

United States and the world today. The implications of this deal will have serious consequences for the Middle East and especially our allies in the Middle East.

Russia and China are especially interested in this deal because of how it changes the international playing field. The President was so pleased that Russia signed on. Well, of course they did. They get to sell unlimited arms and technology. They gave up nothing.

Ultimately, this deal will have serious consequences for the national security of the United States. I ask you, Do you trust Iran?

Several of my colleagues said there is no other alternative. That is how it always is with a contract or a treaty or an agreement. You have to vote for or against it. I am very disappointed in our negotiators. I don't think they were negotiators.

I remember the President saying we would be able to have inspections anytime. That is just as believable as when we were going through ObamaCare and he said: If you like your insurance policy, you can keep it. Nobody got to. This is in that same category, except this is more serious. We are talking about world peace. We are talking about security.

Sanctions brought them to the table. It was leverage. It worked. Then we gave that up so we could sit down and talk to them, and then we didn't leave the table when they wouldn't agree to things that were absolutely needed. What kind of negotiation is that? That is where you trust the Iranians?

Iran's goal is to use its nuclear program to extort its neighbors and threaten its enemies, and it has made it very clear that it considers the United States their No. 1 enemy. We cannot afford to make the kind of strategic blunder that would give Iran a nuclear weapon. We should not give up the advantages we have that were working to prevent Iran's nuclear ambitions. That is why we should oppose this deal. Again I ask: Do you trust Iran?

President Obama has said that if we don't accept this deal, then the only other option is war with Iran, but this isn't true. I don't think anybody believes that. It is the President's way of trying to convince the American people that his way is the only way—just like ObamaCare—and that is not true.

One of the advantages of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act that was passed out of the Senate committee unanimously is that by requiring the President to submit the deal to Congress for review, both the House and the Senate as well as the public can see what is in the deal—kind of see what is in the deal.

I really object to the other side saying we didn't read that. We read what was available. I reviewed the deal. I have heard the administration's arguments in favor of it, and I don't believe this deal is the best way to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. I

don't think it prevents them from getting a nuclear weapon.

I have heard from experts in diplomacy, from experts in arms control and proliferation, from experts in the military, from national security and intelligence experts who say that this deal is not the only way to prevent Iran's nuclear ambitions. Do you trust Iran?

I mentioned that the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act is important because it requires the deal and all its documents to be sent to Congress for review, but I do understand there are separate side agreements between Iran and the International Atomic Energy Agency—and so far as I can tell nobody from the United States has looked at those. Those have not been reviewed by Congress because they haven't been submitted for our review. I am told these side agreements deal with the military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program—the parts of Iran's program that will allow them to launch a nuclear weapon against Israel or American forces in the Middle East or eventually, with enough work, anywhere in the world, including America. You don't sell someone a weapon whose intent is to kill you. Do you trust Iran?

I am deeply concerned that we don't have all the facts about this deal. We need the facts about Iran's military program—facts about how confident the administration can be that Iran is complying with the rules. We should not move forward with any agreement until we have a full understanding of all of the components that are part of it and are convinced it is a good deal. Do you trust Iran?

Understanding all of the components of this deal isn't just about the documents that were submitted to Congress; it is also about understanding what happens when Iran has the freedom and resources to grab for power and position in the region. Do you trust Iran?

The administration has said this deal is a pathway to security and stability. Unfortunately, this administration has consistently misjudged critical moments in the region—most recently, for not taking the Islamic State seriously and developing a real strategy to defeat it. Agreeing to this deal is yet another example of the administration misjudging the difficult and dangerous situation in the Middle East by believing Iran will not take advantage of the situation to attack our allies and undermine American interests.

There are numerous ways Iran can take advantage of this deal, such as—mentioned frequently—using the huge cash infusion that comes with this deal to support Hezbollah or buying arms from Russia. This agreement is not a pathway to peace or stability. It is Iran's springboard to grow into the Middle East's most dangerous bully.

There is even a little provision in here that any contracts entered into before snapback can't be broken. How many contracts do we think they will hurry up and do if they get the right to

do them? They will do every one they need to do—exactly what they want to do. Do you trust Iran?

For more than a decade, the United States and our allies have used sanctions effectively to prevent Iran from achieving its nuclear ambitions. Those sanctions took years to implement and demonstrated the commitment of our international partners to prevent an outcome that would be a disaster. Under this agreement, we would be giving up those sanctions in exchange for the hope that we can trust Iran. It sounds to me like we are giving up the most important tool we have to prevent a nuclear-capable Iran in exchange for nothing. Do you trust Iran?

I urge my colleagues to oppose this deal. It is not the best we can get. We will have another opportunity to vote. It ignores the reality of the complex and dangerous political situation in the Middle East, and it relies on nothing more than hope that Iran will keep its promise, despite all the times Iran has failed to do so in the past. It trades an effective system of sanctions that has worked to prevent Iran's nuclear ambition for nothing. It gives Iran everything it needs to pour money and resources into attacking our allies and making the region more dangerous. I don't trust Iran, and I didn't find anybody in Wyoming who does.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IN ECUADOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to call the Senate's attention to a situation I have spoken about previously, which is the ongoing crackdown by the Correa Government on what little remains of the independent media in Ecuador.

One of the things we have come to expect is that the press—and civil society organizations that expose corruption and challenge the officially sanctioned version of reality—are the first casualties in countries whose leaders are determined to remain in power at any cost.

Ecuador is a prime example. In 2013, President Rafael Correa issued a decree granting the government broad powers to intervene in the operations of non-governmental organizations, NGOs, including dissolving groups on the vague grounds that they have "compromise[d] public peace" or have engaged in activities that were not listed when they registered with the government. A modified version of the