

How is that in the best interests of America? How is that in the best interests of our allies in the Middle East? How is that in the best interests of America and the world? It is not.

The policy of the United States has been to reduce our stockpiles, to reduce the countries that hold these incredibly destructive weapons—Ukraine and South Africa are examples—SALT I, SALT II, SALT III.

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

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ZINKE. Lastly, how could anyone vote for a deal in which the full disclosure of documents is not delivered?

No Member of this body has been privy to the secret deal between the

International Atomic Energy Agency and Iran. No Member has read this. The verification is so incredibly critical; yet we are willing to cede our sovereignty—no American is on it—for a verification process that is 24 days, and even General Hayden said you can only monitor what you can see.

This is a bad deal. The argument is to take this deal or go to war. I say that this deal promotes war, that it promotes nuclear proliferation. It is not in the best interests of the United States, and it puts us—Americans—and the world at risk.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action because we cannot allow Iran to have a nuclear weapon, and this is the smartest, most responsible way to prevent that.

Nuclear experts, our own military and intelligence communities, and all five nations that have negotiated with us—countries that have a direct interest in preventing an Iranian bomb—all agree this deal will work. It does it by restricting Iran's nuclear enrichment to nonthreatening levels and by imposing an unprecedented framework of inspections, monitoring, and enforcement—mechanisms that are not built on trust but that are built on distrust and verification.

Is this deal perfect? No. I would prefer a deal that permanently bans all enrichment. However, experts agree that this deal can and will keep Iran's nuclear program in a box for at least the next 15 years.

Now, opponents think we should blow this deal up, walk away, and try for a better deal. With all due respect, I think they are in denial. All of our negotiating partners tell us that that is not going to happen. We would go forward with a much weaker hand, without any, perhaps, sanction partners at all, and with a huge loss of credibility for abandoning our own deal. Blowing this deal up only makes sense if you are prepared to go to war.

I know—and I am distressed to say—that, across the aisle, many think that that is a good idea. I am concerned that, across the aisle, there is an outbreak of Dick Cheney fever and the amnesia that goes with it. They want to take us back to the good old days of the Bush years when unilateralism and militarism made us less safe, not safer.

There is a smarter and more responsible way forward to prevent Iran from having a bomb. Let's give diplomacy and peace a chance. Let's support this agreement.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

Mr. HOLDING. I thank the chairman. The chairman has one of the brightest and most insightful foreign policy minds this Congress has ever produced.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the legislation in front of us.

For years, our Nation, in conjunction with partners from across the globe, built up a robust sanctions package against the regime in Tehran for their illegal nuclear work, among other illicit actions and activities. These sanctions worked, Mr. Speaker. Iran's economy crumbled, which forced them to the negotiating table.

The only trouble is, Mr. Speaker, on the other side of that negotiating table was the Obama administration—a group so eager to sign a deal that they gave in to the Iranians at every turn and forgot the true nature and evil of who they were dealing with. To get a deal, the administration walked back many of their initial demands—demands that actually might have made this a better deal.

Mr. Speaker, it is all too clear that this deal must be reworked and rejected. Now, I certainly believe that there is a role for diplomacy, but diplomacy must come from a source of strength, not weakness and capitulation, which is why the legislation before us today is so important.

The waivers built into our sanctions were not meant to be used by any President to force an agreement past Congress and the majority of the American people. The last thing the world—let alone the United States—should be doing right now is relaxing sanctions and giving Iran more money—more money to spread terror, more money to execute civilians, more money to support murderous proxy regimes.

Mr. Speaker, this deal cannot stand, and I urge support for this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today against this measure to restrain President Obama from lifting sanctions and to support the Iran deal—the most important step that we could take to secure the future of this planet by stopping Iran's nuclear program for 15 years.

A nuclear Iran is an unacceptable danger. Iran's support of terror and aggression throughout the world, its stated threats to Israel, and the nuclear arms race they would trigger are the reasons the world's major powers came together to put crushing sanctions on Iran in the first place. Currently, Iran can produce enough material for a nuclear weapon in 2 to 3 months. Under this deal, Iran must take several unprecedented steps that would prevent them from having a nuclear weapon in 15 years.

This deal goes further than any agreement in history by including inspections of Iran's entire uranium enrichment supply chain for up to 25 years. Additionally, Iran will be subject to inspections forever under the additional protocol. It is those crushing economic sanctions that brought Iran to the table to finally accept the nuclear deal.

What is critical to remember is that our terrorism sanctions still remain in place, and if a military strike is necessary, the U.S. will have the time and intelligence to intervene but without the threat of a nuclear bomb for 15 years. In contrast, without this deal, sanctions will be lifted anyway, and we will be left with nothing but fear, uncertainty, and an unfettered Iran.

Considering the anxiety of recent years, when the prospect of a military strike on Iran felt imminent, this deal is a welcome alternative, and the risks of rejecting it are too great. For the sake of our security, the security of our allies, and our position as a trustworthy global leader, I urge my colleagues to support the deal and to reject this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, let me just pause to say that I remember the events of 9/11/2001. I want to thank the first responders and those men and women in uniform who have served, our veterans, for what they do to protect us every day.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the nuclear agreement with Iran. I strongly oppose giving the President the ability to unilaterally lift congressional sanctions. Our allies don't trust us, and our enemies don't fear us. I think we ought to take Iran at its word. Here are some quotes.

During the negotiations, the Ayatollah said this:

"The enemies are talking about the options they have on the table. They should know that the first option on our table is the annihilation of Israel."

□ 0945

The Ayatollah Ali Khamenei said this:

The Iranian people and leadership, with God's help, will increase their defensive capability each day.

Through the Iran deal, we are getting ready to give Iran \$150 billion. They can do a lot of damage with that.

They are the largest state sponsor of terrorism. They are responsible for killing people in Indonesia, in India, and all across the globe.

I chair the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee. They are directly responsible for the AMIA bombings in Buenos Aires in 1994, again in 1996 through their proxy, Hezbollah.

The Ayatollah has said: We will not stop supporting our allies. That is Hamas, that is Hezbollah, and that is other terrorist groups.

They have said in their own words—take them at their word—they will continue to support materially and financially the terrorism groups like in Yemen. There is nothing we can do to stop it.

They have also said that we, Western powers, will not have access to secret

military sites or secret nuclear sites, but, yet, we are going to give them 24 days in this agreement. America, I didn't say 24 hours. I said 24 days' advance notice.

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

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Twenty-four days' advance notice before we are going to inspect a site. Are you kidding me?

We are going to allow them to self-regulate. That means they can go out in the desert and get clean dirt and clean air and provide that.

That is like telling a regular drug user that you can bring somebody else's urine and somebody else's hair sample to a drug test.

This is crazy, that we are giving Iran \$150 billion and an opportunity to get a nuclear weapon in 10 years or less, assuming they are going to adhere to every line of the agreement, which nobody that I talk to believes Iran is going to adhere to the agreement. They will have a nuclear weapon.

The immediate concern is \$150 billion in lifted sanctions, money we are giving to Iran so they can continue to fund terrorism around the globe. People will die as a result of this agreement.

\$150 billion can buy a lot of weapons, financial support for terrorist groups to continue attacking our allies and Americans anywhere they are in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose that. As everyone can tell by my passion today, it is time for us to really talk in real terms about what that agreement is.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, they sound like warmongers, don't they, those Iranian leaders?

And so we sit here today, humbled at the task before us. We sit here as Members of the world's greatest legislative body, debating the future of our country and the future of the world. Because Iran with a nuclear weapon is a threat to the world.

And after months of intense review and passionate conversation with the people I represent and with advisers, with my colleagues, after 19 years on the Armed Services Committee, 17 of those on the committee that deals with nuclear proliferation and nonproliferation, chairing that committee for the Democrats, I believe that diplomacy first is the best path for the United States and our allies.

We stand here to discuss the issues of war and peace, of whether we believe in diplomacy with verification or armed engagement. We sit here and we reflect on all of those that will be affected by our votes: my family, our family, the soldiers, and countless others.

Can we look them directly in the eye and say we did all that we could do?

Can we tell them we did not give diplomacy a chance? So don't get me wrong, I am no fan of Iran.

When so many in this Chamber rushed to war in Iraq, I stood up and said no and I said at that time Iran is where we need to keep our focus.

We need to ensure that this deal is implemented, and we need to hold those accountable to implement it correctly. That is our role as Members of Congress. No deal is perfect.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Iran deal. I believe the inspections regime is weak. I don't think the Iranians can be trusted, nor can we reasonably assume that Iran will hold up its end of the deal.

A broad swath of sanctions is lifted all at once, and the deal lifts the arms embargo. Iran will further destabilize an already dangerous Middle East by trafficking more weapons and rockets to its terrorist proxies, like Hamas and Hezbollah. Tehran's coffers will be flush with cash to fund Iranian terror around the world.

But Iranian terrorism isn't new. Iran is the leading state sponsor of terrorism. Its support and influence was there in Beirut in 1983, Khobar Towers in 1996, Nairobi in 1998, and on this day, 9/11.

It has been there at suicide bombings on busses, at shopping malls, and pizza shops. It has supported hostage takings and assassinations around the world. And to this we are to look to diplomacy?

U.S. law allows victims of these attacks to sue Iran for damages in U.S. courts. Over the last 15 years, the United States courts have handed down more than 80 judgments against Iran with \$43 billion in damages. Of course, not a penny has been paid.

I know there is disagreement on this overall issue, but surely we can agree that Iran should have to pay out these damages to its victims' families before Iran benefits from U.S. sanctions relief.

So I have introduced the Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act. It requires the President to certify that Iran has paid all judgments owed to its victims before U.S. sanctions can be lifted. Our position is: Not 1 cent in sanctions relief for Iran until it pays up to its victims—not 1 cent.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, what a weighty responsibility to stand on this floor on September 11.

For those of us who were here in this body on that day, there is no more solemn responsibility than the national security of this Nation.

For that reason, I am gratified to my ranking member for being able to serve

with him through those very difficult times and to be one of the original members of the new Homeland Security Committee.

I have stayed on both of those committees, who hold in their hands the constitutional privileges and rights, but, also, the national security.

So I rise today with a heavy burden to speak to this very difficult decision. So I start by saying I stand here as a mother, and I will choose to speak to that child in Israel and the child in urban and rural America and the children around the world.

I would ask my colleagues the question: What is our burden and responsibility to those children, that, if we have an opportunity not for peace, but an opportunity to stop a potential nuclear rogue, would we not take that opportunity or would we find all kinds of obstacles?

I rise in opposition to the underlying bill, and I rise today in support of this Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. I thank the President and Secretary Kerry, but I thank, more importantly, Republicans and Democrats and Independents. I thank the negotiators.

Mr. Speaker, what we have is the statement and the agreement signed by Iran that it will never, never become a nuclear power. This agreement creates an enforceable roadmap for dismantling Iran's nuclear program.

Before the interim joint agreement in 2013, Iran went from operating approximately 164 centrifuges to 10,000, and then they went to 19,000. But this agreement brings them down to 6,000. Is that not a standing in the gap against a known actor of terrorism?

And then, of course, we have them at 300-kg enriched uranium, and they are only allowed to enrich 3.67. We have a roadmap for the various entities that contributed to their ability to make a nuclear bomb.

Make no mistake about it. You cannot take away knowledge. Even if you bomb Iran through war, you cannot take away the knowledge. And they will ultimately have the ability to come back again.

Now we have an agreement with the P5+1. This is not Munich, for Munich was a capitulation. No one in this agreement is capitulating to Iran. We are demanding that Iran cease and desist.

Tell American people the truth. This is the best pathway to ensuring the scientist in all. And for those who say that it is a reckless regime or scheme, rather, of inspection, they are wrong. Because the only 24-day process deals with the undeclared and even that has an ultimatum that the sanctions will snap back.

The IAEA inspectors are trained by the United States. The United States will be present on site at the IAEA. Many Members traveled there and got a direct briefing of the intensity of their inspection process.

America will be on site when they come back with their inspection mate-

rials, and we will be at the table. We will also be engaged in the redesign of some of those facilities in Iran for more civilian uses.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, that, if we have the opportunity to save a child from a speeding train, would we not take that opportunity to save a child from a speeding train? I think we would. We need to save the children of this world.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3461, and in strong opposition to H. Res. 412 and H.R. 3460.

I support H.R. 3461 and oppose H.R. 3460 and H. Res. 412 because I support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action ("JCPOA") as the best and most realistically attainable means of preventing Iran from ever obtaining a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Speaker, more than twenty-five years ago, as a young mother, I first visited Israel and the Holy Land.

I have returned many times since then to the region that gave birth to three of the world's great religions, civilizations, and cultures.

And I have been a passionate supporter of the Mickey Leland Kibbutzim Internship program, which for over 20 years has enabled inner-city high school students who live or study in the 18th Congressional District the opportunity to spend a summer in Israel.

As a Member of Congress and a senior Member of the Committees on Homeland Security and the Judiciary, both of which deal with national security issues, I have had the opportunity to visit many countries in the Middle East.

I have long been committed and engaged in efforts to develop policies that anticipate and respond to new and emerging challenges to the security of our nation and the peace and safety of the world.

The threat to regional stability, world peace, and America's security posed by Iran's possession of a nuclear weapon is one of the greatest challenges now facing the international community.

The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), negotiated by the P5+1, led by the United States is a response to that challenge.

I have consulted with policy professionals, scientists and other experts, and have reviewed many publications supporting and opposing the agreement.

I have met with and listened intently to supporters and opponents of the JCPOA in my congressional district whose commitment to peace and security is unquestioned and whose counsel on issues relating to Israel's security and America's policies regarding the Middle East I have always valued and will continue to seek.

After this lengthy period of review, consultation, and reflection, I have concluded that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) represents the best and surest means of achieving the goal of preventing the acquisition of nuclear weapons by Iran, the most rigorous and intrusive in the history of nuclear nonproliferation agreements.

Under the JCPOA, the IAEA will have access to all elements of Iran's nuclear program, including those that have never been subject to inspection.

The JCPOA, for example, requires Iran to permit IAEA inspectors to monitor the entire uranium supply chain which will enable them to detect any diversion of nuclear material.

And, to enhance the number of IAEA eyes and ears on the ground, the JCPOA provides that about 130–150 IAEA inspectors will be deployed.

Additionally, the JCPOA makes applicable to Iran the "Additional Protocol" (AP) to its Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement, which is one of the verification agreements the IAEA uses to investigate allegations of any clandestine nuclear activities in Iran, and which requires Iran to detail all of its nuclear activities, including mining and milling and research and development activities.

I take seriously the concern that has been expressed regarding the 24-day period for resolving disputes over IAEA's requests for access to certain locations.

However, it should be noted that this 24-day period applies only to locations not covered by the comprehensive agreement or the Additional Protocol.

Moreover, I am persuaded by experts, including Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz, a Nobel laureate in physics, that the trace evidence created by activities involving nuclear material remains detectable for months, even years.

Finally, under the JCPOA, intransigence by Iran in permitting IAEA's inspectors access to requested locations can in itself be deemed an act of non-compliance subjecting Iran to the threat of re-imposition of sanctions.

Additionally, the IAEA must be satisfied with this inspection regime with Iran and there must be a major reduction in the stockpile before funds held in escrow are released to Iran.

Critics of the JCPOA are correct in pointing out that the agreement does not condition sanctions relief on Iran's renunciation of its past and present support of terrorist groups like Hezbollah.

That is why I take seriously the concern that Iran may use some of the proceeds of sanction relief, approximately \$56 billion, to support terrorist groups, especially those that are hostile to Israel.

But the best way to respond to this threat is not to reject the JCPOA but to work with our allies and the international community to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

The JCPOA makes it easier to confront, deter, and defeat terrorist groups supported by Iran.

Nothing in the JCPOA limits the ability of the United States to exercise all of its authority to sanction Iranian entities for their support for terrorism. President Obama has made clear that he intends to exercise that authority:

"With very limited exceptions, Iran will continue to be denied access to our market—the world's largest—and we will maintain powerful sanctions targeting Iran's support for groups such as Hizballah, its destabilizing role in Yemen, its backing of the Assad regime, its missile program, and its human rights abuses at home.

"The United States reserves its right to maintain and enforce existing sanctions and even to deploy new sanctions to address those continuing concerns, which we fully intend to do when circumstances warrant."

After discussions with Administration and outside experts, I believe that between the IAEA's inspections (the results of which the United States will continue to have immediate

and ongoing access) and our intelligence community's oversight, the necessary verification measures are in place to ensure we can detect any illicit nuclear activity that Iran might attempt to undertake.

Finally, I believe it is important to acknowledge that by preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, the JCPOA contributes substantially to making the region and the world safer.

But an increase in safety should not be confused with an absence of danger, especially for Israel.

Even with the JCPOA, there will remain actors who are intent on doing harm to Israel.

That is why I strongly support a substantial increase in assistance to Israel to make plain to any of its adversaries that Israel's security is sacrosanct to the United States.

Specifically, I strongly support a new 10-year Memorandum of Understanding with Israel that enhances our strong security relationship.

I also support an increase in missile defense funding so that the United States and Israel can accelerate the co-development of the Arrow-3 and David's Sling defense systems.

And to ensure that Israel retains its qualitative military edge (QME), I support further military enhancements that are now underway.

Mr. Speaker, since its entrance into World War II in 1941, the United States has been the leading force for good, for human dignity, and for peace in every region of the world.

From the establishment of the United Nations, the creation of NATO, the recognition of Israel, the United States has been the world's indispensable nation.

In the words of former President Lyndon Johnson, we support Israel "Because it is right."

And as the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said, "Israel's right to exist as a state in security is incontestable."

Dr. King believed in the dignity of all humanity and my best hopes are that a non-nuclear Iran, ceasing to foment terrorism, will be the catalyst for a Middle East in which all faiths and all peoples are respected, and which enjoys economic prosperity and cultural diversity.

Simply put, I want peace and security for the people of the United States and its allies, the Middle East, including Israel, and the world.

Mr. Speaker, the JCPOA negotiated by the P5+1, led by the United States, is in keeping with its tradition of global leadership and desire for peace and security for all persons in all nations.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), negotiated by the P5+1 and led by the United States.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 3461, which is a vote for a world in which Iran does not and will not possess any nuclear weapons with which it could threaten neighboring countries in the region, especially our steadfast ally, Israel.

THE IRAN DEAL BENEFITS U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

AN OPEN LETTER FROM RETIRED GENERALS AND ADMIRALS

On July 14, 2015, after two years of intense international negotiations, an agreement was announced by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, China

and Russia to contain Iran's nuclear program. We, the undersigned retired military officers, support the agreement as the most effective means currently available to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

The international deal blocks the potential pathways to a nuclear bomb, provides for intrusive verification, and strengthens American national security. America and our allies, in the Middle East and around the world, will be safer when this agreement is fully implemented. It is not based on trust; the deal requires verification and tough sanctions for failure to comply.

There is no better option to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon. Military action would be less effective than the deal, assuming it is fully implemented. If the Iranians cheat, our advanced technology, intelligence and the inspections will reveal it, and U.S. military options remain on the table. And if the deal is rejected by America, the Iranians could have a nuclear weapon within a year. The choice is that stark.

We agree with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, who said on July 29, 2015, "[r]elieving the risk of a nuclear conflict with Iran diplomatically is superior than trying to do that militarily."

If at some point it becomes necessary to consider military action against Iran, gathering sufficient international support for such an effort would only be possible if we have first given the diplomatic path a chance. We must exhaust diplomatic options before moving to military ones.

For these reasons, for the security of our Nation, we call upon Congress and the American people to support this agreement.

GEN James "Hoss" Cartwright, U.S. Marine Corps; GEN Joseph P. Hoar, U.S. Marine Corps; GEN Merrill "Tony" McPeak, U.S. Air Force; GEN Lloyd W. "Fig" Newton, U.S. Air Force; LGEN Robert G. Gard, Jr., U.S. Army; LGEN Arlen D. Jameson, U.S. Air Force; LGEN Frank Kearney, U.S. Army; LGEN Claudia J. Kennedy, U.S. Army; LGEN Donald L. Kerrick, U.S. Army; LGEN Charles P. Otstott, U.S. Army; LGEN Norman R. Seip, U.S. Air Force; LGEN James M. Thompson, U.S. Army; VADM Kevin P. Green, U.S. Navy; VADM Lee F. Gunn, U.S. Navy; MGEN George Buskirk, US Army; MGEN Paul D. Eaton, U.S. Army; MGEN Marcelite J. Harris, U.S. Air Force; MGEN Frederick H. Lawson, U.S. Army.

GEN William L. Nash, U.S. Army; MGEN Tony Taguba, U.S. Army; RADM John Hutson, U.S. Navy; RADM Malcolm MacKinnon III, U.S. Navy; RADM Edward "Sonny" Masso, U.S. Navy; RADM Joseph Sestak, U.S. Navy; RADM Garland "Gar" P. Wright, U.S. Navy; BGEN John Adams, U.S. Air Force; BGEN Stephen A. Cheney, U.S. Marine Corps; BGEN Patricia "Pat" Foote, U.S. Army; BGEN Lawrence E. Gillespie, U.S. Army; BGEN John Johns, U.S. Army; BGEN David McGinnis, U.S. Army; BGEN Stephen Xenakis, U.S. Army; RDML James Arden "Jamie" Barnett, Jr., U.S. Navy; RDML Jay A. DeLoach, U.S. Navy; RDML Harold L. Robinson, U.S. Navy; RDML Alan Steinman, U.S. Coast Guard.

THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY,
Washington, DC, August 20, 2015.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER PELOSI: National leaders and experts in numerous fields—scientific, diplomatic, arms control, military—are increasingly advocating support for the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) negotiated between the P5+1 and Iran. They have concluded that support for the JCPOA is in our national interest after carefully evalu-

ating both the specifics of the JCPOA's effectiveness in stopping nuclear weapons development by Iran and the viability of alternative approaches.

In February, I joined Secretary Kerry at the negotiating table as lead technical negotiator for the United States. To help clarify the technical features and safeguards of the JCPOA agreed to and supported by the P5+1, and place these in the context of the choice between approval or disapproval of implementation of the JCPOA that will be before Congress next month, I have compiled and attached to this note a streamlined side-by-side comparison of key elements.

I believe this comparison clearly underscores the conclusions of the U.S. negotiators, the P5+1, and an impressive body of experts: the JCPOA provides significant technical safeguards and disincentives that effectively block Iran's path to a nuclear weapon. It also explicitly enables strong detection and verification measures and timely responses should Iran choose to violate nuclear provisions of the JCPOA. The President, the Congress, and our allies and friends remain united in the determination that Iran will not develop or acquire nuclear weapons. The JCPOA is the best option available.

If you have questions that I can help answer, I would be pleased to do so.

Sincerely,

ERNEST J. MONIZ.

Enclosure.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to take a moment and thank the chairman for his work that has been done for the American public that they have been able to see directly through what this Iran agreement is about.

An interesting thing is happening on this floor as I sit around and listen. I am hearing Republicans and Democrats on the same side. Those that are opposed to it are bipartisan. Those that support this all come from one place.

You know, when I came to Congress, the one thing you are always told is find a committee and stick with that committee because what happens is you get expertise.

If you care about banking, you go to Financial Services, and you get expertise year over year. Taxes, Ways and Means. When it comes to Foreign Affairs, you get the expertise of something like this.

So you know what? I have listened to those who sit on those committees, and I look to the chairman and the ranking member on the Democratic side.

You know what I heard from both of them? They are in the same position. They are opposed to this agreement. They took their years of expertise, they read through it, they did the hearings, and they came to the same conclusion.

So I wonder, could that happen on the other side of this building, inside the Senate? Because they have committees as well. The same bipartisan conclusion came. It just didn't even come from the committees. The next Democratic leader in the Senate, the number two, is opposed to the Iran agreement.

The American public always asks us for bipartisanship. This has brought us together. But it is not just in this House. It is almost in the majority of houses across America.

You see, in the latest poll, only 21 percent of the American people actually approve the deal and 49 percent oppose. That is more than 2 to 1.

Only 2 percent of Americans are confident that Iran will abide by the agreement. Why? Because they never have before.

□ 1000

Iran has a history of not living up to their promises. It is clear today that, what the President said, he did not achieve.

Mr. Speaker, just in April, President Obama said he will “do what is necessary to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.” He said that he will implement this deal “to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.”

He did the opposite. In 13 years, Iran can have a nuclear weapon not just because Iran wants it, but America will say then it is okay. Thirteen years is not that far away.

That is not all that Iran gets in this deal. While we had sanctions on Iran, the only reason they wanted to come to the table—what did they do with their money, even though it was scarce, they didn't have much? They funded terrorism around the world.

What does this deal do? It gives them as much or maybe even more than the bailout that Greece got. What will Iran become? They will become the central bank of terror in the world. That is what we are voting on today.

If you want to know the truth about the deal, you go even further because there are side secret agreements we do not know. On this side of the aisle, we think we should keep with the law. We think when 400 people on this floor voted for the Corker-Cardin bill that said you had to have all agreements, we felt when there were 98 Senators and only one opposed that you would want to hold to the same agreement.

Why would anybody want to vote on something without having all the facts, especially after you read the reports that maybe Iran can do self-inspection? If that is the case, why don't we bring to the floor and change the Olympic committee and those athletes should be able to test themselves? I look for the Education Committee. Maybe students should grade themselves.

Maybe that is facetious, but this is probably the most important bill you will vote on in your term in Congress. Don't fall to political pressure, because you don't need to. The bipartisanship of the majority of Americans stands opposed.

The expertise in this House that you respect, regardless of what party you are in because you selected those Members to lead those committees, are opposed. If that is not enough, study history. History always repeats itself. Have we not learned that peace without freedom is meaningless?

The President said he would not agree to any bad deal. Well, I believe we can have a better deal. History has shown Chamberlain just wanted peace, but history has shown other times in America where Presidents have stood up and stepped back and got a better agreement.

Ronald Reagan wanted to end the nuclear weapons when it came to the Soviet Union. In the end of Ronald Reagan's second term, he sat in Iceland with Gorbachev. He sat down across the table, and he got almost everything he had asked for, but Gorbachev asked for one more item. He asked that America would end their SDI investment.

Ronald Reagan had a choice. Ronald Reagan said no, but he said: I will do something even better. I will provide you the technology as well, so everyone in the world could be safe.

Gorbachev said no. That is a defining moment not for that man, but for this world, and Ronald Reagan got up and walked away. Some people criticized on a political basis, but I ask you this: Would the Soviet Union have collapsed, would the Berlin Wall have collapsed at the time it did, had Reagan not stood firm and asked and kept his word for a better deal?

Peace without freedom is meaningless. This deal does not bring greater freedom to the world. It brings a nuclear missile race. This is not just about America, Iran, or a few other countries. No country in the Middle East will sit back after this action.

The world will not be safer; we will not be freer, but there is still an opportunity. History has shown, if we are willing to stand up, take a step back, and get a better agreement, we can have peace and freedom.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a proud record, a record as strong as any Member in Congress in supporting Israel. It is because of this support that I back the deal that the President and our allies have negotiated. If I thought that this agreement made the State of Israel more vulnerable, I would not support it, but that is just not the case.

Every security expert I trust, like Colin Powell, supports this deal; and almost every former government official I deeply distrust, like Vice President Dick Cheney, opposes the agreement. This is one of the most detailed international agreements of its kind in memory, and it was no small task of American diplomacy, statesmanship, and good old-fashioned negotiating that brought the deal to reality.

The power and position of the United States as a world leader brought our

allies to the table. It achieved an outcome our country working alone could not have achieved. It is not something that the Europeans, the Russians, the Chinese, or even the United Nations could have achieved.

It is not something sanctions alone could achieve and not something that war alone could achieve. The United States, working with our friends and, in some cases, our rivals, brought about this end to Iran's nuclear weapons program with an agreement for verifiable, enforceable, effective curbs on Iran's nuclear ambitions; and it is in Iran's interest to abide by the agreement.

With this one step forward, the U.S. has helped erase our record of international shortsightedness. It gets us back on track as a leader who leverages our economic power, our military power, our powers to persuade and compromise and bring people together.

There are not many times in a person's congressional career or in the course of history, for that matter, where a person can cast a vote literally for war or peace. Voting to support the Iran agreement is a vote to give peace a chance.

Put diplomacy at the top of our agenda, stand up for our men and women in uniform, their families, and our Nation by avoiding war. Let us support a deal that is good for Israel, good for America, good for peace, and good for the world.

Mr. Speaker, Representative YARMUTH and I wrote an op-ed piece for The Hill newspaper entitled “The Iran Nuclear Deal is Good for America and Good for Peace,” and I include it for the RECORD.

[From the Hill, July 29, 2015]

IRAN NUKE DEAL IS GOOD FOR AMERICA AND FOR PEACE

(By Reps. Luis Gutiérrez (D-Ill.) and John Yarmuth (D-Ky.))

We are both Democrats, but our districts and paths to Congress share little in common. A Catholic city councilman from Chicago and a Jewish journalist from Kentucky, the two of us naturally bring very different viewpoints to our work. But we are in complete agreement on one of the most important issues the U.S. faces—the nuclear agreement with Iran is good for America, crucial for Israel and an important step toward a more peaceful Middle East.

The United States entered into negotiations with one prevailing goal: to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. After months of negotiations, we now have an agreement that will do just that. The deal severely restricts Iran's nuclear program to only energy-grade enrichment, eliminates much of the country's uranium stockpile, retires most centrifuges and gives International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspectors more access in Iran than in any country in the world. Most importantly, under this deal, Iran can never have a nuclear weapon.

We recognize that some of our colleagues do not share our enthusiasm for this deal, and we certainly share their mistrust for the Iranian regime. But this agreement is not built on trust. It's built on strict verification and unprecedented enforcement. Iran has

agreed to submit to full IAEA inspections throughout its nuclear supply chain, leaving no site off-limits and ensuring the IAEA will have access wherever it needs it, whenever it needs it.

Iran conceded to these terms after the success of crippling international sanctions. Relief from those sanctions will be introduced gradually, only after Iranian compliance is verified. And should leaders fail to comply at any point, those sanctions will automatically snap back into place.

But make no mistake, sanctions were not delaying Iran's march toward a bomb. Sanctions were designed to make that march unbearable and force Iran to the negotiating table, where we could strike a deal that would truly make the world safer.

And it worked. Now, aside from war, we're left with two choices. Either we support the deal and stop Iran from getting a bomb, or we oppose the deal and allow Iran to resume its nuclear path, unchecked and no longer encumbered by the pain of global sanctions.

Whether we like it or not, that is where we find ourselves. The sanctions' effectiveness depended on a coalition that included China and Russia. Should the U.S. unilaterally defeat this agreement, deemed positive by all members of the coalition, China and Russia are unlikely to simply return to business as usual. The formation of the P5+1 negotiating countries—China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States, plus Germany—was a unique historical moment. A failure by Congress to recognize the significance of today's moment would undo more than a decade of progress while leaving Iran's nuclear program fully intact.

There is simply no acceptable alternative to this deal. It's why, despite all the criticism, no viable substitute has been offered. No one likes working with enemy nations, but deals like these aren't necessary among friends. It's understandable that much of the apprehension over these negotiations has to do with Iran's history, and certainly, the past must be taken into account—it's also why there is such high emphasis on verification. But we must not allow history to be the obstacle in working toward a better, more peaceful future.

Some have derided the agreement based on the Americans who remain unjustly imprisoned in Iran. We too had hoped negotiations would have already led to their release and share the urgent need to free them. But here too, the deal provides our best chance. An abrupt severing of ties would give us no means to free the prisoners, but in an improved negotiating climate, we have a real chance to secure their release.

These choices are never easy, but after more than a decade of groundwork, the best and right path is now clear.

To upend this agreement would be not only a setback for our shared goal of a peaceful world, but it would be a major blow to American diplomacy. If we walk away, the future of international relations within the Middle East will be put at risk. China and Russia will have no need to deal with us if they again have the ability to deal with Iran directly. And Iran's nuclear program will resume its growth, free of safeguards from the international community.

The critics are right about one thing. This is not a perfect deal. But no negotiation ends in perfection, and the results of this negotiation are very good. To be certain, it's the best deal available. It's good for the United States, good for our allies—most especially Israel—and it's good for the Middle East. By cautiously and carefully inviting Iran to rejoin the world stage, we can guarantee it plays by the rules and finally ensure regional stability and security for all.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the bipartisan opposition to the President's nuclear deal with Iran. I didn't arrive at this decision lightly. As a former Marine Corps intelligence officer, I know the difficulty of detecting covert military activity, and I fully expect Iran to cheat.

For years, President Obama has said no deal would be better than a bad deal. Now, as the sun sets on his final term, he has jammed Congress with an agreement riddled with dangerous concessions. No matter the verification arrangements, this deal does not block Iran's pathway to a nuclear weapon. This much, we know.

Rewarding the largest sponsor of international terrorism with billions of dollars and long-range missiles requires Americans to compromise our Nation's security. It is too high a price and one this marine is unwilling to pay.

As sure as Iran will continue chanting "death to America," "death to Israel," I will oppose this agreement, and I will resolve to work on a non-partisan basis to preserve peace by projecting strength.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a nuclear-armed Iran is certainly unacceptable, and there are two ways to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon: diplomacy and military force.

As someone who served in combat, I believe our Nation's first choice should always be diplomacy. I say "first choice" because nothing in this deal takes military action off the table, but before we go down that road, we need to give diplomacy a shot, and this deal is the best way forward.

I am not new to the issue. I just finished serving 8 years on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I have reviewed the intelligence; I have read the classified documents, and I have had numerous briefings with experts from every side of this issue. There is no other deal to be had. It is this, or it is the status quo. Make no mistake, the status quo leaves Iran just a short time away from a bomb.

All of the intelligence clearly points towards the fact that this agreement is far better than doing nothing, better than the status quo. Iran is already a nuclear threshold state. If we reject this deal, Iran will keep getting closer and closer towards the development of their nuclear weapon.

If we accept the deal, we will be able to halt Iran's activities. The IAEA will have enormous access to conduct inspections, and Iran must forever honor the conditions of the nonproliferation treaty or face the consequences.

This deal isn't about trust. I don't trust Iran, and I don't like their leader-

ship, but as it has been pointed out, you don't negotiate peace agreements with those you know, like, and trust.

This deal is about verification. It is about making Iran prove it is not developing a nuclear weapon. It is about keeping America and our allies safe. It is our best and only peaceful path forward. I urge the House to approve the Iran nuclear deal.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the first question is: Does Iran deserve the right to be trusted?

If the answer to that is yes, then I would ask how. Tell me how Iran has earned this right to be trusted. If the answer is no, then obviously, you would have to verify if you don't trust.

If you actually look at the verification in this deal, in many cases, we are finding out from these secret agreements that it is actually Iran verifying for themselves that, in fact, they are going to be nuclear free.

I am a veteran of Iraq, and one of the things that I think is largely forgotten in this debate, even though it has been mentioned a few times, is Iraq is responsible for the death of hundreds if not thousands of American soldiers, both directly and indirectly, through the explosive foreign penetrators they send to Iraq to kill American troops.

The other thing is, Iran in this deal, there is all this talk about Iran cheating, and we know it is in the DNA of Iran to cheat anyway. They don't even need to cheat. They can follow this deal to the T and become a zero-time breakout nuclear state.

You don't even need to have nuclear weapons to have the same kind of power if you are a zero-time breakout nuclear state. You just need to have the threat to marry a nuclear weapon to an intercontinental ballistic missile—which, by the way, we give Iran the right to have in year eight, ICBMs married up to the tip of a nuclear weapon.

In 5 years, by the way, Iran can now take weapons from Russia, Europe—frankly, the United States if we wanted to sell it to them—because we lift the arms embargo against them.

□ 1015

South Korea and the United Arab Emirates have asked us for the right to enrich or reprocess uranium—friends of the United States—and we told them no because of our dedication to keeping nuclear weapons out of the wrong hands. So we denied our best friends the right to enrich uranium, and we are getting ready to give it to our worst enemy. This deal will, in effect, end the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty for the world, because we can never deny anybody the right to enrich uranium in the future.

With that, I urge the rejection of this deal.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, by now, I should be used to the wild and spurious charges my Republican colleagues will level at the administration when they know they are about to lose a big battle.

This is an extremely well-conceived arms agreement that does exactly what needs to be done when it comes to preventing Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, if it is enforced. There is not an argument or an objection against it that has not been debunked by actual regional and nuclear experts on both sides of the aisle. And yet not a single Republican in the entire United States Congress is willing to consider the deal's exceptional merits—not a single one. Now, that is politics; that is not policy. Instead, we have spent 2 days watching the Republicans trip over themselves on how best to unanimously disapprove of this deal.

If we disapprove, where does it lead? You heard: either to war or let's go get another deal. That is not going to happen. Everyone has told us that is not going to happen. It is the same neocons that have led us into 15 years of war in the Middle East that now want us to leave the thing open with Iran; don't settle it.

We have seen Secretary Kerry and Secretary Moniz go toe-to-toe with the Iranians for months. Enduring the through-the-night meetings and countless strained arguments, our diplomats ultimately delivered the most far-reaching nuclear agreement in history. There is nothing that compares with what we have here. That is real leadership.

Of course, we have seen the shameful campaigns of misinformation and vitriol before—ObamaCare. If you were to play the ObamaCare arguments, they are the same ones that you are hearing today: Fear; fear, folks; you are going to lose your doctor; you are going to lose everything. And yet we now have it in place, and 20 million people have more health care. Now we are seeing it again.

A Republican, Teddy Roosevelt, said it best:

Credit goes to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who at best knows, in the end, triumph of high achievement, and who at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall not be with these cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat.

The President has gone out on the line. He has listened to this stuff for 2 years and came back with an agreement. You have got experts in Israel, you have got experts around the world saying that this is a good deal. Now, imagine if we were making this agreement 70 years ago with the Japanese. We had been at war with them. We wouldn't have the same arguments.

Vote against this bill.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I want to underscore the point the gentleman from Illinois made a few

minutes ago. This deal effectively shreds the bipartisan Non-Proliferation Treaty, a bipartisan accomplishment, an accomplishment that has served to curtail proliferation for 50 years now.

As a consequence of this action, for the first time, we are going to make an exception for Iran, an exception that everyone else is going to demand; and we are going to see an arms race, if this deal goes through, not just in the Middle East, but one that is going to threaten the wider world as well.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the President's nuclear agreement with Iran. It is not good for America or her allies.

The administration would have us believe that the only alternative to this deal is war. Those of us saying this is a bad deal are not advocating for war. We are advocating for a better deal, one that effectively prevents Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon now, 15 years from now, and into the future.

Instead of preventing a nuclear weapon-capable Iran, this deal allows Iran to keep its nuclear infrastructure; gives Iran billions of dollars in sanctions relief to promote terrorism and instability throughout the region; does not allow for anytime, anywhere inspections; lifts the arms embargo, allows Iran to acquire intercontinental ballistic missiles; and does nothing to free the four American hostages being held in Iran.

Quite simply, this is a bad deal that aims to solidify a legacy rather than prevent a nuclear weapon-capable state sponsor of terrorism.

I urge my colleagues to reject this deal.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to compliment all of my colleagues for all the time that everyone has spent going through the classified documents, listening to the hearings, listening to the ambassadors from all the other nations, listening to people on every side of this issue.

The decision that we have to make right here today is what are the consequences, ultimately, of this decision. And the fact is we have learned that Iran is only several weeks away from the possibility of developing a nuclear weapon. Those are the hard, cold facts that we have been told. They haven't, because of the sanctions and the restrictions that are in place. They have enough fissile material to make 8 to 10, maybe as many as 12 nuclear weapons.

So what does this deal do? What makes them give up 98 percent of that fissile material? They won't have enough to build one bomb if this agreement is fully implemented. It makes them get rid of two-thirds of the centrifuges. They will not be able to develop one bomb if this deal is implemented.

If this deal is implemented, we retain the support of the international community, all of whom are committed to seeing to it that Iran does not have a nuclear weapon. And for those who prefer a military option, it is not taken off the table.

We need to remind ourselves that until all of these conditions are met, none of the sanctions are lifted. They can be snapped back in a minute. We have got 24-hour, 7-days-a-week camera inspection. We have unprecedented inspection.

If they violate this agreement, we will know about it. We can snap back the sanctions. And for those who want a military option, that is still on the table.

This agreement gives peace a chance. This agreement gives diplomacy a chance. It is something that we can ill afford. The opposite may very well be something that forces us into another war in the Middle East, costing us trillions in treasury, costing us blood, and creating the prospects of a confrontation that is unimaginable and unacceptable.

We must give diplomacy a chance. That is what this agreement is all about, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, over the last few days, our Nation has heard from its elected Representatives on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, affectionately known as the Iran nuclear deal. I stand here today to add my name to the list of Members who recognize what a terrible deal this is and the grave danger a "yes" vote creates for humanity.

It has been said by most that this will be one of the most important votes a Member will cast in his or her term in Congress. I agree.

It has been said by many that it paves the way for a nuclear-armed Iran. I agree.

It has been said by many that lifting of sanctions will further destabilize an already troubled region. I agree.

And it is indisputable, Mr. Speaker, as most have admitted, that Iran is the largest state sponsor of terror. I could go on and on: self-inspections, ballistic missiles, retention of centrifuges, side deals.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just a bad deal. It is unconscionable that we would consider anything that leaves a path for Iran to possess a weapon, as this agreement does.

A "yes" vote, Mr. Speaker, will be on the wrong side of history. I urge my colleagues to stand with the American people, defeat the resolution, and stop this very bad deal.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, with all the rhetoric invoked around this

agreement, I am reminded of what President Ronald Reagan—since his name was used just a few moments ago by the leader—told Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in November of 1985 when they discussed the nuclear arms reduction. Go back to history and not have selective history. President Reagan said this: “I bet the hard-liners in both our countries are bleeding when we shake hands.”

If that doesn't resonate, what will?

And when the United States struck an agreement with the Soviet Union 2 years later to reduce the size of our Nation's nuclear arsenals, President Reagan received much criticism, including, as conservative columnist George Will put it, for accelerating—listen to this—“the moral disarmament of the West by elevating wishful thinking to the status of political philosophy.”

Almost 30 years later, we see that President Reagan's actions were not a capitulation to an entrenched enemy, but instead the underpinnings of a larger strategy that reduced the nuclear threat.

This agreement should not be judged on its ability to curb Iran's hateful rhetoric or its role in destabilizing the Middle East, because that was never the goal of the agreement.

No agreement can be perfect, but I am not convinced that a better deal—which exists only in the abstract at this point—will materialize if Congress were to reject the one before us.

Rejecting this agreement, Mr. Speaker, would require the world's largest economies, who are party to this multilateral agreement, to follow our lead and reimpose sanctions.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad deal. Even many of those who have found a way to justify voting for this deal can see that it is a bad deal. This deal enables Iran more money to fund terror, accumulate more power, and it will lead to a nuclear arms race in the Middle East—and those points aren't disputable.

This deal authorizes Iran so much control over the inspection process that it is not possible to say that this deal provides the level of verification that even the administration demanded up until a few months ago.

Why do I say that? Because we can't even see what the inspection procedures are other than that Iran gets to inspect itself. There is not accountability to Iran in this deal.

Mr. Speaker, I am perplexed how one can vote for this deal without knowing what the actual inspection and verification procedures are. We are sacrificing our strength and leverage to the unknown.

What is known is that the statements coming out of Tehran over the past week reinforce that they cannot be trusted, that they will play games, and that their motives are evil and their terrorist activities will continue.

Vote “no” to this deal.

□ 1030

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for doing the work necessary in a bipartisan way to inform the American people, as well as our body, of the concerns here today. So I rise today in strong and bipartisan opposition to the President's dangerous deal with Iran.

This one-sided deal gives Iran virtually everything it wants, ultimately paving the way for them to develop a nuclear weapon and further destabilize the Middle East. It gives the Iranians billions in sanctions relief that will be used to finance terrorism. It gives Iran 24 days to cover its tracks before inspectors are allowed in. It even includes secret side deals that the President, Congress, and the American people have not seen.

Meanwhile, four Americans tragically languish in Iranian prisons, including one Michigianian.

Mr. Speaker, at moments like this, party politics must take a backseat to the safety of the American people. I urge my colleagues to stand with our ally, Israel. Stand for security. Stand for peace. Stand for America. Don't reward Iran for spreading terrorism, abusing human rights, and holding Americans hostage.

Reject this deal, and let's demand the right one.

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

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, a constituent, Ms. Debora Avgerinos, visited me the other day. She owns a restaurant in Brownsburg, Indiana, and she was perplexed about this agreement.

One of the things she mentioned was that in her restaurant OSHA, the EPA, and anyone else from the Federal Government can come and inspect her at any time with no notice. Such is the case with this upside-down administration. Our own Americans can be inspected at any time.

Yet, when it comes to the world's biggest sponsor of terrorism, we can't inspect them at all. We have to go through a third party and wait at least 24 days. Common sense turned upside down. Except in this case, Mr. Speaker, it is with grave danger to Americans and grave danger to our friend, Israel.

Now, the President said it is either this deal or war, and, in fact, there is no other deal, and I think that is patently false. In fact, I believe that this deal will, in all likelihood, bring war.

And why do I think that?

Well, we are putting \$150 billion back in the hands of Iranians, and I want to know: Who here thinks that they are going to build hospitals? Who here

thinks they are going to use that \$150 billion to help Iranians?

They are going to use it for “death to America.”

Please vote against this deal.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, the Iranian Government has American blood on its hands. It vows to kill as many more U.S. citizens as it can; it is committed to destroying Israel; and it funds, trains, and arms terrorists throughout the Middle East.

This nuclear deal with Iran does not dismantle their program. It rewards Iran with \$100 billion in cash and frozen assets, and there are no anytime, anywhere inspections. In 5 years, Iran can develop or buy conventional weapons, and in 8 years, it can buy or develop an intercontinental ballistic missile.

Now, some Members here in the House and in the Senate hope that these radical mullahs will abandon their quest to become a military power. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that hope is not a national security strategy, especially against those who wish to kill us.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to protect our homeland and to keep us safe is to reject this deal.

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

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, just over a half a century ago, John F. Kennedy, in an era of difficult engagements with the Soviets, said: “Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.”

President Obama's diplomacy with Iran is grounded in strength and realism, but it is animated by something all too rare in foreign relations: hope. This is a strong deal that represents our best hope for lasting security and peace.

As a veteran, I stand with our President and support this deal.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, President Reagan walked away from a bad deal in Iceland. He walked away, and then he applied pressure; and as a consequence of that pressure, he then got a good deal.

In the case of this administration, they did not walk away from a bad deal during the interim agreement. As a matter of fact, this administration rejected the stronger pressure that this House passed, with a vote of 400–20, and held that bill up in the Senate during its negotiations in the prior Congress and did not give us the leverage we needed for a good deal. But that is still available to us.

Frankly, we all have experience with North Korea. We remember what happened. But Iran won't have to cheat like North Korea did to get close to a bomb, and that is because the essential

restrictions on Iran's key bomb-making technology expire. They sunset in 10 to 15 years. After these restrictions expire, Iran will be left with an internationally recognized, industrial-scale nuclear program—and that is what the President concedes. As the President said of his own agreement, in year 13, 14, 15, Iran's breakout times would have shrunk almost down to zero.

A former State Department official testified to the Foreign Affairs Committee that this sunset clause is a disaster. It will enable the leading state sponsor of terrorism to produce enough material for dozens of nuclear weapons, all under the terms of the agreement.

As another expert witness pointed out, the bet that the administration is taking is that in 10 or 15 years, we will have a kinder, gentler Iran. But we are not going to have a kinder, gentler Iran because we are releasing to Iran \$100 billion in immediate sanctions relief. That is the down payment. And Iran is guaranteed in all of this a reconnection to the global economy.

Now, the point I want to make to the Members here is that that does not go to the average Iranian. It is the Quds Forces; it is the IRGC; it is the clerics that took over the major corporations in Iran; they are the ones that are going to receive that \$100 billion, and we already know the impact of that. It is going to solidify the Supreme Leader's grip on power. That is why he did the deal, to keep his revolution intact.

We had the bottom falling out of the price of oil. We had hyperinflation in Iran. We were in the position, had we exerted the additional pressure, to force a real choice between economic collapse and actual compromise on this program rather than what we got.

But, by removing economic sanctions, the President is withdrawing one of our most successful peaceful tools from confronting the regime; and, as a result, 200 retired generals and admirals concluded this agreement will enable Iran to become far more dangerous.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a terrible deal. This administration has made a lot of mistakes when it comes to foreign policy. This has got to be the worst one because this deal will not stop Iran from getting a bomb. This deal will all but guarantee it.

We went into these negotiations saying that Iran had to eliminate its nuclear program, all of it, full stop. Now, they are saying that was unrealistic, too unreasonable, too pie-in-the-sky.

And we are handing over hundreds of billions of dollars in sanctions relief. So Iran gets billions of dollars in exchange for what? For taking apart some—not all, just some—of its nuclear program?

And then, in 10 or 15 years, all of these limits expire. In other words, they are getting something for essen-

tially nothing. It is a steal. And that is if they don't cheat.

Now, the administration says that this deal will bring about unprecedented transparency. We will get regular access, they say. We will see what Iran is up to, they say. But if the inspectors think something is up, Iran has 24 days to cover its tracks and, in some cases, Iran's own inspectors will get to collect the evidence.

Finally, against all of the advice from our military, we are going to let Iran buy ballistic missiles in just 8 years. Mr. Speaker, you only buy ballistic missiles if you are looking to build a bomb.

I get why Russia and China like this idea. They get another big customer. But I don't, for the life of me, understand why we would ever agree to this.

Mr. Speaker, the President is taking a huge gamble here. He thinks if we make nice with the Iranian regime they will change their ways. Bring them into the global economy, and they will become more like us.

Now, I think the Iranian people, they want democracy, they want freedom. But we are not talking about the Iranian people here. We are talking about an extremist regime that is unaccountable to their own people.

This is a regime that chants "death to America." This is a regime that funds terrorism all around the world. This is a regime that has called for wiping Israel off the map.

I am all for diplomacy, but I'm not for rewarding a rogue regime.

I would also point out that the sanctions we are lifting will let European and Asian companies build up Iran's economy, and they will make the regime even stronger. And should Iran start to cheat—which they have a pretty darn good track record of doing so—it will be that much harder to put back in place the sanctions. Our trading partners, they will feel the pinch, and they won't want to hold this regime accountable.

So I want to stress how fervently I oppose this deal. I know the President may have already lined up enough support to save his deal, but with this vote—with this vote—we need to send a message to both Iran and to the world: The regime may have bamboozled this administration, but the American people know that this is a rotten deal.

And I fear that, because of this deal, the Middle East and the world at large will only become a much, much more dangerous place.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend, Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement represents the best path to achieving our goal of preventing Iran from ever obtaining a nuclear weapon, and it advances the national security interests

of the United States and our allies, including Israel.

Mr. Speaker, for years, the Congress, the President, our European partners, and the international community have imposed a series of tough economic sanctions on Iran with the goal of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. Those sanctions brought Iran to the negotiating table and I commend President Obama, Secretary Kerry, and the entire team, along with our P5+1 partners, for their efforts to negotiate an agreement to prevent Iran from building a nuclear weapon.

The question for Members of Congress, who will vote on this agreement, is whether it achieves its stated goals.

After the JCPOA was submitted to Congress on July 19, 2015, I carefully reviewed all of its terms, attended the classified briefings and numerous presentations, and reviewed the transcripts of all the hearings that have been held in both the House and the Senate. I also met with opponents and supporters of the agreement before announcing my decision on July 30, 2015, the day after the final hearings before the Congressional August recess. While I respect the opinions of those on both sides of this issue, I concluded that this agreement advances the national security interests of the United States and all of our allies, including our partner Israel. This agreement is the best path to achieve our goal—that Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon. Indeed, I firmly believe that, should Congress block this agreement, we would undermine that goal, inadvertently weaken and isolate America, and strengthen Iran.

The benefit of any agreement must be measured against the real-world consequences of no agreement. Many forget that when these negotiations began in earnest two years ago, Iran was a threshold nuclear weapons state and remains so until and unless this agreement is implemented. As Prime Minister Netanyahu warned at the United Nations in 2012, Iran was a few months away from having enough highly enriched uranium to produce its first bomb. Today, prior to the implementation of this agreement, it has a nuclear stockpile that, if further enriched, could produce up to 10 bombs. It currently has installed nearly 20,000 centrifuges that could convert that fuel into weapons material. Indeed, many analysts believe that the combination of Iran's nuclear stockpile and its centrifuges would allow it to produce enough weapons-grade nuclear material for a bomb in two months.

In addition, Iran has been enriching some of its nuclear material at its deep underground reactor at Fordow, a very difficult target to hit militarily. Moreover, Iran was in the process of building a heavy-water reactor at Arak, which could generate plutonium to be used for a nuclear weapon. Finally, Iran has been operating for years under an inadequate verification regime that increases the risks of a covert program going undetected.

This agreement blocks all of these paths to acquiring weapons-grade nuclear material and puts in place an inspection system that assures the detection of any violation and future dash to acquire a nuclear weapon. The Interim Agreement has already neutralized Iran's stockpile of highly enriched uranium that Prime Minister Netanyahu highlighted in his speech. This final agreement will significantly scale back the remainder of its program. Iran's

stockpile of enriched uranium will be cut from 9,900 kg to 300 kg, and that remainder will be limited to low-enriched uranium that cannot be used for a weapon. In addition, the agreement removes two-thirds of Iran's installed centrifuges. No enrichment activities may be conducted at Fordow for a period of 15 years, and the facility at Arak will be permanently converted to one that does not produce weapons-grade plutonium.

Taken together, these measures will extend the breakout time from about two months to at least a year and put in place layers of verification measures over different timelines, including some that remain in place permanently. It is generally agreed that these measures would allow us to detect any effort by Iran to use its current nuclear facilities—Natanz, Fordow, or Arak—to violate the agreement. The main criticism with respect to verification is that the agreement does not sufficiently guard against an effort by Iran to develop a secret uranium supply chain and enrichment capacity at a covert place. However, the reality is that the agreement permanently puts in place an inspection mechanism that is more rigorous than any previous arms control agreement and more stringent than the current system. The agreement ultimately requires inspections of any suspected Iranian nuclear site with the vote of the United States, Britain, France, Germany, and the European Union. Neither the Chinese nor the Russians can block such inspections in the face of a united Western front. Are we really better off without this verification regime than with it?

In exchange for rolling back its nuclear program and accepting this verification regime, Iran will obtain relief from those sanctions that are tied to its nuclear program. However, that relief will only come after Iran has verifiably reduced its nuclear program as required. Moreover, if Iran backslides on those commitments, the sanctions will snap back into place. The snapback procedure is triggered if the U.S. registers a formal complaint against Iran with the special commission created for that purpose. In addition, those U.S. sanctions that are not related to the Iranian nuclear program will remain in place, including U.S. sanctions related to Iran's human rights violations, support for terrorism, and missile program.

There are some who oppose the agreement because it does not prevent Iran from engaging in adversarial actions throughout the Gulf, the Middle East, and elsewhere. That conduct, however, was never within the scope of these negotiations nor the objective of the international sanctions regime aimed at preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. President Reagan understood the distinction between changing behavior and achieving verifiable limits on weapons programs. He negotiated arms control agreements with the Soviet Union, not because he thought it would change the character of "the Evil Empire" but because limiting their nuclear arsenal was in the national security interests of the U.S. and our allies. That reality is also true today. An Iranian regime with nuclear capability would present a much greater threat to the region than an Iran without one. In fact, today, as a threshold nuclear weapons state, Iran wields more influence than it will under the constraints of this agreement. That is why our focus has appropriately been on reining in the Iranian nuclear program.

The lifting of the sanctions will certainly give Iran additional resources to support its prior-

ities. Given the political dynamic in Iran, some of those additional resources will likely be invested to improve the domestic standard of living. But even if all the resources were used to support their proxies in the region, respected regional observers agree that they are unlikely to make a significant strategic difference. Moreover, any effort by Iran to increase support for its proxies can be checked by the U.S. and our allies through countermeasures. Finally, it is clear that any alternative agreement opponents seek would also result in the lifting of the sanctions and freeing up these resources.

In my view, opponents of the agreement have failed to demonstrate how we will be in a better position if Congress were to block it. Without an agreement, the Iranians will immediately revert to their status as a threshold nuclear weapons state. In other words, they immediately pose the threat that Prime Minister Netanyahu warned about in his U.N. speech. At the same time, the international consensus we have built for sanctions, which was already starting to fray, would begin to collapse entirely. We would be immediately left with the worst of all worlds—a threshold nuclear weapons state with diminished sanctions and little leverage for the United States.

I disagree with the view that we can force the Iranians back to the negotiating table to get a better deal. All of our European partners have signed on to the current agreement. Consequently, the U.S. would be isolated in its quest to return to negotiations. And in the unlikely event that we somehow returned to negotiations, the critics have not presented a plausible scenario for achieving a better agreement in a world where fewer sanctions means less economic pressure.

The bottom line is that if Congress were to block the agreement and the Iranians were to resume nuclear enrichment activities, the only way to stop them, at least temporarily, would be by military action. That would unleash significant negative consequences that could jeopardize American troops in the region, drag us into another ground war in the Middle East, and trigger unpredictable responses elsewhere. Moreover, the United States would be totally isolated from most of the world, including our Western partners. The folly of that go-it-alone military approach would be compounded by the fact that such action would only deal a temporary setback to an Iranian nuclear program. They would likely respond by putting their nuclear enrichment activities deeper underground and would likely be more determined than ever to build a nuclear arsenal.

We don't have to take that path. This agreement will give us a long period of time to test the Iranians' compliance and assess their intentions. During that period, it will give us a treasure trove of information about the scope and capabilities of the limited Iranian nuclear program. Throughout that period and beyond, we reserve all of our options, including a military option, to respond to any Iranian attempt to break out and produce enough highly enriched material to make a bomb. But we will have two advantages over the situation as it is today—a more comprehensive verification regime to detect any violation and a much longer breakout period in which to respond.

As former Secretary Clinton has indicated, the fact that we have successfully limited the scope of Iran's nuclear program does not

mean we have limited its ambitions in the region. We must continue to work with our friends and allies to constantly contain and confront Iranian aggression in the region. The United States and Israel must always stand together to confront that threat. The fact remains that Iranian support for their terrorist proxy Hezbollah continues to destabilize Lebanon and poses a direct threat to Israel, as does its support for Hamas. We must do all we can to ensure that our ally Israel maintains its qualitative military edge in the region, including providing increased funding for Israel's Arrow anti-ballistic missile and Iron Dome anti-rocket systems. Consideration should also be given to previously denied weapons if a need for such enhanced capabilities arises. We must always remember that some of Iran's leaders have called for the destruction of Israel and we must never forget the awful past that teaches us not to ignore those threats.

The threats Iran poses in the region are real. But all those threats are compounded by an Iran that is a threshold nuclear weapons state. This agreement will roll back the Iranian nuclear program and provide us with greater ability to detect and more time to respond to any future Iranian attempt to build a nuclear weapon.

For all of the reasons given above, I've concluded that this is an historic agreement that should be supported by the Congress.

□ 1045

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

For far too long, we faced the nightmare of Iran with nuclear bombs. Impacted by heavy sanctions, Iran finally agreed to negotiate, led by the United States and five other nations. After agreeing on a framework, which Iran complied with, the parties completed the much-detailed Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

When I issued my statement of support for the JCPOA 6 weeks ago, its fate was uncertain. What decisively turned the tide was the impassioned leadership of the President with Secretaries Kerry and Moniz, combined with a momentous outpouring of support outside the political realm from a vast array of scientific experts, experienced diplomats, key figures from all religious faiths, a wide variety of military leaders, and informed expressions from major former governmental figures of the highest integrity, including Colin Powell and Brent Scowcroft.

It also became increasingly clear that there was no other workable alternative. This point was reinforced by the joint statement yesterday from British Prime Minister Cameron, French President Hollande and German Chancellor Merkel. They said, among other points:

This is not an agreement based on trust or on any assumption about how Iran may look in 10 or 15 years. It is based on detailed, tightly written controls that are verifiable and long-lasting. Iran will have strong incentives not to cheat: The near certainty of getting caught and the consequences that would follow would make this a losing option.

It is now absolutely clear that the JCPOA will go into effect, requiring the initial set of detailed obligations

that Iran must fulfill. It is, therefore, time to go on.

This institution, which has been a major center of attacks on the JCPOA, would hopefully have those who opposed now join with those who supported the agreement and work together to rekindle the kind of overall bipartisanship that Senator Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan urged should apply to key foreign policy issues as they “approached the water’s edge.”

Surely this kind of rekindled bipartisanship needs to be undertaken in particular to take steps to deepen support for Israel’s security, to fight and defeat terrorism, and to rekindle efforts for viable peace negotiations.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 3461, which is a vote of approval for the comprehensive agreement that would prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 3460, which would suspend the President’s authority to waive sanctions and, in effect, prevent him from implementing the comprehensive agreement.

I close. It is, indeed, time to move on and to take the next steps. Failure to do so but, instead, to perpetuate partisanship will, I strongly believe, be counterproductive for any who try it and for our entire Nation. We can and we must do much better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, sanctions are about more than nuclear weapons. They are about the principles and values America holds dear.

Iran continues to hold American prisoners hostage, sponsor terrorism around the world, and American soldiers have died because of the terrorist actions of Iran. And just this week the Iranian Supreme Leader said that Israel will be destroyed within 25 years.

Now, every lawmaker must ask: Are we willing to put \$150 billion into the hands of an Iranian regime who chants “Death to America” and wants to eliminate Israel from the Earth?

We must ask: Are we willing to risk American lives on the promises of a leader who believes those same American lives are worth nothing?

I refuse to sit idly by while this administration leaves the safety, stability, and security of everyone everywhere at the whim of Iran, whose neighbors fear them and allies consist of the Assad regime and Hezbollah. This agreement with Iran would threaten all that we hold dear.

I encourage my colleagues to join the bipartisan opposition against the Iran deal and, instead, support the security of America above the dangerous desires of Iran.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the

gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) who, to put it mildly, is a senior member of our committee.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, my fellow Members, this is a historic occasion for the House and a very emotional time for me because, unfortunately, I have known war. I have known the horrors of war.

And I speak for all of those that have had this horrendous experience to say that we should always give diplomacy a chance before we put any American in harm’s way.

I don’t think any of us, with any degree of certainty, have any idea whether this agreement is going to hold or if we can contain the criminal, inhumane ambitions of the leadership in Iran.

What we do know is that the international powers not just of China, not just of Russia, but of the United Kingdom, of France, of Germany, and the thinking of the United States of America, truly believe that this is the best possible way to avoid war.

It would seem to me that now is not the time for us to engage in exchanges that separate and bring us apart as a Nation. The rules of the House and the Senate make it abundantly clear that, whether you like it or not, this is going to become the policy of the United States of America. This will not be the policy of President Obama, of Democrats or Republicans, but the policy of our great Nation.

It pains me, as I am about to leave service in this august body, that we have people in this Chamber that have such hatred and disdain for the leadership of this country that they would put this feeling above what is the best policy for the security of this great, beloved Nation of mine.

I know that, if the President of the United States was able to walk on water, there would be people in this Chamber that would say: See, we told you that he couldn’t swim.

And so what I am saying—

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANGEL. I don’t think I can do that. Because the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) said that China and Russia are supporting this because they want to sell arms to Iran.

I think that was despicable because that includes the United Kingdom, that includes France, that includes Germany, that includes people that are talking about that this is the best way that we are able to do this.

So what I am saying is this: 14 years ago a terrible thing happened to my country, to my city, when terrorists struck on 9/11. And now we have the opportunity to bring our country together the way we did then. Fourteen years ago, there were no Republicans. There were no Democrats. There were Americans that would say we have to come together.

We are not going to change this agreement. This is the policy of the

United States of America—or soon will be. Should we not be saying: What is the enforcement? What are we going to do? What happens if they violate it?

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the ranking member.

Are we here to embarrass Presidents, Republicans, and Democrats or are we here to preserve the dignity and the integrity of the United States of America, no matter who is the President?

If ever there was a time for us to come together and support the policy, the time is now.

Thank you so much for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the oldest trick in the book, if you cannot win a debate on the merits, is to impugn the other person’s motives.

People who are opposing this agreement, whether they be Republicans or many of the Democrats who are opposing this agreement, are opposing this agreement because it is a terrible agreement, and there is no other reason.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, this nuclear deal isn’t much of a deal at all. It is a gift to the Iranian regime.

For starters, we gave them permanent sanctions relief to the tune of \$150 billion in exchange for temporary enrichment restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, the Ayatollah calls the United States the Great Satan, and just this week he said that Israel will not exist in 25 years.

Imagine the evil that this regime can carry out when they cash in their billions. Under this agreement, Iran will undoubtedly become the central bank of terror.

What is more, with this deal, we shrugged off the opportunity for true “anytime, anywhere” inspections. Instead, we gave Iran an opportunity of at least 24 days to slow-walk investigations of their nuclear sites and conceal signs of noncompliance.

Even worse, under a secretive side deal that was not transmitted here to Congress, we have learned that Iran will be allowed to self-inspect a key military base.

So to be clear, Members of this body who vote for this agreement will be voting for a deal that they have not seen in full.

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to tell the Tennesseans that I represent

that I voted for an agreement with the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism without knowing every last detail. We cannot and should not leave anything to chance when it comes to the security of America and our allies.

I will be casting my vote on behalf of Tennessee's Sixth District against this dangerous deal, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), another valued member of our committee.

Mr. LEWIS. I thank my friend, the ranking member, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of diplomacy and a pathway to peace.

For many months I thought long and hard about this decision. I attended briefings, read the documents, and met with citizens of my district. I even had a long executive session with myself.

I reflected on the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., when he called upon us to rededicate ourselves to the long and bitter, but beautiful, struggle for a new world. The way of peace is one of those immutable principles.

And after much study, thought, and reflection, I believe that it is a good deal. No, it may not be perfect. But do not let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

□ 1100

I remember standing on this very floor several years ago and speaking against the war in Iraq. I said it then, and I will say it again today: "War is messy; it is bloody; it destroys the hopes, the aspirations, and the dreams of a people."

The American people—and people around the world—are sick and tired of war and violence. We do not need more bombs, missiles, and guns. When you turn on the news, when you read the newspaper, you see a mass dislocation. Too many people are suffering, and many are desperate for a chance at peace.

I believe in my heart of hearts that this may be the most important vote that we cast during our time in Congress. To put it simply, it is non-violence or nonexistence.

It is my hope that my vote today, along with the votes of others, will be a downpayment for peace towards a world community at peace with itself.

Maybe with this deal, we will send the message that we can lay down the burdens and tools of war. Maybe we can come together as a family of human beings.

Mr. Speaker, we have a moral obligation, a mission, and a mandate to give peace a chance. Give peace a chance.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, later today, we are going to cast two votes. These votes will be amongst the most consequential votes

that we will cast—some of us—in our careers.

Our Founding Fathers charged both the President and the Congress with providing for the common defense for good reason. It is the core responsibility of our Federal Government. It is the key to our freedom and for all of our opportunities.

That is why, at the front of the oath every Member takes, it states: "I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic."

As we consider this nuclear agreement with Iran, it is our duty to determine whether it will keep America safe.

Sadly, this deal is far worse than anything I could have imagined. Why? It is because the President and his negotiators broke every one of their promises.

Does this deal dismantle Iran's nuclear program or shut off their path to a nuclear weapon as they promised it would? No. Instead, it allows Iran to keep thousands of nuclear centrifuges spinning, as they are today. Within 10 years, in the best case, it allows Iran to achieve a nuclear status.

Was this agreement built on verification? No. It appears a side deal will trust Iran to self-inspect a key site where the regime conducted tests on nuclear detonators. Of course, we haven't seen that actionable side deal, and we don't know if there are any other secret components.

Does this agreement allow inspectors to have anywhere, anytime, 24/7 access as they promised it would? No. Inspectors will have to wait up to 24 days for access to suspicious sites.

Will sanctions snap back? No. The administration admits that nothing at the UN happens in a snap.

Does it shut down Iran's ballistic missile program as they promised it would? No. Actually, the agreement lifts the arms and missile embargoes in 5 and 8 years, respectively, and it allows Iran to build ICBMs capable of delivering a nuclear warhead right here at the United States of America.

Does this agreement affect Iran's status as the world's leading sponsor of terror? Yes, it actually does. It hands Iran billions of dollars to support more of their terrorist activities around that part of the world, and it gives amnesty to the shadow commander responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American troops in Iraq.

This is all without Iran cheating. That is right; this is such a bad deal that the Ayatollah won't even have to cheat to be just steps away from a nuclear weapon.

Today, we are going to cast two votes. These votes are aimed at stopping President Obama from unilaterally lifting sanctions on Iran and ensuring accountability.

My colleagues, in pursuing this deal with Iran, President Obama refused to listen. He ignored the concerns of the

American people, national security experts, and a bipartisan majority here in the Congress. Now, he is preparing to try and force this deal over our objections.

Never in our history has something with so many consequences for our national security been rammed through with such little support.

Today is September 11. It is a day for all Americans to come together and for us to keep the oath we swore to our Constitution. Our fight to stop this bad deal, frankly, is just beginning. We will not let the American people down.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our leader, who, indeed, as she goes to speak, has been our leader on this effort.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership, for the courage it took for him and the humility to listen and to learn what was in this legislation and this agreement. That is something that I commend the Members of the House for doing, to listen and to learn.

Our distinguished Speaker just referenced the oath of office that we take when we become Members of Congress. It is a vow that we make to the American people, to protect and support our Constitution and our responsibility to protect and defend the American people.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we will vote on an agreement to make America safer—indeed, to make the world a safer place—so say the nuclear scientists and the diplomats, so say the military and security leaders of both parties or of no party, so does the faith community beseech us to do.

This morning, Father Conroy offered a prayer to God to "help the Members of this House to recognize that you are with us in our deliberations." Indeed, as we cast our votes on this historic agreement, we are thankful to God, that God was with us to, again, give us the humility to learn and the courage to act; and for that, we should all be grateful.

It is important to note that support for this agreement, as I have said, comes from both sides of the aisle. More than 100 former diplomats—Democrats and Republicans and ambassadors, et cetera—wrote:

In our judgment, the agreement deserves congressional support and the opportunity to show it can work. We firmly believe that the most effective way to protect U.S. national security and that of our allies and friends is to ensure that tough-minded diplomacy has a chance to succeed before considering other more risky alternatives.

Thirty-six generals and admirals wrote: "There is no better option to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon. If the Iranians cheat"—as the Speaker suggested they might—"If the Iranians cheat, our advanced technology, intelligence and the inspections will reveal it, and U.S. military options remain on

the table. And if the deal is rejected by America, the Iranians could have a nuclear weapon within a year. The choice is stark."

What is mysterious to me is that when our colleagues come to the floor and say, under this agreement, Iran can be a nuclear power in 10 or 15 years, so we should reject this agreement, no. Without the agreement, they are a threshold nuclear power right now and can have a weapon within months or a year. It seems to me the choice is clear, as the generals and admirals pointed out.

It is also interesting to note that our distinguished Speaker pointed out some shortcomings, in his view, in the agreement. That is disagreed with by the best nuclear physicist, who wrote to congratulate the President on the agreement. Now, these are Nobel laureates, and these are engineers, nuclear physicists, who work and specialize in nuclear weapons research and development.

They said: "We consider that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action the United States and its partners negotiated with Iran will advance the cause of peace and security in the Middle East and can serve"—this is really important—"as a guidepost for future non-proliferation agreements."

They went on to say: "This is an innovative agreement, with much more stringent constraints than any previously negotiated non-proliferation framework."

That is why they were congratulating the President of the United States.

I mentioned the prayer of Father Conroy this morning. I also, this morning, saw in *The Washington Post* that the Prime Minister of the U.K., David Cameron; the French President, Francois Hollande; and German Chancellor, Angela Merkel, wrote an op-ed that said: "This is an important moment. It is a crucial opportunity at a time of heightened global uncertainty to show what diplomacy can achieve."

These heads of state went on to state: "This is not an agreement based on trust or on any assumption about how Iran may look in 10 or 15 years. It is based on detailed, tightly written controls that are verifiable and long-lasting."

They said: "We condemn in no uncertain terms that Iran does not recognize the existence of the state of Israel and the unacceptable language that Iran's leaders use about Israel. Israel's security matters are, and will, remain our key interests, too."

Prime Minister Cameron, President Hollande, and Chancellor Merkel then said: "We would not have reached the nuclear deal with Iran if we did not think that it removed a threat to the region and the non-proliferation regime as a whole . . . We are confident that the agreement provides the foundation for resolving the conflict on Iran's nuclear program permanently. That is why we now want to embark on

the full implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action."

Today, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the agreement that enhances our vigilance and strengthens our security.

I just always am fond of quoting a story of Solomon in the Bible. When King David died and Solomon was to become king, he was uncertain as to his ability to be king in terms of his wisdom and the rest. He prayed to God and prayed that God would give him the wisdom because David was such a great king and how could he say to God, I am going to be the king of your people, help me with wisdom?

God came to him in the night, and he said: Solomon, because you did not ask for longevity, because you did not ask for great riches, because you did not ask for vengeance upon your enemies, I will give you more wisdom than anyone has ever had; and you will be renowned for wisdom, the Solomon of wisdom which sprang from humility, the humility to pray for enlightenment, for knowledge, for wisdom, for judgment.

That humility is so essential in the job that we do here. We don't have foregone conclusions. That is why I am so proud of my Members who spent so much time studying this issue, not only reading the agreement and the classified sections and the rest, but seeking answers, having information, seeking validation from generals and admirals and scientists and leaders of other countries as to what their actions would be should we, unfortunately, reject this, which happily we will not do today.

□ 1115

They had the humility to open their minds to learn, and when they learned, they had the courage to take action where some others of their friends may not have arrived yet because they did not have the benefit of all of this information. Wherever Members come down on this issue, we know one thing—that we have to come together in the end to protect our country and to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

I say, mostly of my own experience, that I have had decades of experience in tracking Iran and its nuclear ambitions. I have served longer than anyone—more than two times more than anyone—on the Intelligence Committee, so I know of what I speak. I went to the Intelligence Committee to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and that gave me some judgment as to what the President brought back in this agreement. Still, I was subjected to the harshest scrutiny as to, from my experience, if I thought that this was the best possible route we could achieve.

We mustn't judge agreements by what they don't do but respect them for what they do do; and what this does is to make our country safer, the region safer, and our friends in Israel

safer as their own national security experts have attested.

So I thank you, my colleagues. I thank you for listening, for learning, for coming to whatever conclusion you came to, but for understanding that, at the end of the day, we have respect for each other's opinions and a regard for our responsibilities to our people, to the people in the region, to our friend Israel, and also a global responsibility.

I join the nuclear physicist in congratulating President Barack Obama for his great leadership and for giving us this opportunity.

Today, we will not just be making history as the approval of the agreement goes forward. We will be making progress for the cause of peace in the world.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank Chairman RYAN.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic leader just recalled the invocation, that of invoking God's presence, and she said that we had prayed for wisdom, and she called us to act humbly.

So the question is: Are we willing to submit ourselves to the collective wisdom of a majority of this body and to a majority of the other body? I would suggest a majority of this body and a majority of the other body think this is a bad idea.

She also admonished us that we should listen and learn. It is not a bad idea, so let's listen to what is in the bill, itself. The bill, itself, gives \$150 billion in sanctions relief to the Iranian Government.

The question is: What do we expect with \$150 billion? Is it all going to go to pave roads? Is it going to go to build schools in Tehran? Is it going to fix water systems? I do not think so, and neither does President Obama. Listen to his own words.

This is Barack Obama:

Let's stipulate that some of the money will flow to activities that we object to. We have no illusions about the Iranian Government or the significance of the Revolutionary Guard.

Listen to National Security Adviser Susan Rice when she says:

We should expect that some portion of that money would go to the Iranian military and could potentially be used for all kinds of bad behavior that we have seen in the region up until now.

Let's listen to those words. They are clear. They are obvious.

So now think in terms of percentages of \$150 billion. Is it going to be half? Is it going to be a quarter? Is it going to be 10 percent? Is it going to be 1 percent—1 percent of that money—\$1.5 billion? Doing what—funding Hamas? funding Hezbollah? killing Americans? Let's listen and let's learn.

Now, my friend from New York said this is definitely the policy of the United States. Definitely. It is a fait

accompli. There is really no reason to have this debate and this discussion. It is all over according to his world view. I don't buy it. I don't buy that for a second. I am not going to lay down here and let the President of the United States run roughshod in his probably—let's think about it. Is this just a bad idea, or is this the worst bill ever? the worst idea ever? I think it wins the "worst idea ever" award.

Mr. Speaker, it was a week ago when it was crazy talk as to the idea that the President of the United States had standing, and it was crazy talk a week ago that the House of Representatives had standing in the courts. Now, do you know what the courts have said? The House has standing.

So, as to the notion that this is all done and that this is just a settled case, it is not. I think we have got to be very, very clear about what is going on, and we need to listen, and we need to learn, and we need to vote "no."

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, our Speaker stood before us a few minutes ago and sounded a somber, serious note. I am sorry the process that we are going through does not reflect that somber, serious attitude. It is sad that it has come to this: a parody of what could have been a week-long, thoughtful, thorough debate about our relationship with Iran, which Republicans, instead, have turned into an incoherent, partisan shouting match. It ignores the reality, the complexity, and the opportunity.

There has been no discussion, for example, about how America seriously mismanaged our relationship with Iran since we helped the British overthrow their popularly elected government in 1953 and installed the Shah as dictator; how we backed the murderous Saddam Hussein's war against Iran that cost up to 1 million lives, and we looked the other way when he used poison gas—a real weapon of mass destruction; how we labeled them the "axis of evil" when they were working with us in a post-Taliban Afghanistan. It is amazing that the majority of Iranian people still likes us.

Now, I strongly oppose the current Iranian leadership; but, for years, I have been working for a diplomatic solution with other countries because sanctions only work when other countries join us. Well, they did, and we have an opportunity today to enforce a nonnuclear future for Iran.

The Republican talking point is, somehow, they are going to get \$150 billion. That talking point, however, ignores the reality. Those five powerful countries that joined with us, that help get the agreement, they are going to walk away if America walks away from the sanctions they have imposed on Iran if America walks away from the deal. As multilateral sanctions will dissolve, Iran will get its money anyway and nuclear weapons, if it wants,

in a year or two. It will be the United States and Israel that will be isolated, and the world will be less safe.

These are some of the reasons that the major independent experts have said the Iran Nuclear agreement is the best alternative for the United States. Not a perfect agreement, but the best agreement. Let's use all of our time and energy to make this agreement work and to strengthen relationships in the Middle East to avoid more mistakes currently championed by the same people who gave us the disastrous Iraq war.

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, this is a horrible deal. In any deal, you never get what you deserve. You get what you negotiate. Let me give you a contrast between what two Presidents say when they talk about deals.

President Obama has told America that it is either this agreement or war. President Reagan said there is no argument over the choice between peace and war, but there is only one guaranteed way you can have peace, and you can have it in a second—surrender.

Now I want you to let your mind drift back to 14 years ago, on a morning very eerily like today, when America awoke, and some Americans were going off to work in the World Trade Center, when some Americans were going off to work at the Pentagon, and when some Americans boarded flights for destinations that they thought they were going to get to. Three thousand Americans said good-bye that morning to their families and their loved ones, thinking that they would see them again, never knowing that they would never be able to say that again, would never be able to kiss them good-bye, would never be able again to celebrate a birthday or any other meaningful event in their lives because of an act of terrorism.

Flight 93. By the way, it was United Flight 93. Thirty-seven passengers and seven crew members boarded the airplane destined for San Francisco. That is not where the plane landed. That plane is embedded in a smoldering crater in the peaceful countryside of Shanksville, Pennsylvania, because of terrorists. The members of that flight crew and those passengers performed the greatest act of religious sacrifice that you can do. They gave up their lives for the lives of their fellow Americans. They walked away from futures filled with promise and decided it was more important at that moment to sacrifice themselves.

How in the world can we sit in America's House—and I speak to you today not as a Republican but as an American. My friends, as we let our eyes fill with tears over the great loss that day and as our ears pick up on the message

from our enemies in the East of "death to Israel," "death to the Great Satan," "death to America," let us resound with long and lost strength and temerity and say: "Listen. Never again. Never again. Never again." Let those words echo forever and ever, not only in your ears but in your hearts. Do not cave in. Do not sacrifice the safety, the security, and the stability of 330 million Americans for the legacy of one man.

That is not who we are. That is not who we have ever been. That is not who we will ever be.

My friends—and I mean, sincerely, my friends—and my fellow Americans, vote against the greatest betrayal we have ever seen in this country. This is not a deal that protects America. It is unenforceable. It is unverifiable. This is just a horrible deal.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I pause for a minute.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as the last speech indicates, it is hardly by chance that the House Republican leadership has scheduled these votes on 9/11—votes on an agreement to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon—ever.

The justifiable fear of another terrorist attack and the justifiable outrage about the terrorist attack of 9/11 have been exploited before today. They were exploited to justify the disastrous invasion of Iraq. While few Americans today will recall that, actually, after 9/11 there was some early support in Iran against al Qaeda terrorism, few can forget the oft repeated and rather deceitful warning that promoted the rush to war in Iraq: "We don't want the smoking gun to be a mushroom cloud."

Once again, the specter of this mushroom cloud is being raised with those who would interfere with an international, diplomatic success—an agreement that would avoid putting us on another path to war. The same kind of folks who urged us to rush into Baghdad are the same folks who told us back before we even had this agreement that it wouldn't work and that we ought to begin bombing in Tehran and in the surrounding area. They are the same folks who said that it would only take a few days of bombing and it would all be over. It is the same poor logic that took us into a disaster in Iraq, which cost so many families the ultimate sacrifice and the waste of over \$1 trillion.

□ 1130

This is not a debate about the Twin Towers. It is a debate, though, that would be a twin wrong if we follow the same approach we took the last time.

I have supported sanctions against Iran.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DOGGETT. I have supported them at each opportunity, but this is not about sanctions. It is about a last-ditch effort to undermine a diplomatic victory.

Those who reject this victory are weak on alternatives. They talk about a "secret." The biggest secret is what they would do other than bomb first and ask questions later.

The director of the Mossad, the Israeli CIA, says we are putting in place a verification system, which is second to none and has no precedent.

Ultimately, reason will prevail this week in Congress. The President will be sustained, and families here and in Israel will be safer.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this debate. I have read this agreement. I heard my colleague from Illinois say something that resonates with me.

We should listen. First and foremost, we should listen to the American people. They are overwhelmingly saying: This is dangerous. Reject this deal. Let's listen to the leaders that say this puts us in more jeopardy of going to war.

We all want peace. There is not a human being in America that wants to go to war. To classify us on this side of the aisle as having a desire to go to war, shame. But you will get peace through strength, and you need to put the American citizens first.

What about our four fellow American citizens that are sitting in an Iranian jail right now and the President said: We tried to negotiate it, but they wouldn't talk to us? Well, then you walk away.

What about the families that are represented in the \$47 billion worth of judgments that have been filed against Iran because they suffered terrorist acts at the hands of Iran and we are going to give \$150 billion to Iran without paying those fellow American citizens, those families who suffered and lost dear loved ones? Stupidity. American citizens always must be first.

Iran has raised no confusion as to what its intention is here. It wants a nuclear weapon. It wants to destroy Israel. It wants to destroy America. Listen to their own words. If you do, we would say we want peace, but it will be on our terms from a position of strength.

Vote "no" on this deal.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. MIKE KELLY is a good man. I like MIKE. I admire him. But I think he did a disservice to the House and to this debate by bringing up the issue of 9/11.

I do thank him for honesty for at least showing that that is what this is all about, having this debate today and

this vote today to stir the emotions of the American people.

My emotions are always stirred on this day. Fourteen years ago, I knew people who died that day. My cousin died. My friends died. I don't need to be reminded of that. But it will not cloud my decisionmaking on this important issue.

Today I stand in support of a Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. This has been a difficult decision for me, and I know it has been for many of my colleagues as well.

There are those who came out against this deal before you even read it. But for those of you who took the time to read the agreement and came to a different conclusion, you have my deep and profound respect because we both share the same goals.

After carefully studying this agreement, I believe it is important to give diplomacy the opportunity to succeed. The agreement takes important steps to address Iran's nuclear program.

Under this agreement, both the current uranium and plutonium paths to a bomb are addressed and all of Iran's operating uranium enrichment will be centralized into a single facility that is penetrable by U.S. air power.

This agreement does not constrain the United States from bolstering our allies and aggressively pushing back against Iran's other nefarious activities.

There is more we can do and must do, including strengthening Israel, Jordan, and our other allies in the region. Israel is the only country being threatened with annihilation. I know that. So it needs and deserves a quantitative and qualitative military advantage.

And if this deal doesn't work or Iran's leadership somehow gets the idea that they can attack us or wipe out our friends, the United States and our allies will have the capability, the will, and the power to confront Iran's nuclear program and destroy it.

We have the best military in the world. We have the best intelligence service in the world. America will always be prepared.

The fact is no one here can predict whether Iran will give up its program, not Republicans nor Democrats. If they don't, we have options. But we can do this and give this plan the opportunity to work, and I am prepared to do that.

Now, after all this discussion and talk about bipartisanship, a real profile in courage would be for one of you to support your President, one Republican to stand and support your President.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CROWLEY. Thirteen years ago, I stood here in the House of Representatives and I gave the benefit of the doubt to the then-President, and he took us to war. I will give today the benefit of the doubt to your President to take us to peace.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. BRADY), a distinguished member from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I didn't take an oath of office to defend my President. I took an oath in office to defend my country.

The world is a dangerous place, and nothing makes it more dangerous than a nuclear-armed Iran. This isn't a Republican versus Democrat issue. This is true security versus false security at a critical moment in world history.

I have read the agreement, and I have studied it. You have got to ask yourself three key questions: Does this stop Iranian's nuclear capability for the long term? No. Does it stop the spread of nuclear weapons in the Middle East? No. More importantly, does this make America and our allies like Israel safer? The answer is no. And even supporters believe that to be true. No.

America deserves, Israel deserves, our world deserves, an agreement that dismantles Iran's nuclear capability, not just delays it for a small while at best.

That is why I oppose this agreement. It makes our country and our allies at risk. That is why I support stopping the President, suspending the President, from lifting the sanctions in this agreement.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 12¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to listen to the debate. Some of the things that are going on, yes, they are heated.

But as we look at this historic agreement—my good friend from New York just asked: Will you stand with your President? I have stood with the President before.

I think it is also important that we take a look at this agreement. This is a historic mistake. This is one that will jeopardize the safety and security of the United States.

And I want to echo that this is a bipartisan opposition. So this is not about left versus right. This is about right versus wrong.

Ultimately, when I tuck my children in bed at night, a 13-year-old, an 11-year-old and an 8-year-old, and I look into the faces of those that are here, these young Americans, and I wonder what type of country they will inherit with a nuclear-armed Iran, for me, that is unacceptable.

Our stated objectives, our goals, were to make sure that Iran never has the ability to achieve a nuclear weapon. And, yet, this agreement, according to BOB MENENDEZ, all but preserves it, a nuclear-armed Iran, one that shouts

“death to America.” They want to wipe Israel off the face of the map.

In this agreement, the ballistic missile embargo is lifted in 8 years, an arms embargo in 5 years.

My friends, what do you use a ballistic missile for? I would argue it is not to drop leaflets. It is not for humanitarian purposes. It is to have a reign of terror in the United States of America. For me, that is completely unacceptable.

Again, I don't care where you come from, what district you are in, this is about will be safer. And the answer is simply no.

I believe that this agreement ultimately will be an arms race in the Middle East. We have talked about France. We have talked about the U.K. We have talked about Germany.

Has anybody asked the neighborhood? Has anybody asked Saudi Arabia or the UAE or Egypt or Israel? The answer is no because they are uniformly against this because they know Iran's ultimate goal is to not only devastate that region, but to devastate the United States of America.

This is one of the things that, again, must unite us. This is not about partisanship.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DOLD. This is not about partisanship. Please hear me. We don't want to bring up 9/11 in the sense that we want to do it on this day, 9/11.

But I do think that it does smack of the idea that we never want to see that dirty bomb that comes into a container ship, that goes into New York, Miami, or Washington, D.C. Because you know what? No one wants to relive what happened on that day 14 years ago.

Yet, if we do not step up in a united front and stop this, my fear is that we will relive that day again. That, for me, is unacceptable. I implore you all, my colleagues, my friends, to stand up against this awful historic mistake.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE), the distinguished member of the Budget Committee and member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this week Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, the person with whom President Obama and his administration say they have reached an agreement that we should support, doubled down, once again calling the United States the Great Satan.

And he further declared, after negotiations, there will be nothing left of Israel in 25 years and, until then, jihadi morale will leave not a moment of serenity.

This is the very man that the President of the United States is blindly trusting if we endorse this deal.

Sadly, this administration has folded on every single red line and point of leverage that the United States had.

There are no “anytime, anyplace” inspections. There is no accountability for past Iranian nuclear activities. Conventional armament bans will be lifted. Ballistic missile bans will be lifted.

To put it plainly, Mr. Speaker, this deal paves a shiny yellow brick road for Iran to spread Islamic extremism, death, and destruction around the world, not to mention an unprecedented nuclear arms race across the entire Middle East.

We should have made sure that not a single resource or benefit received by Iran funds Islamic terrorism. We should have made sure that Iran publicly accepts Israel's right to exist, that genocide is unacceptable, that stated goals of wiping entire groups of people and nations off the Earth is unacceptable.

At the very least, we should have made certain that four American hostages, including a Christian pastor being held in Iran, were released. Of course, not a single one of these objectives were achieved.

The administration thought that compelling Iran to renounce nuclear holocaust or Islamic terrorism or genocide were simply far too unreasonable to request.

If this deal goes through, time will surely demonstrate that it will be a shameful stain in the history of the world.

Now, we pray that terrible ramifications do not come to fruition. However, if the past is prologue, this agreement may very well make any further action or concerns voiced by anyone too little, too late.

A nuclear Iran spells nothing but disaster. For safety at home and abroad, this agreement must be rejected.

□ 1145

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, after listening to this debate, I commend President Obama and Secretary Kerry for their leadership and resolve in crafting the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action reached between the P5+1 nations and Iran. I do so because this is a plan which promotes peace and security, not war or the continuous threat of war.

Yes, no agreement is perfect, and no agreement will fully satisfy everyone, but I can tell you that, for me and the constituents of the Seventh District of Illinois, we say let's give peace a chance. We say let's support the position of our President, but we also say let's support the position of our experts, let's support the position of our allies, let's heed the words of the prophets who say, “Come and let us reason together” or we shall all be “utterly destroyed by the edge of the sword.”

Yes, we say let's support the most rational, the most logical, the most com-

prehensive, and the most effective path to peace that we know. Yes, it is not about supporting the position of any single individual, but it is about supporting what is good for America. It is about supporting what is good to help stabilize our world so that we can exist with the idea that peace is, indeed, possible and war is not inevitable.

Yes, I support the President.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), another distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to lifting economic sanctions on Iran. Throughout August, I spoke with many Nebraskans all across my district at public meetings. In addition to their frustration over the reach of the Federal Government, the most common concern they shared with me involved the Iran deal.

The ramifications of this agreement will impact not only our country's future, but also, I believe, the stability of the world. I am opposed to this deal and believe Congress must reject it and allow U.S. negotiators to go back to the table.

Permanently lifting economic sanctions on Iran, as this deal does, would allow global financial resources to flow into a country still included on our list of state sponsors of terrorism. Not only does this deal end long-held sanctions, it also lifts arms embargoes, as we have heard.

The conventional weapons embargo ends in 5 years under this agreement, and the ballistic missile ban is lifted in 8 years. We should be mindful of our closest ally in the region, Israel, whose leaders continue to gravely warn us of the dangers of trusting the Iranian regime.

The President has said our options are either accepting this deal or going to war. I think that rhetoric is irresponsible. Economic sanctions have served as one of the most effective peaceful methods of suppressing the Iranian regime. When our national security is on the line, reaching no deal is certainly better than advancing a bad deal.

Congress must stop this bad deal and pursue a stronger agreement which enforces greater accountability measures on Iran and prioritizes the safety of our country and our allies.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains for both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 6¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, first, I rise with so many of my colleagues today in remembrance of one of the worst days in our Nation's history. It is a solemn day of remembrance and prayer for those who lost their lives on that fateful day.

As Americans, we must be united as a nation in fighting terrorism, which we know remains a threat every single day in this country. September 11 is a day burned in the hearts and souls of all Americans, and we must work hard together—together—to ensure that we never witness such a horrific tragedy in our homeland ever again.

We all agree, never again. I say that, like my colleague from New York, Mr. CROWLEY, as a woman who lost a cousin in a terrorist act and watched a woman I love never recover from her son's death. We all care.

Congress and this country, as a whole, have a responsibility to work with nations across the world in pursuit of peace. My district is home to one of the largest populations of Arab Americans in the country who, like so many of us, came to the United States as immigrants. They are among the most patriotic Americans I know. They are proud to be Americans and have made numerous contributions to this great Nation. Today, I ask you to also remember this.

I rise in support of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. Like so many, it was not an easy decision, and it was made with the utmost respect for my colleagues and friends on both sides of the aisle. This process has shown me that, no matter what decision one reaches on this issue, almost everyone shares the same concerns, and they have been named and reviewed many times, so I am not going to go over them.

What I do want to say is—and we have said many times—it is not based on trust. It is based on verification. That is the last point I want to address today.

Congressional oversight of the Iran deal will not end with this vote. In fact, it will just be the beginning. This effort must be bipartisan, and I hope it will be divorced from the acrimonious politics that have dominated too much of this discussion.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: let's work together for peace in the Middle East and across the globe.

Senseless politics and inflammatory rhetoric only complicate an already difficult decision. September 11 should be a day that we use to remind us of what binds us together, the values we share, the love of America that every one of us in this institution has, and let's work together to protect this Nation we so dearly love.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), another distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker and Members, military leaders, national security experts, diplomats, administra-

tion officials, Democratic and Republican Members of Congress all agree that sanctions against Iran have worked.

Several years ago, 400 Members of Congress in this body—a huge bipartisan majority—voted to increase sanctions on Iran because they recognized that smart, targeted sanctions would curtail the Iranian economy and help unite the world against the Iranian nuclear weapons program.

Desperate for sanctions relief, Iran came to the negotiation table. I support diplomatic efforts and was hopeful that the President would be able to bring back a good deal. In fact, 365 Representatives—84 percent of the House—sent a letter to the President, saying we could accept a deal that accomplished four things: had a long-lasting deal that ensured that Iran had no pathway to a bomb; that it fully disclosed the military aspects of its program; that we had anytime, anywhere inspections; and that we would address Iran's ballistic missile capabilities and its destabilizing role in the region.

Sadly, none of these principles were met under this deal.

The President has claimed that this deal is the strongest nonproliferation agreement ever negotiated, but that just isn't true. In our nonproliferation agreement with Libya, we demanded that they completely eliminate centrifuges, halt all advanced centrifuge research and development, that they completely eliminate their enriched uranium stockpile, that they give unfettered access to the IAEA, and that they completely eliminate their long-range missile program, and that we also would ratify the strictest safeguards regime, known as the additional protocol.

Under this agreement, Iran doesn't have to do any of this. Will a nuclear Iran make the world a safer place? Instead of giving the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism hundreds of billions of dollars and more intercontinental ballistic missile technology and conventional weapons, we should demand a better deal.

The President should be working with Congress in a bipartisan way because the world deserves a verifiable, enforceable, and accountable agreement that enhances safety, stability, and security.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of those who do not have a voice today in this debate, and that is the over 500 servicemen and -women who died in Iraq because of the export of vehicle-borne IED technology by Iran, by the brutal terrorist leader Qasem Soleimani who used money from Iran—and he will be getting more money in order to export with the sole purpose to kill American troops—and the thousands who were wounded.

I deployed to this region six times in my military career, and our military is concerned about this administration turning their back on the men and women who died and the strength that they need in order to keep that region safe and secure. This is a slap in the face to those who paid that sacrifice.

Qasem Soleimani is a brutal man. We have studied him throughout my entire military career. He is exporting terror all over the region and not just in the region. He is responsible for deaths in places like India and Latin America. He is funding money to the Assad regime—over 250,000 dead—Hezbollah and Hamas.

I sat a few weeks ago on the edge of the Gaza Strip, where thousands of rockets were launched last summer, killing innocent civilians in Israel. Israelis have 7 to 30 seconds to run to shelter when these rockets are coming. They are funded and exported by Qasem Soleimani and Iran. We stood up on the northern border near where Hezbollah, funded by Iran, is stockpiling over 100,000 rockets, ready to launch at the Israeli people.

This is a dangerous deal. This is not about a choice between this deal or war. Those of us who served in the military, we want war less than anybody else. We know the price. We want diplomacy. Those sanctions were working. We just cranked them up in the last 18 months.

They are cash-strapped in Iran. They are fighting in between the desires in their different factions of how they are going to use that money to continue to move their nuclear program forward or export terror. We had them exactly where we wanted, and then we gave up.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, if we give them these funds, with the arms embargo and the ICBM embargo, it is going to be a more dangerous military action, and more American lives will be lost. It is not this deal in war. This will deal in, potentially, war.

On behalf of our American troops, I would ask you to please vote against this deal. It is dangerous for the many reasons my colleagues have mentioned, but do it on behalf of those who gave the ultimate sacrifice.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have had a vigorous debate. This agreement is going into effect. As we have debated here this morning, that is a fact. This is the challenge before this body, and that is whether we will try to recapture some real bipartisanship or we essentially will forfeit it.

There is work to be done implementing this agreement. That is acknowledged by all. The question is whether we will join together to try to

make it work, an agreement that I support, but I think the same responsibility is incumbent upon those who oppose it; or, as the Speaker says, they have just begun to fight.

□ 1200

That, I think, is the wrong approach, in a very important way—both as to this agreement but also beyond—because there is work to be done in terms of efforts to reinforce security in the Middle East, especially for Israel. There is work to be done in the Middle East and beyond in terms of fighting terrorism. There is work to be done outside of the Middle East—everywhere—in terms of terrorism.

And so I think it is a deep mistake to leave this moment here, with this agreement going into effect, saying the fight will continue. No. The fight should be with all of us together to make this work and to address the continuing challenges that face this country in the Middle East and beyond.

So I close with everybody else who has worked so hard on this and who has come to a conclusion on our own. But I think the tenor here sometimes is deeply troubling, and I think the Speaker's statement that the fight has just begun—over what? I hope not over the effort to continue the flames of partisanship that sometimes have captured this debate and before.

We all took the pledge. We have a solemn obligation, I think, to work together. And I think it would be a deep mistake to have it forfeited for reasons of political advantage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that we believe that the President has exceeded his authority in so many ways, that he has stretched the separation of powers on lots of issues; and on most of those issues, I believe we can fix those problems. On most of those issues, whether it is regulations or domestic laws, I believe we in this body, with the next administration, will have with the power and the ability to fix this. This is one where I don't think we can.

I think he has stretched the Constitution, because this should be a treaty. This is an executive agreement. When asked why, they said: Well, we couldn't pass a treaty.

So much for the Constitution that we all swore to uphold.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think the President is going to get the legacy that he thinks he is going to get or that he is hoping he is going to get.

I will insert in the RECORD a letter from 190 former military officers. It says:

This agreement is unverifiable. As military officers, we find it unconscionable that such a windfall could be given to a regime that even the Obama administration has acknowledged will use a portion of such funds to continue to support terrorism.

AUGUST 25, 2015.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House.

HON. NANCY PELOSI,

Minority Leader.

HON. MITCH MCCONNELL,

Majority Leader.

HON. HARRY REID,

Minority Leader.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES BOEHNER AND PELOSI AND SENATORS MCCONNELL AND REID: As you know, on July 14, 2015, the United States and five other nations announced that a Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) has been reached with Iran to prevent it from developing nuclear weapons. In our judgment as former senior military officers, the agreement will not have that effect. Removing sanctions on Iran and releasing billions of dollars to its regime over the next ten years is inimical to the security of Israel and the Middle East. There is no credibility within JCPOA's inspection process or the ability to snap back sanctions once lifted, should Iran violate the agreement. In this and other respects, the JCPOA would threaten the national security and vital interests of the United States and, therefore, should be disapproved by the Congress.

The agreement as constructed does not "cut off every pathway" for Iran to acquire nuclear weapons. To the contrary, it actually provides Iran with a legitimate path to doing that simply by abiding by the deal. JCPOA allows all the infrastructure the Iranians need for a nuclear bomb to be preserved and enhanced. Notably, Iran is allowed to: continue to enrich uranium; develop and test advanced centrifuges; and continue work on its Arak heavy-water plutonium reactor. Collectively, these concessions afford the Iranians, at worst, a ready breakout option and, at best, an incipient nuclear weapons capability a decade from now.

The agreement is unverifiable. Under the terms of the JCPOA and a secret side deal (to which the United States is not privy), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) will be responsible for inspections under such severe limitations as to prevent them from reliably detecting Iranian cheating. For example, if Iran and the inspectors are unable to reach an accommodation with respect to a given site, the result could be at least a 24-day delay in IAEA access. The agreement also requires inspectors to inform Iran in writing as to the basis for its concerns about an undeclared site, thus further delaying access. Most importantly, these inspections do not allow access to Iranian military facilities, the most likely location of their nuclear weapons development efforts. In the JCPOA process, there is substantial risk of U.S. intelligence being compromised, since the IAEA often relies on our sensitive data with respect to suspicious and/or prohibited activity.

While failing to assure prevention of Iran's nuclear weapons development capabilities, the agreement provides by some estimates \$150 billion dollars or more to Iran in the form of sanctions relief. As military officers, we find it unconscionable that such a windfall could be given to a regime that even the Obama administration has acknowledged will use a portion of such funds to continue to support terrorism in Israel, throughout the Middle East and globally, whether directly or through proxies. These actions will be made all the more deadly since the JCPOA will lift international embargoes on Iran's access to advanced conventional weapons and ballistic missile technology.

In summary, this agreement will enable Iran to become far more dangerous, render the Mideast still more unstable and introduce new threats to American interests as well as our allies. In our professional opin-

ion, far from being an alternative to war, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action makes it likely that the war the Iranian regime has waged against us since 1979 will continue, with far higher risks to our national security interests. Accordingly, we urge the Congress to reject this defective accord.

Sincerely,

Admiral David Architzel, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Stanley R. Arthur, US Navy, Retired; General William Begert, US Air Force, Retired; General J.B. Davis, US Air Force, Retired; Admiral William A. Dougherty, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Leon A. "Bud" Edney, US Navy, Retired; General Alfred G. Hansen US Air Force, Retired; Admiral Thomas Hayward, US Navy, Retired; Admiral James Hogg, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Jerome Johnson, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Timothy J. Keating, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Robert J. Kelly, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Thomas Joseph Lopez, US Navy, Retired; Admiral James A. "Ace" Lyons, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Richard Macke, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Henry Mauz, US Navy, Retired; General Lance Smith, US Air Force, Retired; Admiral Leighton Smith, US Navy, Retired; Admiral William D. Smith, US Navy, Retired; General Louis C. Wagner, Jr., US Army, Retired; Admiral Steve White, US Navy, Retired; General Ronald W. Yates, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Teddy G. Allen, US Army, Retired; Lieutenant General Edward G. Anderson, III, US Army, Retired; Lieutenant General Marcus A. Anderson, US Air Force, Retired.

Lieutenant General Spence M. Armstrong, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Harold W. Blot, US Marine Corps, Retired; Vice Admiral Michael Bowman, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General William G. "Jerry" Boykin, US Army, Retired; Vice Admiral Edward S. Briggs, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Richard E. "Tex" Brown III, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General William J. Campbell, US Air Force, Retired; Vice Admiral Edward Clepton, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Daniel L. Cooper, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral William A. Dougherty, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Brett Dula, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Gordon E. Fornell, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Thomas B. Goslin, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Earl Hailston, US Marine Corps, Retired; Vice Admiral Bernard M. Kauderer, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Timothy A. Kinnan, US Air Force, Retired; Vice Admiral J. B. LaPlante, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Tony Less, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Bennett L. Lewis, US Army, Retired; Vice Admiral Michael Malone, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral John Mazach, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Thomas McInerney, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Fred McCorkle, US Marine Corps, Retired; Vice Admiral Robert Monroe, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Jimmy Pappas, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral J. Theodore Parker, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Garry L. Parks, US Marine Corps, Retired; Lieutenant General Everett Pratt, US Air Force, Retired; Vice Admiral John Poindexter, US Navy, Retired.

Lieutenant General Clifford "Ted" Rees, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Vice Admiral William Rowden, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Robert F. Schultz, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General E.G. "Buck" Shuler, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Hubert "Hugh" G. Smith, US Army, Retired; Vice Admiral Edward M. Straw, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General David J. Teal, US Air Force, Retired; Vice Admiral D.C.

“Deese” Thompson, US Coast Guard, Retired; Lieutenant General William E. Thurman, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Billy Tomas, US Army, Retired; Vice Admiral John Totushek, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Jerry Tuttle, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Jerry Unruh, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Timothy W. Wright, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral William V. Alford, Jr., US Navy, Retired; Major General Thurman E. Anderson, US Army, Retired; Major General Joseph T. Anderson, US Marine Corps, Retired; Rear Admiral Philip Anselmo, US Navy, Retired; Major General Joe Arbuckle, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral James W. Austin, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral John R. Batzler, US Navy, Retired.

Rear Admiral John Bayless, US Navy, Retired; Major General John Bianchi, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Donald Vaux Boecker, US Navy, Retired. Rear Admiral Jerry C. Breast, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Bruce B. Bremner, US Navy, Retired; Major General Edward M. Browne, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Thomas F. Brown III, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Lyle Bull, US Navy, Retired; Major General Bobby G. Butcher, US Marine Corps, Retired; Rear Admiral Jay A. Campbell, US Navy, Retired; Major General Henry D. Canterbury, US Air Force, Retired; Major General Carroll D. Childers, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Ronald L. Christenson, US Navy, Retired; Major General John R.D. Cleland, US Army, Retired; Major General Richard L. Comer, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Jack Dantone, US Navy, Retired; Major General William B. Davitte, US Air Force, Retired; Major General James D. Delk, US Army, Retired.

Major General Felix Dupre, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Philip A. Dur, US Navy, Retired; Major General Neil L. Eddins, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Paul Engel, US Navy, Retired; Major General Vince Falter, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral James H. Flatley, US Navy, Retired; Major General Bobby O. Floyd, US Air Force, Retired; Major General Paul Fratarangelo, US Marine Corps, Retired; Rear Admiral Veronica “Ronne” Froman, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral R. Byron Fuller, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Frank Gallo, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Albert A. Gallotta, Jr., US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral James Mac Gleim, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert H. Gormley, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral William Gureck, US Navy, Retired; Major General Gary L. Harrell, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Donald Hickman, US Navy, Retired; Major General Geoffrey Higginbotham, US Marine Corps, Retired; Major General Kent H. Hillhouse, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Tim Hinkle, US Navy, Retired; Major General Victor Joseph Hugo, US Army, Retired; Major General James P. Hunt, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Grady L. Jackson, US Navy, Retired.

Major General William K. James, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral John M. “Carlos” Johnson, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Pierce J. Johnson, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Steven B. Kantrowitz, US Navy, Retired; Major General Maurice W. Kendall, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Charles R. Kubie, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Frederick L. Lewis, US Navy, Retired; Major General John D. Logeman, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Major General Homer S. Long, Jr., US Army, Retired; Major General Robert M. Marquette, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert B. McClinton, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral W. J. McDaniel, MD, US Navy, Retired; Major General Keith W. Meurlin, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Terrence McKnight, US Navy, Retired; Major General John F. Miller, Jr., US Air

Force, Retired; Major General Burton R. Moore, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral David R. Morris, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Ed Nelson, Jr., US Coast Guard, Retired; Major General George W. “Nordie” Norwood, US Air Force, Retired; Major General Everett G. Odgers, US Air Force, Retired.

Rear Admiral Phillip R. Olson, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert S. Owens, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert O. Passmore, US Navy, Retired; Major General Richard E. Perraut, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral W.W. Pickavance, Jr., US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral L.F. Picotte, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Thomas J. Porter, US Navy, Retired; Major General H. Douglas Robertson, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral W.J. Ryan, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Norman Saunders, US Coast Guard, Retired; Major General John P. Schoepfner, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Major General Edison E. Scholes, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Hugh P. Scott, US Navy, Retired; Major General Richard Secord, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral James M. Seely, US Navy, Retired; Major General Sidney Shachnow, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral William H. Shawcross, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Bob Shumaker, US Navy, Retired; Major General Willie Studer, US Air Force, Retired; Major General Larry Taylor, US Marine Corps, Retired; Rear Admiral Jeremy Taylor, US Navy, Retired; Major General Richard L. Testa, US Air Force, Retired.

Rear Admiral Robert P. Tiernan, US Navy, Retired; Major General Paul E. Vallely, US Army, Retired; Major General Kenneth W. Weir, US Marine Corps, Retired; Major General John Weide, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral James B. Whittaker, US Navy, Retired; Major General Geoffrey P. Wiedeman, Jr., MD, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral H. Denny Wisely, US Navy, Retired; Brigadier General John R. Allen, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General John C. Arick, US Marine Corps, Retired; Brigadier General Loring R. Astorino, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert E. Besal, US Navy, Retired; Brigadier General William Bloomer, US Marine Corps, Retired; Brigadier General George P. Cole, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Richard A. Coleman, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General James L. Crouch, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Marianne B. Drew, US Navy, Retired; Brigadier General Philip M. Drew, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Larry K. Grundhauser, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Thomas W. Honeywill, US Air Force, Retired.

Brigadier General Gary M. Jones, US Army, Retired; Brigadier General Stephen Lanning, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Thomas J. Lennon, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Bobby C. Lee, US Navy, Retired; Brigadier General Robert F. Peksens, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Joe Shaefer, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Graham E. Shirley, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Stanley O. Smith, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Hugh B. Tant III, US Army, Retired; Brigadier General Michael Joseph Tashjian, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General William Tiernan, US Marine Corps, Retired; Brigadier General Roger W. Searce, US Army, Retired; Brigadier General Robert V. Woods, US Air Force, Retired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. This is an agreement that waives the sanctions against terrorism. This is a regime that funds terrorism. It said nothing about stopping further terrorism. It lifts the bans on conventional weapons so they can arm back up. It lifts the

bans on intercontinental ballistic missiles. The only reason you have an ICBM is to put a nuclear weapon on it. It guarantees that Iran becomes a nuclear power, and it gives them \$150 billion upfront to finance it.

About a decade ago, I was in Kuwait in a tank graveyard. I spent the morning walking through acres of destroyed M1 Abrams tanks, Humvees, MRAPs, and they had the same kind of signature blast—a hole ripping right through it, killing whoever was inside, our soldiers.

Then, we went up to Baghdad and met with one of our senior commanders, a great general named Ray Odierno, and we asked: What is killing all of our servicemembers? What is doing this?

EFPPs, explosively formed penetrators.

He got one of them that they had confiscated and showed us what it was, a highly sophisticated machine explosive device with wiring on it that said “Made in Iran,” brought by a gentleman named Soleimani. And we are lifting the sanctions on them.

This is not a vote for some person’s legacy. This is a vote to put yourself on the right side of history. Vote to kill this agreement.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 3461; and

Passage of H.R. 3460.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage