

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1100

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

suing falls far short of this moral imperative.

#### IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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