

is the principle that not one lawyer—that any one lawyer in the Department of Justice or any agency of government doesn't have a right to override the opinion of the Congress expressed in a statute so clearly as this is expressed.

Madam President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 68, S. 579, the Inspector General Empowerment Act of 2015; I further ask consent that the Johnson substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Yes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. May I ask on whose behalf the minority leader is objecting? Is it on his own behalf or on behalf of another Senator?

Mr. REID. Other Senators are concerned about it, and I made the objection on my behalf.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will not question what the minority leader just said, but it seems to me we ought to know who that Senator is besides the minority leader because Senator WYDEN and I have worked very hard over the last 10 years, and we finally got done what we thought was a very good measure for this body; that the people who put holds on legislation ought to be made public, and there has been nothing in the RECORD. So why don't these people have guts enough to put in the RECORD their reasons and who they are? The public has a right to know that.

Mr. REID. I am it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. No.

Mr. JOHNSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, I want to rise and voice my disappointment. This is a very commonsense piece of legislation that has strong bipartisan support. Senator GRASSLEY has worked tirelessly on this and certainly our committee has as well. We cannot get a simple, commonsense bipartisan piece of legislation passed by the Senate—and then the insult of not even hearing what the objection is.

What is the objection to giving the inspectors general the tools they need to provide the accountability and the transparency to safeguard American taxpayer money?

I cited my example of the Potomac Healthcare system, the Potomac VA health care system, where because an inspector general was not transparent

because the VA inspector general held 140 reports on inspections and investigations, the family of Thomas Baer did not realize there were problems. They took their father to that health care facility and their father died of a stroke because of neglect. That is how important this is. Yet we cannot even hear the reason behind the objection as to why they would not allow this very commonsense piece of legislation to pass.

This is very disappointing.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 6 p.m. today.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise today to revisit an issue that some in this body I am sure, no doubt, would probably not want to revisit. My intention is not to cause any of my colleagues discomfort, but this is an issue—and the Presiding Officer knows more than most—that needs to be discussed, and the Presiding Officer has done a great job of discussing it. I think it has become pretty clear to most Americans and many Members of this body that this body made a mistake a few months back, a mistake with significant consequences for our security, for the security of the Middle East, and certainly a mistake as it relates to some of our own American citizens. For the first time in U.S. history on a national security agreement of major importance, the mistake that was made was the Congress of the United States moved forward to approve an agreement not on the basis of a bipartisan majority, which is the history of this country, but on the basis of a partisan minority in both Houses. Of course, I am talking about President

Obama's Iranian nuclear deal that will very soon—as early as next month, according to the terms of the agreement—be sending tens of billions of dollars to the biggest sponsor of terrorism in the world.

There are many things that are going on in this body right now. We are looking at the spending bills, and there is a lot of concern about terrorism. As a matter of fact, polling is showing that right now terrorism is ranking as the highest concern for Americans—higher even than the economy—given the attacks in California and what is happening with ISIS.

Amidst all of these challenges, however, the implementation of the Obama administration's nuclear deal with Iran is looming on the horizon and is not being talked about enough in this body. It is critical that we keep our eye on Iran—still the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism—particularly now. Why is it so critical now? Because, as I noted, as early as next month, in January, tens of billions of dollars of sanctions relief will be pouring into the country of Iran according to the terms of the agreement.

I commend my colleague from New Jersey, Senator MENENDEZ. I was presiding last week in the Senate, and once again he gave another outstanding speech on American foreign policy, on American national security, on what is going on with Iran, what is going on with their activities destabilizing the Middle East, what is going on with their activities which are as we speak violating the Iran U.N. Security Council resolutions.

Yes, I know we debated this issue for a long time on the Senate floor, and I am sure some of my colleagues who voted on this deal are done and they don't want to talk about it anymore.

Mr. President, if you recall, one of the arguments to support this deal, one of the arguments the President was making was that—we were told this deal would change Iran's behavior. President Obama stated that the deal “demonstrates that if Iran complies with its international obligations, then it can fully rejoin the community of nations.” The words of the text of the agreement even state that the United States is “expressing its desire to build a new relationship with Iran.” And, of course, Secretary Kerry, in hearings and in private briefings with the Senate, noted that he thought—and you saw his actions—that the agreement would establish a much more positive and constructive relationship between Iran and the United States. So that was one of the arguments for the deal we voted on. How is that working out? Well, I think we have gotten a new relationship with Iran, all right, but it is worse than the old one.

Since the signing of the Iranian deal, Iran has taken deliberative steps, definitive steps that continue to undermine the security interests of the United States and our allies and those of our citizens in almost every region,