United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2015 No. 131

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

On this anniversary of the 9/11 tragedy, we ask Your blessing of peace upon our Nation and the world. May Your healing presence continue to imbue the lives of those who were personally assaulted on that momentous day, and ease the mourning of those who lost their loved ones.

This is a month laden with important matters of policy both at home and abroad for our Nation. Help the Members of this House to recognize that You are with them in their deliberations. You are the God of us all. Help all to trust that Your will for peace and prosperity among Your children can move the human heart.

And through it all, may all maintain a common respect for the goodwill of those with whom they might disagree.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. BUSTOS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RESTORING CONSTITUTIONAL BALANCE ON THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, this week, as we somberly memorialize the tragic attacks of 14 years ago, we can also rejoice in our constitutional values being upheld by a Federal court this week, in that the President's overreach on the Affordable Care Act will be heard under our separation of powers.

The court has confirmed the U.S. House has standing to preserve legal claims on the President's overreach once again, this time, illegally overstepping his bounds on the Affordable Care Act and handing out $175 billion to insurance companies.

It is very important for the people's voice to be heard on an action that was never voted upon or even seen in the public light of day on the Affordable Care Act and its inability to meet its goals of being affordable. Instead, the price is going up. Rates are going up.

So this action is, indeed, a strike for our constitutional values, the ones we fought for, the ones we memorialized, the ones that are dear to our country.

14TH ANNIVERSARY OF SEPTEMBER 11

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the anniversary of the September 11 attacks. Fourteen years ago, our Nation faced an unparalleled tragedy that forever changed us.

Today our thoughts and prayers remain with the victims that perished in these attacks in New York City, Washington, D.C., and Pennsylvania on September 11. We mourn with the families of the victims and continue to thank the selfless first responders who rushed to aid those in danger, even if it meant risking their own lives.

As we remember the lives that were lost that day, we must also commemorate the brave men and women of our armed services who have lost their lives trying to protect us from the dangers we still face today.

Today we must stand as more than just Democrats and Republicans but, rather, together, as Americans, who will work to ensure that our Nation never faces an attack like that ever again.

SEPTEMBER 11 AND A NUCLEAR IRAN

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, today marks 14 years since September 11, 2001, a day when thousands of Americans lost their lives in a terrorist attack carried out by al Qaeda. On that day, we united as a Nation in response to a tragedy too terrible to fathom.

Today I remain thankful for our first responders, our firefighters, police, and many others who displayed courage and strength in helping out all impacted by the attacks.

This day also reminds us to reflect on the dedication of the men and women in our Armed Forces. Thousands have served honorably in Iraq, Afghanistan, and in the war on terror since September 11. We are thankful for their

sacrifice and willingness to stand for American interests across the globe.

We all remember where we were on that fateful day 14 years ago, and we all recognize where we stand today. Our Nation faces greater dangers and higher stakes than ever before.

The threat of a nuclear Iran remains all too real. That is why any deal with Iran or any other country must be verifiable, enforceable, and accountable. Iran has been a chief sponsor of terrorism across the globe. A nuclear Iran is a threat to everyone everywhere.

It is not just about us. It is about our worldwide stability. The safety of the American people is not a partisan priority. It is an American priority.

After closely reviewing the details of the unveiled agreement, it is clear this plan will not adequately deter the threat of a nuclear Iran nor safeguard the well-being of our citizens and national security interests.

I hope that we can all remember, today especially, how crucial it is to protect ourselves, our children, and future generations against this huge threat throughout the globe.

FIRST SERGEANT P. ANDREW McKENNA

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, last month Rhode Island and the United States lost a hero when First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna, an Army Green Beret serving in Kabul, Afghanistan, was killed during an attack on a NATO facility. He ran into danger so that the lives of hundreds of his fellow soldiers would be spared and, in doing so, lost his own life.

During his 17 years of service, Sergeant McKenna completed five tours of duty in Afghanistan and one in Iraq. His patriotism, loyalty, and sense of duty embodied all of the best values of Rhode Island and our entire Nation.

I was fortunate to meet Sergeant McKenna just 2 months ago at the Bristol Fourth of July parade, where he was presented with a flag flown over the United States Capitol. I am grateful that I had this opportunity to thank him for his service to our country.

As we mark the 14th anniversary of the September 11 attacks today, it is important to remember there are still nearly 10,000 American troops serving in Afghanistan. We owe them and all of our men and women in uniform our gratitude for the sacrifices they have made so that we can all enjoy freedom and live safely.

My thoughts continue to be with Sergeant McKenna's parents, Carol and Peter, and his entire family during this incredibly difficult time. It is my hope that the heartfelt gratitude of our entire Nation will be a source of comfort to his family.

14TH ANNIVERSARY OF SEPTEMBER 11

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mark the 14th anniversary of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, a horrific day that changed our Nation forever, as terrorists killed thousands of innocent people in lower Manhattan, the fields of Pennsylvania, and at the Pentagon. We must never forget that day.

We saw good rise in the face of evil and heroes rise in the face of danger. When the day was over, we learned that thousands of Americans had lost their lives, 700 from my own State. We witnessed neighbors and friends consoling one another and watched as Americans from all walks of life stood united together, side by side.

As America rebounded, we responded to these acts of terrorism with the skill of our military and our first responders. This is a war we continue to fight. It began without provocation, without warning. It was not a war of our own choosing, but it became a war of our priority. It continues today.

It is the solemn duty of every Member of the House to protect the security of our Nation and our citizens. In today's dangerous and chaotic world, we begin to honor that responsibility by pledging never to forget that day 14 years ago.

May God bless those who defend America, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

14TH ANNIVERSARY OF SEPTEMBER 11

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, this morning, at 8:46, across America there was a moment of silence and remembrance that, on the morning of September 11, 2001, the world witnessed a horrific attack against our Nation.

The profound, unfathomable casualties shattered our sense of safety. Yet, out of the ashes of the fallen World Trade Center towers, the crushed concrete of the Pentagon, and the burning fields of Pennsylvania, Americans rose united. We comforted strangers. We strengthened community. Hope prevailed over hatred. Resilience defeated fear.

Americans will never forget where we were on that day. We must always remember what happened that day.

President Lincoln once cautioned of the silent artillery of time wearing away at our memories. He was referencing those who had lost their lives in the Civil War.

We pray that the years might ease the pain of the bereaved and that it would be a comfort to them that we will never forget.

Young people born after 9/11 are coming of age in a world that knows that no attack will ever destroy America's ideals of liberty, freedom, and equality of opportunity for all people. Terrorism will never triumph over justice. That is a goal of terrorists: to instill terror, instill fear. They have failed.

We have emerged even more committed to protecting the liberties that have long distinguished our Nation from regimes that rely on divisiveness and hatred.

We honor the thousands of people we lost that day and those we lost to 9/11-related illnesses in the years that followed. We must remember those heroes of 9/11. In remembering them, we must honor our commitments to them, whether it is access to health care for those who were affected by 9/11.

The selfless first responders—firefighters, police officers, and courageous citizens who helped save lives, searched for survivors, and jeopardized their own safety to rescue others—represent the very best of humanity.

May we forever remember the spirit of September 11, 2001, and strive to build a future based on the hope and unity that emerged from the ashes that day. And may we always remember that, on this day, as we discuss this issue, we are walking on sacred ground. May we treat it with dignity and respect.

IRAN DEAL

(Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on this historic day of 9/11, a day in 2001 when terrorists killed thousands of Americans on United States soil and a day in 2012 when terrorists killed four Americans in Benghazi, Libya, I stand today in strong opposition to the Iranian nuclear deal, a deal with Iran, a leading state sponsor of terror.

Every day that goes by another story comes out about why we shouldn't support the deal. The head of Iran's military has said they will never accept the deals restrictions on arms capabilities.

The AP recently uncovered that key verification provisions are buried in a pair of confidential side agreements that Congress doesn't even have that will allow Iran to inspect its own nuclear capabilities.

Just last week the Supreme Leader of Iran changed the rules of the game, saying that Iran will not comply with their side of the deal unless sanctions are lifted and not merely suspended.

This is a deeply flawed deal, and I know we can do better. America is still the most prosperous and powerful country on Earth and the protector of freedom and stability in the world. We must do better for the victims of 9/11 and the victims of Benghazi.

□ 0915

OCEANS AND CLIMATE CHANGE: SEA LEVEL RISE

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House

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 Alamitos 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, PROVIDE RELIEF FROM, OR OTHERWISE 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 RELATED 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 recommittal 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 gentlewoman 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 intenseness of their inspection process.

America will be on site when they come back with their inspection materials, 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 evaluating 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 nonpartisan 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 leadership, 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 Michiganian.

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 essentially 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 priorities. 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 nonviolence 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 we 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 comprehensive, 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 gentlewoman 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, administration 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 opinion, 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. Doughert, 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 Clexton, 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. Schoultz, 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. Kubic, 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. Schoeppner, 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. Scearce, 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?

EFPs, 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

of the bill (H.R. 3461) to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 162, nays 269, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 493]

YEAS—162

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—269

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—1

Johnson (GA)

□ 1231

Messrs. KELLY of Mississippi, AMODEI, ISSA, FLORES, REICHERT, CARTER of Georgia, BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BLACK of Tennessee, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE, SUSPEND, REDUCE, PROVIDE RELIEF FROM, OR OTHERWISE LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO AN AGREEMENT RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 186, as follows:

[Roll No. 494]

AYES—247

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce

Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—186

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1245

Mr. TAKAI changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 381

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 381.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 493, I was, unfortunately, detained and missed that rollcall vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday and Tuesday, no votes are expected in the House. On Wednesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Members are advised that, given the shortness of the week due to the Jewish holiday, Members should be prepared for a full legislative day on Friday.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 758, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015, sponsored by Representative LAMAR SMITH. This bill will ensure that innocent Americans are protected against frivolous lawsuits.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider two measures that respond to the horrific videos released throughout the summer on Planned Parenthood practices. The first is H.R. 3134, sponsored by Representative DIANE BLACK, which places a 1-year moratorium on funding to Planned Parenthood while Congress investigates these videos.

Three committees in the House are currently looking into Planned Parenthood activities, funding, and adherence to the law.

The second will be a bill sponsored by Representative TRENT FRANKS, which adds criminal penalties to people who violate the Born Alive Act, for medical providers who fail to provide medical care to a baby who survives the abortion procedure.

Americans are rightfully outraged by what was depicted in these videos, and Congress and the American people have a right to know exactly what is happening.

These two critical bills will ensure that we get all the facts and protect those who cannot protect themselves.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the information.

I would just observe that we share the view of the—you used the term ''horrific'' videos. As I understand it, these videos are heavily edited. I don't want to get into debate about them; we will have that debate next week, but we are certainly concerned about, as the gentleman knows, 97 percent of the health care delivered by Planned Parenthood has nothing to do with the issues raised in the video, edited or not.

We would hope that we could come to an agreement on making sure that those healthcare services that are provided to literally thousands and thousands of women are not interrupted, but I understand that we will have that debate next week.

Mr. Leader, you do not include in your schedule a continuing resolution for the funding of government. As the gentleman knows, we have essentially, as I count it, 5 full legislative days left. We have 8 or 9 days left, but there are many partial days.

We have 5 full legislative days left before the government runs out of authority and funds to continue. As the gentleman knows, I have been urging the majority leader and your side of the aisle to enter into discussions on levels of funding and funding itself.

We suspended the appropriations process approximately in the middle of July when the Interior bill was pulled from the floor. Presumably, it was pulled because there was a possibility of amendments being offered regarding the Confederate battle flag, but notwithstanding that, half the appropriation bills have not been brought to the floor. No appropriation bills have passed the Senate.

I have been urging, for at least 2 months now, that we have discussions. I discussed with Mr. VAN HOLLEN today there have been no discussions between Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. PRICE with reference to a resolution of the funding levels for a CR or the length of term of the CR.

I had an opportunity to talk to Ranking Member NITA LOWEY today of the Appropriations Committee. She informs me that there have been no substantive discussions between herself and Mr. ROGERS and that Mr. ROGERS, in fact, has no indication of what funding levels will be going forward or what a CR would look like or the length of period of time it would be for.

In addition to that, I have discussed with the leader's office, Leader PELOSI's office—and I know that neither my office nor Leader PELOSI's office have been in discussion either with

the Speaker's office or your office in a substantive way with how we might be moving forward on a CR.

I, frankly, thought that this coming week would be the week for us to consider a continuing resolution so that given the very, very short number of days available in September for us to meet, that there would be time for the Senate to receive a continuing resolution for us to consider that and pass it so that we would not, again, confront a crisis of confidence, a crisis in terms of ongoing government operations, but also a crisis of confidence not only in our country, but around the world that the United States of America could manage its finances in a responsible way.

With that said, Mr. Majority Leader, can you share with us some insight? Again, I know that it is not on the schedule, and this is about scheduling, but we have 5 full days and 3 partial days and a ninth day which the Pope is going to be here, and I know we will be having votes on that day, but we have such a minimal time before the government runs out of authority and funding for its operations that it seems to me that it is critical that today or tomorrow or Monday, we decide how we are going to proceed.

I will be pleased to yield to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, the fiscal year does end on September 30. As the gentleman knows, we have had this discussion often because our intention was always to solve this problem very early. As history shows, this is the earliest we have ever started the appropriation process for Congress.

I had grave concern during the summer, reading many of the headlines from some on your side of the aisle and over on your side of the aisle in the Senate, that it was a strategy to make sure the appropriation process would not work.

When votes came to the floor, very strongly, you were able to hold many of your Members. Counterpart with the number two on the Senate side, Senator SCHUMER, his whole strategy for the summer, he was much more effective where none of them came up.

We know the number of days we have left. We are continuing conversations on government funding, and we will inform Members when action is scheduled in the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, there are 5 days—full days—left to go. You are right; we have been discussing this for some period of time, but with all due respect to any strategy that we have, you only brought six bills to the floor and passed six bills through this House, and that is only half of the appropriation bills.

The MilCon bill got 255 votes; the Energy and Water, 240; the Legislative Branch, 357; the Commerce, Justice, Science, 242; T-HUD, which we didn't like and, apparently, a lot of your Members didn't like either, 216 votes; and the Defense bill, 278 votes.

There was nothing on our side that stopped the appropriations process from going forward. You chose not to bring six of those bills to the floor. I don't take any blame on our side of the aisle, whatever our strategy might be.

Our strategy has been consistent with, very frankly, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee strategy, and that is to have funding levels on both the defense and nondefense side of the ledger which were rational and reasonable.

I repeat ad nauseam, as you know—and you are tired of hearing me repeat it, I am sure—Mr. ROGERS' comments that the sequester levels given to the Appropriations Committee to meet their responsibilities were ill-conceived and unrealistic. That is Mr. ROGERS' quote, not mine, not our strategy.

That was what the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on your side of the aisle characterizes the funding levels that you have provided the committee for—I don't mean you individually—the House has provided the chairman with to write his bills up.

As a result of being unable to do that, every time you brought a bill to the floor, it has gotten a majority of the votes. Forget about us. We can't control. We have 188 Members. You can pass anything you want.

The appropriations bill process came to a dead halt for two reasons. Number one, it is because there are no negotiations for a well-conceived and realistic alternative to sequester. That is what HAL ROGERS says—not me—your chairman.

I continue to be extraordinarily disappointed that we have not undertaken any discussions—I mentioned Mrs. LOWEY on the Appropriations Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN on the Budget Committee, Leader PELOSI's office, my office—any discussions which have allowed us to come to some agreement so that we might in a bipartisan way move forward.

Now, I understand there are a lot of members on your side of the aisle who won't vote for anything if it funds Planned Parenthood. I get that. They don't come close to making the majority of this House.

□ 1300

Until such time as we start acting with the majority's will prevailing as opposed to a faction's prevailing, I think we are going to be in this gridlock that is undermining the confidence of our country, of our government, and of our international partners.

I would hope that, in the next, perhaps, few days, Mr. Leader—and I am prepared to spend time today, this weekend, Monday, and Tuesday—I know we are not coming back until Wednesday—to try to work with you and with the relevant committees, with the Speaker, and with the leader of my party to try to get us to a point where we can do exactly what you want to do and what we want to do, and that is not have this government by crisis that we have now. This is the third time on an unrelated issue where there has been a problem with funding government as is our responsibility at whatever levels we agree upon. I would hope that we could pursue those discussions. I have been urging that for months now, and we haven't done that.

You also did not mention something that I have discussed with you and discussed with the Speaker that I bring up all the time. As a result of our failure to fund the Export-Import Bank and to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, we are losing jobs, and we have lost a substantial number of jobs already. Speaker BOEHNER indicated in a quote not too long ago that, in fact, there are thousands of jobs on the line that would disappear pretty quickly if the Ex-Im Bank were to disappear.

Essentially, in terms of new loans and new products that could be sold abroad, the Ex-Im Bank has disappeared as of July. I have had discussions with the Speaker, and I think he has been quoted publicly as saying he thought the Ex-Im Bank was, in fact, in some form, going to be considered on the floor this month.

I ask my friend, the majority leader, as it is not on the schedule, but, again, it is not as if we have months to go—we have 5 days to go—before the end of the fiscal year and that funding for the Ex-Im Bank expires. Can the gentleman tell me whether there is any possibility of that being considered within the next 5 or 8—if you want to count 8—legislative days we have left in this month?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would not feel these colloquies were complete if I did not get this question. I admire the gentleman's consistency in asking it, but my answer remains just as consistent. There is no action scheduled in the House on Ex-Im.

Mr. HOYER. With that answer, the gentleman can be assured that I will keep asking the question, and I keep asking the question not to vex the majority leader. I keep asking the question because the Speaker and I agree that we are losing jobs. We are putting ourselves in a noncompetitive position with the rest of the world.

By not bringing this up to the floor, Mr. Leader—I haven't counted specifically, but I will bet you, however, that there are over 275 votes on this floor to pass a reauthorization and extension of the Export-Import Bank. The failure to bring it to the floor is not because it doesn't enjoy a majority of support—it does. When it last came to the floor—when Mr. Cantor and I worked on the legislation and brought it to this floor—it got well over 300 votes. Now, I understand there are some in your party who don't like it; but, very frankly, we have got to get over, because some in your party don't like

things, that we gridlock the Congress of the United States and make America uncompetitive and undermine confidence in this country.

Yes, Mr. Leader, you are very tolerant, and I will keep asking the question because I think it is critical for our economy, and it is critical to get us off this gridlock where a small minority of the Congress of the United States is holding good policy hostage.

Now, let me also ask you: On October 29, the highway bill will lose its authorization, which we have been extending in very short periods of time. The gentleman knows no Governor, no mayor, no county commissioner, no contractor can possibly plan infrastructure improvements—highways, bridges, sewer systems, whatever—on the basis of 90-day or 60-day extensions of authority and funding.

The gentleman didn't mention it. It is not coming up next week. I understand that we have a longer time—but not a long time—between now and October 29 when the highway bill will expire. As the gentleman, I am sure, knows and agrees, the failure to do that will have a significant adverse effect on jobs for Americans and a significant adverse effect on the infrastructure of this country.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not he expects a highway bill to come to the floor anytime within the timeframe prior to October 29?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman did mention, the highway program is currently authorized through the end of October. The relevant committees are at work—I met with them today—developing the best path forward, and I will keep you apprised, as well as the Members, and I expect it to be done before the deadline.

Mr. HOYER. That is good news that the highway bill, at least, will be done before the deadline.

I will tell my friend, like the majority leader, I had a discussion today with Mr. DEFAZIO, who is the ranking Democrat on the relevant committee, Mr. SHUSTER being the chairman. I know they have had some discussions, but I also know that they are not very close to an agreement. I know that neither one of them likes the Senate bill that was sent to us. The majority leader and I had discussions on that. We didn't take that up. I thought that was probably the right thing for the majority leader to do, to not take it up.

Again, the majority leader says he is engaged. I would hope he uses his good office to get us to a place where we can pass a bill in a bipartisan fashion as, during my 34 years, has normally been the case. That extends for a significant period of time—no less than 5 years—at levels that are necessary to meet the infrastructure needs of this country, both from an economic standpoint and a national security standpoint.

I yield to my friend if he wants to say anything further. If not, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2015, TO TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2015; AND HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3 p.m. on Tuesday, September 15, 2015; and, further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, September 16, 2015, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

WORLD SUICIDE PREVENTION WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Suicide Prevention Week.

Unfortunately, in the past several years, we have witnessed an increase in suicides among our Active-Duty members of the Armed Forces and our veterans populations.

Prior to my tenure in Congress, I served nearly three decades addressing the mental health needs of individuals who have suffered life-changing disease and disability. This is an issue I remain passionate about, particularly when addressing the mental health of those who place their lives on the line in serving this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I remain confident this body can do right by our servicemembers and veterans. A part of that is advancing the Medical Evaluation Parity for Servicemembers Act, which is intended to improve suicide prevention by instituting a mental health assessment for all new military recruits, which will then be used as a baseline throughout their military careers. This was included in the 2016 National Defense Authorization.

Our dedication to this cause is the least we can do for those who have sacrificed so much for their Nation.

COMMEMORATING THE BRAVE MEN AND WOMEN LOST ON 9/11

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the brave men and women lost on September 11.

Last week, I visited a windswept meadow in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, just outside my district, which, until 14 years ago, had little meaning for this country.

At 10 a.m. that day, the quiet of that field was shattered as 40 Americans successfully thwarted an attack on the Nation's capital. They, like 2,700 other individuals that day, lost their lives as a result of acts of raw evil. Quiet has returned to that field, but, today, there exists at the site a memorial and a new visitor center that opened yesterday.

I visited the site last week, and it amazed me how fresh the memories of that horrible day remain. The remembrances are unforgettable, from the timeline embedded within the walk that follows Flight 93's path—8:46 a.m., 9:03 a.m., 9:37 a.m.—to the words of the passengers from phone calls that were made that day.

Let's draw inspiration from the brave sacrifices made by so many Americans that day; and let's, today, renew the commitment we all felt in the days after September 11 to reinvigorate, heal, and strengthen our Nation.

IRAN DEAL

(Mr. BABIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, on this day, the 14th anniversary of the terrible attack of 9/11/2001, I rise to strongly oppose the deeply flawed, dangerous, and unacceptable deal that President Obama has struck with the Islamic Republic of Iran and its leader, Ayatollah Khamenei. To even stand here in the people's House of the greatest nation on Earth and discuss this course of action taken by the President is both shameful and embarrassing for our country.

The Islamic Republic of Iran is the world's leading sponsor of terrorism. They have the blood of thousands of American soldiers on their hands. They lead chants of ''death to America,'' whom they call the Great Satan, and burn our flag in their streets. They declared just last week, with certainty, that Israel, whom they call the Little Satan, will be wiped off the map in no less than 25 years. This plan allows Iran to build a nuclear bomb in no less than 15 years. You do the math.

The President's deal with a terrorist nation allows them to continue their nuclear program and gives them over $150 billion to fund worldwide terrorism.

A vote for this deal, with all of its dire implications for the future of our children and grandchildren, could well be the most regrettable vote that a Member of Congress will ever take in his career.

FALLEN FIREFIGHTERS

(Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of

three brave firefighters—Tom Zbyszewski, Andrew Zajac, and Richard Wheeler—who were killed after their vehicle crashed near Twisp, Washington, leaving the men in the path of a raging fire.

Washington State has faced record forest fires this season. Nearly a million acres have burned. There has been a lot of loss, including the lives of these three men.

Tom, the youngest, at 20 years old, was a rising junior at Whitman College, who followed in his parents' footsteps and accepted the call to fight fires during the summer. How he and his colleagues died is really a testament to the type of men that they were—brave and generous, fiercely dedicated to protecting their home, and willing to put their lives at risk to protect it.

My prayers continue to be with their families and all those who have been impacted by these fires. We are eternally grateful for these young men and their service to our beloved State.

You are our heroes. Rest in peace.

□ 1315

JAMES ZADROGA 9/11 HEALTH AND COMPENSATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Reauthorization Act and to call attention to our duty to the heroes who have already sacrificed so much.

As Americans, we have pledged to never forget the terrible events of 9/11. As Americans, we have a duty to never forget those who risked their lives to save others. Well over 1,000 9/11 first responders have been diagnosed with cancer caused by their exposure to toxins at Ground Zero.

Because of the Zadroga Act, over 70,000 9/11 first responders and survivors around the country, including 6,000 in my district, are being monitored for cancer and other Ground Zero-related incidences. Over 7,600 are already receiving treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we honor our commitment to those brave men and women by permanently reauthorizing this important program.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACARTHUR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, coincidental to the message or the speech that I am about to give, I am reminded, as so many of you are, that this is September the 11th and 14 years ago terrorists, in an evil, devastating act against our country designed to destroy us as a people, attacked the very fabric of the Nation and killed almost 3,000 innocent Americans.

I pray for their families, and I pray for those who loved those people and still feel the loss within their souls today.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that one of the best ways we can honor the people who lost their lives that infamous day is to remember that the price of freedom has always been eternal vigilance.

We still face a world where jihad has designs on destroying this, the greatest and freest republic in the history of the world.

And in the name of those we have lost, in the name of those generations still to come, God help us to be vigilant people, as Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the blood, sacrifice, and noble principles of millions of gallant souls across America's history have made this Nation the unipolar superpower of the entire world. Our international policies now significantly impact the peace and security of the entire human family.

The very first responsibility of this Nation's government and especially its Commander in Chief is to protect America's national security. The only two ways we have to do that is to prevent any enemy or potential enemy from having the intent and capacity to do us harm. We must make sure that, if there is an enemy with the intent to do us harm, that they do not have the capacity to proceed.

The intent of the Islamic Republic of Iran has been crystal clear since they took and held 52 American hostages 444 days at the beginning of their radical revolution those 36 years now ago. They have ever since been waging war on America and their own neighbors.

But the only way the Iranian leaders can ever truly achieve their ultimate goal is to become a nuclear-armed nation.

Consequently, they have proceeded inexorably in that direction both secretly and openly and obviously for decades until America and the Western world came together with resolutions, sanctions, and warnings of military intervention to halt and dismantle this unspeakably dangerous threat. This pressure finally brought Iran to the negotiating table.

But now, instead of increasing and using that pressure, President Barack Obama has completely ignored the original commitment that the sanctions would only be dismantled when Iran's nuclear weapons program was dismantled.

The President blindly accepted whatever deal Iran put on the table and completely forgot who was at the other end of that table.

Mr. Obama then proceeded to capitulate on every redline and minimum requirement that both he and the United Nations had previously required.

The President has now squandered away every form of leverage we had against this theocratic radical regime, which has broken every promise it has ever made to us.

And what did we get in return, Mr. Speaker? We got an insane rope-a-dope, duplicitous, unverifiable, astonishingly unenforceable deal. We got a deal that legitimizes and empowers the most prolific state sponsor of terrorism in the world.

It obligates America to lift all sanctions, lift bans on Iran's imports of weapons and ballistic missile programs. It allows Iran a protected protocol to enrich uranium and research even more advanced centrifuges.

It gives them tens of billions of dollars with which they can continue to spread their terror and destabilizing expansionism throughout the word.

It allows them to continue their human rights abuses, including illegally holding American citizens hostage. And it allows them to keep their entire nuclear infrastructure.

All the while, the Supreme Leader and ultimate authority in Iran is publicly reaffirming his hatred toward the United States and publicly leading throngs of his supporters in shouting ''Death to America'' and ''Death to Israel.'' Unbelievable.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Clinton made a far better deal than that, and the result was that the police state of North Korea proceeded to develop nuclear weapons only a few years later.

Some of our most loyal allies live under that nuclear threat to this day. Now this deal will place America and our vital ally, Israel, under that same nuclear threat tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the Iranian mullahs were intently listening when Barack Obama proclaimed before the United Nations that no nation has the right to pick and choose what nations have nuclear weapons. But I remind him that Iran is a nation that has threatened to destroy America and destroy Israel.

These same mullahs were watching as Barack Obama knowingly stood by and idly watched as thousands of innocent civilians in Iraq were either butchered, tortured, raped, beheaded, crucified, or burned alive by ISIS. They then knew they had nothing to fear from Barack Obama.

So the jihadist leaders of Iran came to the nuclear negotiating table with nothing and walked away with everything.

These are the same Iranian mullahs that openly bragged how their bounties and weapons have killed hundreds of American Marines and soldiers on the battlefield, shattering their families in an unbelievable way.

What will these leaders do if they have nuclear weapons? Inexplicably, instead of making sure they never get a nuclear weapon, Barack Obama's politically motivated peace-in-our-time capitulation empowers the most dangerous sponsor of terrorism on this Earth and places them on the path to obtain an entire nuclear arsenal.

Mr. Speaker, unless this Congress or the next President is able to stop this madness, Barack Obama will be on trajectory to be remembered as the father of the Iranian atomic bomb and the one who ultimately nuclearized the entire Middle East, and our children will start down a path that leads through the shadow of nuclear terrorism.

And whatever the costs there might have been to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear weapons will pale in comparison to the costs of dealing with a nuclear-armed Iran. We must not let that happen, Mr. Speaker.

Astonishingly, Democrat Senators are now arrogantly filibustering any attempt for the Senate to reject this inexpressibly dangerous deal.

It is time for the majority leader of the Senate to use the nuclear option in the Senate rules to bring this inexpressibly dangerous nuclear deal with Iran to the Senate floor and vote on and reject it as the treaty that it actually embodies under the Constitution of the United States. If Republicans do not use the nuclear option in our rules, Iran may some day use their nuclear option against our Nation.

It is September 11, Mr. Speaker. God help us to remember. For the sake of our children and future generations, God help this Congress to reject this treacherous deal and God help us all to focus on the unspeakable importance of the coming elections in America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1461. An act to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for out-patient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015.

S. 1629. An act to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1461. An act to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for out-patient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 1629. An act to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 15, 2015, at 3 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2692. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Processed Raspberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Late Payment and Interest Charges on Past Due Assessments [Document No.: AMS-FV-14-0042] received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2693. A letter from the Comptroller, Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter reporting a violation of the Antideficiency Act, as required by 31 U.S.C. 1351, Army case number 13-08; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2694. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Housing Choice Voucher Program: Streamlining the Portability Process [Docket No.: FR-5453-F-02] (RIN: 2577-AC86) received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2695. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2696. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's third quarterly report from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration regarding the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority transition, pursuant to the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, Pub. L. 113-235; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2697. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements (RIN: 1991-AC02) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2698. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's two Congressional Reports on Alternative Fuel Use by Federal Dual Fueled Vehicles. One report is for FY 2011 and 2012, and the second report is for FY 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2699. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 15 of the Commission's Rules for Unlicensed Operations in the Television Bands, Repurposed 600 MHz Band, 600 MHz Guard Bands and Duplex Gap, and Channel 37; Amendment of Part 74 of the Commission's Rules for Low Power Auxiliary Stations in the Repurposed 600 MHz band and 600MHz Duplex Gap [ET Docket No.: 14-165]; and Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions [GN Docket No.: 12-268] received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2700. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Russian Sanctions: Addition to the Entity List to Prevent Violations of Russian Industry Sector Sanctions [Docket No.: 150610514-5514-01] (RIN: 0694-AG66) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2701. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-083; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2702. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-040; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2703. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-057; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2704. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-081; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2705. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-059; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2706. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Secs. 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-023; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2707. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Secs. 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-006; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2708. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting six reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277, 5 U.S.C. 3345-3349d; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2709. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Fiscal Year 2015 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals through the 3rd Quarter of Fiscal Year 2015''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2710. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277, 5 U.S.C. 3345-3349d; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2711. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2015 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Golden Tilefish [Docket No.: 120403249-2492-02] (RIN: 0648-XE087) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2712. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Framework Adjustment 9 [Docket No.: 150401329-5659-02] (RIN: 0648-BF00) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2713. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Species: Final Rulemaking To Revise Critical Habitat for Hawaiian Monk Seals [Docket No.: 110207102-5657-03] (RIN: 0648-BA81) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2714. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Revisions to Charter Halibut Fisheries Management in Alaska [Docket No.: 140724618-5506-02] (RIN: 0648-BE41) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2715. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 20 [Docket No.: 140611492-5605-02] (RIN: 0648-BE30) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2716. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; 2015 Bigeye Tuna Longline Fishery Closure [Docket No.: 150619537-5615-01] (RIN: 0648-XE037) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2717. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery and Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 26; Endangered and Threatened Wildlife; Sea Turtle Conservation [Docket No.: 141125999-5362-02] (RIN: 0648-BE68) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2718. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coral, Coral Reefs, and Live/Hard Bottom Habitats of the South Atlantic Region; Amendment 8 [Docket No.: 140214145-5582-02] (RIN: 0648-BD81) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2719. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Office of General Counsel, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting the Bureau's interim rule — Contraband and Inmate Personal Property: Technical Amendment [Docket No.: BOP-1163] (RIN: 1120-AB63) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2720. A letter from the Chairperson, Commission on Care, transmitting an update on the work of the Commission that was established in Sec. 202 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2721. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting notification of the President's ongoing negotiations with the European Union in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, in accordance with Sec. 107(b)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

The Committee on Natural Resources discharged from further consideration. H.R. 348 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. PALMER):

H.R. 3490. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the National Computer Forensics Institute, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3491. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of special pension for Medal of Honor recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 3492. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to limit the number of local wage areas allowable within a General Schedule pay locality; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DONOVAN (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. McCAUL):

H.R. 3493. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Securing the Cities program to enhance the ability of the United States to detect and prevent terrorist attacks and other high consequence events utilizing nuclear or other radiological materials that pose a high risk to homeland security in high-risk urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 3494. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide greater clarity for States with respect to excluding providers whose actions a State suspects causes termination of fetuses born alive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3495. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow for greater State flexibility with respect to excluding providers who are involved in abortions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3496. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and title 17, United States Code, to provide greater access to in-State television broadcast programming for cable and satellite subscribers in certain counties; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 3497. A bill to protect the Nation's law enforcement officers by banning the FiveseveN Pistol and 5.7 x 28mm SS190, SS192, SS195LF, SS196, and SS197 cartridges, testing handguns and ammunition for capability to penetrate body armor, and prohibiting the manufacture, importation, sale, or purchase of such handguns or ammunition by civilians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 3498. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit human cloning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3499. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of disability rated and certified as total by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs as disability for purposes of such titles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3500. A bill to require the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, to report the Consumer Price Index (CPI-W) using methodology employed in 1980; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 3501. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, to condition the receipt of certain highway funding by States on the enactment and enforcement by States of certain laws to prevent repeat intoxicated driving; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3502. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to improve nutrition in tribal areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 3503. A bill to require an assessment of fusion center personnel needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. JONES, Mr. PERRY, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. YOHO):

H. Res. 417. A resolution impeaching Regina McCarthy, Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Res. 418. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 15, 2015, through September 21, 2015, as ''Balance Awareness Week''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

122. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 8, recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Older Americans Act of 1965, affirming the Legislature's continuing support for the goals of the act, and to memorialize the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate to reauthorize the act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

123. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 23, commemorating the 43rd anniversary of the enactment of Title IX, and urging Californians to continue to work together to achieve the goals set by Title IX, as specified; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

124. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of the United States Virgin Islands, relative to Resolution No. 1820 (Bill No. 31-0153), urging the United States Congress to amend Sec. 11 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, 48 U.S.C. 1591, by repealing the requirement that the governor's official residence is ''in the Government House'' on Saint Thomas and providing for the Legislature of the Virgin Islands to determine the location of the Governor's residence; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

125. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9, urging the President and Congress of the United States to craft a balanced and workable approach to reduce incentives for and minimize unnecessary patent litigation while ensuring that legitimate patent enforcement rights are protected and maintained; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

126. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 7, requesting that the Congress of the United States of America further amend the GI Bill of Rights to make benefits available, with all appropriate safeguards, to all veterans for use as startup capital in the establishment of first businesses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

127. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2, calling upon the President of the United States and the United States Congress to formally and consistently reaffirm the historical truth that the atrocities committed against the Armenian people constituted genocide; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Foreign Affairs.

128. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 8, urging Congress and the President of the United States to reform the short stay admissions criteria for Medicare beneficiaries and to discontinue the two-midnight policy; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 3490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8 of the Constitution states ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;''

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 3493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 3494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers . . .''

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 3497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. Art. I § 8.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 3498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 3501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 3503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 27: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 140: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 155: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 225: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 266: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 292: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 335: Ms. LEE, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 348: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 467: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 494: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 510: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 525: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 539: Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 540: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 592: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 662: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 671: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 692: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 702: Mr. GUINTA and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 708: Mr. ROSS and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 711: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 746: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 766: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 793: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 818: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 822: Mr. KIND and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 855: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 863: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 879: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 911: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 918: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 985: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 997: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 999: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1002: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1061: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 1062: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1078: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1100: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1130: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1197: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1221: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1258: Mr. HECK of Washington and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1270: Mr. BRAT and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 1284: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 1309: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1333: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1340: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1343: Mr. LAMALFA and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1356: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1383: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 1389: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1391: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 1401: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1416: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1427: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1460: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1475: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1530: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 1534: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1550: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1559: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1567: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1608: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1624: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1644: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BOST, and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1655: Mr. TURNER and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1671: Mr. FORBES, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1692: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 1715: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1769: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1779: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1784: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1786: Mr. BEYER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1801: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 1814: Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1853: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 1854: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 1855: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1856: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 1859: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1877: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1941: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 1943: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1969: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KIND, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 2059: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2067: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2077: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2124: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DENT, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 2138: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2283: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2293: Mr. HENSARLING and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2303: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2400: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 2508: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2622: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 2643: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2646: Mr. REED, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2649: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2660: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2675: Mr. COOK and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2697: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2704: Mr. WELCH and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2737: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2759: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2850: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2858: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 2896: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2902: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2903: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2964: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2972: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2976: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3036: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3037: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3041: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3060: Mr. COHEN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3083: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 3084: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 3115: Ms. FOXX.
H.R. 3118: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3120: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 3134: Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 3146: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 3178: Mr. POLIS and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 3179: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3187: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 3190: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 3197: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3215: Mr. BABIN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3248: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 3251: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3294: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3311: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3326: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3338: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. BERA.
H.R. 3341: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3364: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3371: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 3375: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3381: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3418: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PAYNE, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 3422: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3423: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 3429: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 3443: Mr. HARPER and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3458: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 3463: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 3466: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3472: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 3473: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3488: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 3489: Mr. FATTAH.
H.J. Res. 36: Mr. PETERS.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H. Con. Res. 51: Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MICA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BRAT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. COFFMAN, and Ms. KUSTER.
H. Res. 145: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 220: Mr. DESANTIS.
H. Res. 294: Mr. WELCH.
H. Res. 343: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. PETERSON.
H. Res. 346: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. BARR.
H. Res. 361: Ms. GRANGER.
H. Res. 378: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Res. 410: Mr. PERRY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 381: Mrs. DINGELL.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2015 No. 131

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 and 04 seconds a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable DAVID PERDUE, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 11, 2015.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID PERDUE, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PERDUE thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P.M. ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2015

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 1 p.m. on Tuesday, September 15, 2015.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9:30 and 30 seconds a.m., adjourned until Tuesday, September 15, 2015, at 1 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

SPEECH OF

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), the nuclear agreement reached between the P5+1 nations and Iran.

This month marks the 70th anniversary of the nuclear age. The dangers of nuclear war remain very real but the path to contain the nuclear demon has not been easy. The Iran Nuclear Agreement is the latest attempt to reduce the nuclear danger and perhaps one of the most complex set of issues ever confronted in shaping an international agreement.

In my judgment this agreement enhances the security of the United States and reduces the likelihood of nuclear confrontation in the Mideast. Failure to accept the terms of this agreement, on the other hand, seems likely to either exclude the United States from a role in preventing nuclear proliferation in the Mideast as other nations move ahead without us or, more ominously, set the region on a path of escalating tensions. I believe either of those last two options are unacceptable, and reckless. With determination, patience and U.S. leadership, this agreement has the potential of opening the door to further agreements on non-nuclear security issues.

No agreement is perfect and no agreement will fully satisfy everyone. Agreements negotiated with our adversaries by their nature mean that we are seeking to achieve our security goals by diplomatic means not by imposing our will by military means. U.S. security experts have expressed their support for the agreement as the best option as have our nation's nuclear experts. Leading Israeli security experts have also voiced their support as have the leaders of many leading U.S. Jewish organizations because of their concerns for Israel's security. Should our diplomatic efforts in this agreement fail to close the path to an Iranian nuclear weapon we would still be in a better position as to time and means to choose other options.

I commend President Obama and Secretary Kerry for their leadership on this issue. The stakes for the United States, for the Mideast region and for the world are too high for us to miss this opportunity.

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

SPEECH OF

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. The agreement is not in the best interest of our country and will have a lasting impact well beyond this Congress and Obama's presidency.

It boggles the mind that we would put faith in a regime that is the world's leading state sponsor of terror and continues to openly destabilize the Middle East. Furthermore, this deal fails to establish acceptable consequences for violations, and financially strengthens the Iranian regime via international trade and technology assistance.

This international gamble will adversely affect generations of Americans and Middle Easterners hoping to live in a more peaceful world.

We must do everything we can to prevent implementation of this dangerous agreement, and remain firm by defending freedom and protecting American interests at home and abroad. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote against implementing this deal.

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

SPEECH OF

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, over the course of this debate, you're going to hear about the failures of this deal from members of both parties. You'll hear about how this deal fails to provide the "anytime, anywhere" inspections that the Administration promised. You'll hear about how it relies on Iran to self-inspect at military nuclear facilities such as Parchin. And you'll hear about how Iran will get over a hundred billion dollars in immediate sanctions relief in exchange for a limited inspections regime that expires within 15 years. These are all important reasons to reject this deal, but I want to focus on something different: the character of the Iranian regime.

The Islamic Republic of Iran's founding action 35 years ago was to declare war on the United States, violating all international laws and agreements by invading our embassy and taking our diplomats hostage. Since then, Iran has been complicit in the murders of thousands of our soldiers. Iran's Lebanese terrorist proxy, Hezbollah, murdered hundreds of Marines in Lebanon in the 1980s, and in the last decade, Iranian-sponsored militias murdered thousands of American service members in Iraq. As we debate this deal today, Iran continues to hold American hostages. This is a regime that was born in terror and that exists to spread terror across the world.

It's the character of the Iranian regime that makes its pursuit of nuclear weapons so dangerous. Countries like Japan have enough stockpiled plutonium for thousands of bombs, but because it doesn't sponsor terror or threaten its neighbors, no one is concerned with the Japanese nuclear power industry. An Iranian regime that espouses terror and threatens genocide can never be allowed to have a nuclear program, not today, not in ten years, not in a century.

Iran's development of a nuclear weapon will have repercussions far beyond its own borders. Iran's terrorist allies are currently waging war against America's allies across the Middle East. Iranian proxies Hezbollah and Hamas continue to threaten Israel with tens of thousands of rockets, Iranian death squads in Iraq and Syria have killed tens of thousands of people, and Iranian backed rebels overthrew the pro-American government of Yemen. This is not ancient history; this is all within the past year.

Any deal that the United States signs must result in the dismantlement, destruction, and irreversible rollback of Iran's nuclear program. There is no acceptable level of enrichment for an Iran that sponsors terrorism and threatens its neighbors. If Iran won't accept a deal on these terms, then the United States should keep the sanctions in place and tighten them until they force the Iranian regime to its knees. Iran will never be a normal nation as long as its government is ruled by radicals whose ideology is terror. When Ronald Reagan was pursuing nuclear arms reduction negotiations with the Soviet Union, he famously operated under the principle of "Trust, but verify." In contrast, this deal requires blind trust without any meaningful verification. It does nothing to change the character of the Iranian regime and instead counts on the good will of a terrorist state that openly proclaims "Death to America." I refuse to trust the security of America and our allies to the Iranian regime's promises. I don't trust Iran and I cannot support this deal.

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

SPEECH OF

HON. ANN WAGNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to reiterate my deep-seated belief that the Iran nuclear deal is a dangerous mistake of historic proportions.

On my recent trip to Israel, I learned firsthand how the Iranian regime will use this deal to further its terrorist ambitions and threaten the peace and security of the entire Middle East.

Because of the unprecedented number of concessions offered to the Iranians by the Obama Administration, this deal will do little to prevent Iran from ultimately obtaining a nuclear weapon.

In actuality, instead of averting Iran's quest for the bomb, this deal will speed other nations' desire for nuclear arsenals and provide one of our greatest enemies with the resources it desperately needs. Resources that

Iran will turn around and use to fund attacks on our interests in the Middle East and beyond.

We are providing our sworn enemy with the means to attack us, and all we get in exchange is a brief delay in their unending quest for a nuclear weapon.

This terrible deal not only affords Iran legitimacy for a partial nuclear program at present, but allows them a full and unfettered program after 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, under this deal, Iran will receive hundreds of billions of dollars in sanctions relief and be allowed access to advanced weaponry and ballistic missiles it can use to threaten its neighbors and the United States.

Iran will be free to use the weapons and money provided by this agreement to fuel its terrorist aspirations around the region, threatening our ally Israel and further inflaming a region already in crisis.

Under this deal, the world's number one sponsor of terrorism will suddenly have access to enormous resources that it can distribute to its allies Hamas, Hezbollah and the Assad regime in Syria.

This is a completely unacceptable outcome for the United States, Israel, and our allies in the Middle East.

Wagering the peace and security of the U.S., Israel and the world on the small chance that a hateful regime will suddenly see the error of its ways is not only wrong, it is dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that, no matter how much the President may wish it to be so, Iran's decades long record of terrorism, extremism and hate will not suddenly change simply because this deal has been signed.

Our allies are almost uniformly opposed to this deal. On my recent trip to Israel, I had the honor and privilege of meeting with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu for over two hours.

We discussed the Iran deal at length, and I came away even more convinced that this deal is not only foolhardy, it is dangerous.

Prime Minister Netanyahu explained to us how the Obama Administration has sold out our Israeli allies to strike a deal with a murderous and untrustworthy Iranian regime.

The President expects Congress to stand idly by and do nothing while he trades the security of the U.S. and its allies for a legacy-burnishing accomplishment.

He expects us to sit on the sidelines while his Administration offers one concession after another to the Iranians, and agrees on a deal that would endanger the stability of the entire Middle East and jeopardize U.S. national security.

But that will not happen. We will not stand idly by while the American people's security is traded for some empty promises.

A nuclear-armed Iran would start a new arms race in the Middle East and pose an intolerable threat to the national security of the United States and our allies, especially Israel.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our children, and our children's children, we must face down this threat now before it is too late.

I urge my colleagues to review this agreement with an eye towards history, towards the past, present and future of a region critical to America's national interests.

Iran has a record of deception and hostility towards American interests, no amount of wishful thinking will change their core tendencies.

Congress must use this opportunity to stand up for what is right.

The United States must not capitulate in the face of persistent evil. We must stand together, united against the threat of a nuclear Iran, in order to guarantee a free and peaceful tomorrow.

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

SPEECH OF

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks I have been carefully considering the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), the agreement that is intended to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. There is no question that preventing Iran from ever developing a nuclear weapon is in the best interest of the United States, Israel and the Middle East, and the rest of the world. I favor diplomacy over military action whenever and wherever reasonably possible, and I strongly agree that an engaged and unified international community, led by the United States, is the best option to preserve peace by keeping close watch over a rogue state that seems to respond only when the world's major powers speak in one voice. It is through this lens, and with these goals, that I approached my analysis of the JCPOA and the potential consequences of Congress accepting or rejecting the agreement. I will vote to support the agreement and advocate for vigorous oversight and enforcement.

To reach this decision, I carefully read the agreement, reviewed classified intelligence materials, and participated in both classified and unclassified briefings. I have spoken with President Obama, and I've heard thorough explanations from Secretary of State Kerry and Secretary of Energy Moniz. Knowledgeable critics of this agreement offered compelling arguments, which I considered in my analysis. I asked questions of the Administration and other experts and evaluated their responses. I have discussed the agreement with people from Iran and Israel, and others with deep ties to both nations. Constituents have offered significant input in letters, emails, phone calls, conversations, and at town hall meetings across Northwest Oregon. As I deliberated, I recalled my time visiting Israel, and always kept in mind my knowledge and understanding of how volatile the region is and what it's like to live under constant threat.

Reaching this decision was not easy. The consequences of this agreement will shape the future of the region and the world. The complexity of the agreement, and the questions it raises about the future that cannot be answered irrefutably, contributed to the fervent, well-reasoned, and passionate opinions on all sides. Many people who I know and respect deeply have reached a different conclusion; I acknowledge their concerns but have concluded that rejecting the deal will not diminish the possibility that Iran will obtain a nuclear weapon. In my assessment, if Congress rejects the agreement, it could result in a higher likelihood of Iran developing a nuclear weapon while at the same time diminishing the global leadership of the United States.

Implementing the JCPOA, on the other hand, will preserve the principal role of the United States in dealing with Iran in the future, and it is our best chance to stop Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Right now, without the agreement, the "breakout time" for Iran to acquire fissile material for a nuclear weapon is a mere 2–3 months. Under the JCPOA, the breakout time for at least the next decade will be extended to a year, and there will be no sanctions relief until that breakout time has been extended and Iran has taken multiple required steps and completion of those steps has been verified. These steps include reducing Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium by 97 percent, removing the core of the heavy water reactor and filling it with concrete, and submitting to ongoing inspections and continuous, unprecedented monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Iran can only enrich uranium to 3.67 percent, a level far below the 90 percent range that is necessary to build a nuclear weapon. Sanctions "snap back" and can be reinstated if there is a violation. The JCPOA does not affect the existing U.S. bans on weapons sales, and, importantly, no option, including military force, is taken off the table.

Like most negotiated agreements, however, the JCPOA is not perfect. Because of that, some suggest that we should reject the deal and bring the parties back to the table in an effort to make it better. But our negotiating partners agree that this is a deal worth pursuing, and I concur with many experts who say it would be a near impossibility to convince all parties to return to the table. Even then, it is not at all clear that the outcome of future negotiations would be better than the current agreement. Others have argued that the agreement is likely to fail given Iran's history of noncompliance. Yet throughout this process, no one has suggested that the Iranian government can be trusted. This is not a deal built on trust, but rather on verification. The agreement puts in place a comprehensive inspection regime, some of which is permanent, that will supplement the work of intelligence agencies and provide confidence that Iran could not dash for a nuclear weapon without being caught.

Rather than reject the agreement, Congress should come together and commit to vigilance in holding Iran to every aspect of the JCPOA and to the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which provides that Iran, as a signatory, is never allowed to develop a nuclear weapon. We should make clear—very clear—that anything short of strict compliance will result in the swift reimposition of sanctions. Working together in Congress and with other world leaders will give us the best chance to make sure that Iran complies with its obligations and the best chance to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran. I support this bill.

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

SPEECH OF

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I've travelled throughout Alabama's 2nd Congressional District the last few weeks and I've listened to the

concerns expressed by those I represent. I want to clearly state my views on the President's proposed nuclear agreement with Iran.

Many remain puzzled as to why we are negotiating in the first place with a regime that has a stated intent to destroy the United States and Israel. Remember that just days after this deal was reached, Iran's Supreme Leader applauded and encouraged a large crowd gathered in Tehran as it chanted "Death to America!" and "Death to Israel!" Also puzzling is, even if we are going to negotiate, why be so unwilling to walk away when our stated objectives fall one after the other?

I share my constituents' frustration at a flawed, weak deal that seems to serve Iran's interests at the expense of our own.

How is that? First, inspections are not "anywhere, anytime" like negotiators originally said would be a deal-breaking must. In fact, at certain sites the Iranians could have up to 24 days' notice before inspectors are allowed in. That's a joke. And, even then, Americans are prohibited from making unilateral inspections.

Second, the "snap back" provisions the Administration points to as accountability mechanisms are weak by their own admission. Secretary Kerry and President Obama have repeatedly said that our unilateral economic sanctions don't work and put the United States at a disadvantage. Yet, the threat of those very sanctions "snapping back" into place is supposed to be the way we make sure Iran lives up to the agreement. They can't have it both ways. If our sanctions aren't strong enough on their own now, why would we rely on them as a way to hold Iran accountable in the future?

Third, under this deal, as much as $150 billion would flow into Iran's coffers. Let's not kid ourselves to think that the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism won't turn around and fund those who want to harm Americans and our allies. So, not only will we have paved the way for Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon and potentially initiated a nuclear arms race in the Middle East, but we will have strengthened the hand of this adversarial state while weakening our own.

I will continue to work with my colleagues to point out these weaknesses and make those supporting the deal explain why to the American people.

One silver lining is that the agreement is subject for review in the next administration because this is an executive agreement and not a treaty. Let's pray our next president doesn't adhere to a foreign policy doctrine of "leading from behind."

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of peace in the Middle East. Peace for our allies and friends in the region. Peace for the Iranian people. And sustainable peace for the United States.

Throughout my 29 years of military service, I served during war and peace. Throughout the Cold War, we constantly trained to respond to and combat the greatest nuclear threat the world has ever faced: the Soviet Union. I deployed to Germany on what was effectively the front line, within walking distance of this grave threat. Afterwards, I fought in Desert Storm, with the Iraqi chemical and biological arsenal a threat at any moment. Finally, I deployed several more times to Iraq during the most recent war, fighting for stability against Islamic terrorists bent on death, chaos, and destruction.

In each of these experiences, I found the best and worst in humanity, and was always working towards lasting peace and stability.

I now have the honor to serve in the United States Congress, where I seek to prevent engagements in various regional conflicts, including those in Libya and Syria. I seek to bring a more democratic process to deploying American personnel into combat, which was the intent of the original 1973 War Powers Act. I take these positions because I know that the best and most responsible means of preventing conflict, or the exacerbation of conflict, is through strong diplomacy.

Today, I continue to fight to keep the United States out of another war. I work to protect and keep safe our allies and friends throughout the Middle East and the world. This is why I say no to an agreement that will only make us and our allies less safe in both the short and long term. The Iranian regime is the same regime that calls for death to America and Israel. This is the same regime engaged in destabilization of Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen, and elsewhere. This is the same regime that funds the Assad regime in Syria which has used Weapons of Mass Destruction, killing hundreds of thousands of people. This is the same regime that funds terrorist organizations like Hezbollah, Hamas, and the Houthis. This is the same regime that directly funded, trained, and engaged in combat alongside radical Shiite militias that fought, injured, and killed American service men and women, including those under my command.

This deal not only allows, but in fact tacitly approves, Iranian access to modern conventional arms within five years. Within eight years, it lifts the ban on access to ballistic missile technology. The deal also allows Iran to immediately access tens of billions of dollars through sanctions relief, ensuring the modernization of its depleted conventional military and support for its world-wide terror network. The deal seeks to eliminate the legislative sovereignty of the United States Congress, our states, and our municipalities when it comes to key aspects of our foreign policy. The deal does not permit anytime, anywhere inspections. The deal does not outline how inspections will take place. The deal does not stop nuclear research and development in Iran. The deal does not prohibit Iran from seeking and obtaining nuclear weapons either through cheating or after the expiration of the terms.

I am afraid that this deal could hasten the pace to war, not end the threat of it. But this can be prevented. We can return to the negotiating table and engage from a position of strength. We can do so through stronger diplomacy; a more credible and consistent military posturing that does not appear haphazard and reactive; we can enact stronger sanctions, if needed; and finally, we must be willing to stick to a true red line and say no to a bad deal. I plead with my colleagues in the United States Congress, as well as President Obama, Secretary Kerry, and others in this Administration: do not go ahead with this ill-fated and weak deal that hurts our national and international security.

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

SPEECH OF

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, after careful study of public and classified information, extensive discussions with people on both sides of the issue, and much thought and deliberation, I have concluded that supporting the Iran nuclear agreement is the best option we have at this time to prevent Iran from having nuclear weapons. That is why I am supporting H.R. 3461, the legislation approving the Iran agreement.

While this agreement is not perfect, the deal provides unprecedented oversight and transparency over Iran's nuclear program that is not possible today. Furthermore, if the United States does not support the deal, I am concerned it could potentially isolate us from our partners who have given all indications that they are not prepared to walk away from this agreement.

We know Iran cannot be trusted. Therefore, if this deal is approved, there is no question we must be vigilant to make sure Iran does not violate the terms of the agreement. If there are any indications Iran is violating the deal, immediate action must be taken. We must never allow Iran to move towards having a nuclear weapon, and we must never give up working with Israel and our other allies until we achieve peace and stability in the Middle East.

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

SPEECH OF

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I stand in proud support of the international agreement reached by the P5+1 nations (France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Russia, China, and the United States) that is aimed at preventing Iran from becoming a nuclear-armed state. Preventing a nuclear arms race in the Middle East is essential to the security of the U.S., Israel, and the larger international community. It is why the U.S. led negotiations on this agreement and why this agreement has the unanimous support of the U.N. Security Council, over 90 nations, our Gulf state allies, and the world's largest powers.

Under this agreement, Iran has committed to obligations that go far beyond the requirements of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. The agreement will block every pathway to a bomb for at least 15 years. It will require Iran to eliminate 97 percent of its stockpile of enriched uranium, remove two-thirds of its installed centrifuges that enrich uranium as well

as remove all the pipework and infrastructure that connects the centrifuges, and terminate the use of its advanced centrifuges to produce enriched uranium. Iran will be required to fill the core of the heavy water Arak reactor with concrete and repurpose it for peaceful purposes. Additionally the deal directs Iran to ship all spent fuel from the reactor out of the country, and prohibits Iran from building any new heavy water reactors. Experts say that these steps are not easily reversible and it would take Iran anywhere from 2 to 5 years to rebuild that infrastructure. Efforts to rebuild it would be detected within a few days.

Under the agreement, Iran's uranium and plutonium manufacturing capabilities will be both severely limited and strictly monitored by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The IAEA will be granted around-the-clock access to Iran's uranium mills, mines, conversion facilities, centrifuge manufacturing and storage facilities, making it nearly impossible for the Iranian government to violate their manufacturing restrictions. The IAEA will also have access to sites of concern where they believe unauthorized production to be taking place.

If Iran fully complies with this agreement it will be an historic moment not only for the U.S. but for the rest of the world. If Iran violates the agreement, U.S., U.N., and E.U. sanctions will be snapped back into place. Further, all U.S. sanctions on Iran related to their involvement in terrorism and human rights abuses remain in place. All of the P5+1 partners understand that the U.S. will continue to strongly enforce these sanctions, including sanctions that impact non-U.S. entities.

While I will not question the intentions of my colleagues, since we all have the same goal which is to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran, some of the rhetoric in opposition to this agreement has been damaging, unhelpful, and at times absurd. Opponents of the agreement have called into question the integrity of the IAEA and their ability as the world's foremost independent organization on nuclear non-proliferation to do their work—for example, by claiming that the confidential nuclear safeguards agreement between the IAEA and Iran is a "side deal" and must be made available to the U.S. government. There is too much at stake and this debate merits a serious conversation based on facts. We need to move beyond the irresponsible, heated rhetoric and do what's necessary to assure that this agreement is successful, will not be violated by Iran, and ensuring that if violations occur there will be serious consequences.

When this agreement is implemented Iran will be further away from the bomb than they are today. It will result in prolonging their timeline for creating a nuclear bomb from a matter of months to at least one year. Without the agreement, Iran would be able to continue their nuclear program unrestrained. If the U.S. walked away from the agreement, Iran would most likely ramp up their centrifuge production—as they did after the U.S. imposed sanctions—which would surely spark a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

Congress should play a supportive role in ensuring that the president can implement this agreement and provide oversight of Iran's compliance. Instead, my Republican colleagues are attempting to scuttle and undermine it, damaging U.S. credibility in the international community and creating a potentially dangerous security position for our nation. While I have not always agreed with President Obama's foreign policy choices I have fully supported his efforts to resolve the crisis over Iran's nuclear ambitions through diplomacy. The conclusion of this agreement demonstrates just how far the U.S. has come in repairing the damage wrought during the Bush administration. It proves that once again the U.S. can be trusted in working with both our allies and adversaries in navigating some of the world's most challenging security issues.

The U.S. has nothing to lose by implementing this agreement—all options remain on the table, but we have a lot to lose if we walk away. Rejecting this agreement like some of my colleagues are advocating would take us back to some of the darkest years in U.S. history. Opponents of this agreement are using arguments put forth by Dick Cheney and Benjamin Netanyahu, two leading cheerleaders of the Iraq war—the worst U.S. foreign policy mistake in the history of our nation. Nobody wants to become further entangled in an endless war in the Middle East. The U.S. wasted more than $4 trillion on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and spent more money rebuilding Afghanistan than we did on the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe after World War II. What have the results been? Afghanistan is still a mess and Iraq is rife with religious and ethnic strife and partially overrun by ISIS.

Preventing Iran from developing a nuclear weapon would be a huge step forward in the most unstable and dangerous region of the world. Implementing this agreement is the only option and the best alternative available to taking military action.

Lastly, I'm hopeful that the successful implementation of this agreement will lead to a permanent peaceful resolution to this matter and open up a new chapter in Iranian-U.S. relations. Iran's future is also at stake and there is a young Iranian population that would like to see better relations with the U.S. and a more open Iran. This agreement should not be viewed as an irreversible capitulation to Iran. It is the first step in what will be a very long and arduous road to resolving critical issues with Iran and ensuring a safer Middle East.

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

SPEECH OF

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, after careful review of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), analysis by experts pro and con, consultation with advocates from AIPAC, and prayerful consideration, I have concluded that the JCPOA is a strong, verifiable agreement which, if implemented, provides the best available option, short of military action, to prevent Iran from securing a nuclear weapon.

Israel is our nation's closest friend in the Middle East and one of our nation's key allies. Our relationship is based on shared democratic values, mutual respect, and our Judeo-Christian heritage. I have witnessed first-hand Israel's remarkable culture, innovation, entrepreneurship, and patriotism, especially when I traveled to the Holy Land.

Drawing from my experience as a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, and the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs, I have an acute appreciation for the tremendous security challenges Israel and its people face as the nation seeks to survive and thrive in a very hostile neighborhood. Consequently, I have always supported funding for Israel's missile defense programs; a peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct and bilateral talks; and efforts such as the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2013 to promote closer military, scientific, and economic ties between our two countries.

Moreover, I have consistently supported international sanctions against Iran, not merely to inflict economic hardships on the government and people of Iran because of their anti-American, anti-Israeli, and anti-Semitic conduct, but to ultimately bring Iran to the negotiating table to deter its nuclear weapons program, which poses a real and grave threat to Israel, the United States, and the entire world.

Because the threat of Iran acquiring a nuclear weapon is so ominous, our country was able to persuade a multitude of nations to join us, albeit reluctantly, in imposing these severe sanctions which have effectively brought Iran to the negotiation table regarding its nuclear weapons program. On July 14, 2015, negotiators from Iran, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, and China, along with the European Union, announced completion of a comprehensive nuclear agreement with Iran—the JCPOA.

The JCPOA requires that the full extent of the Iran nuclear program will be under constant surveillance—24 hours a day, 7 days a week—by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for at least 15 years, which is the strongest nuclear non-proliferation monitoring agency anywhere in the world. Even after 15 years, Iran will be permanently obligated to follow all international Nuclear Non-Proliferation treaty requirements. Monitoring of the most sensitive parts of Iran's nuclear program will continue indefinitely.

The JCPOA affirms that under no circumstance will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons. It also places severe restrictions on Iran's uranium enrichment facilities, dismantles its plutonium production capabilities, and provides the IAEA access to all known and potential covert sites.

If Iran complies with the JCPOA, international sanctions will be lifted and Iranian funds frozen in foreign banks will be released. However, if Iran violates the agreement, sanctions will snap back into place and all options—including the use of military force—will remain available to the United States, Israel, and our allies to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. These options will only be strengthened by the intelligence gathered from the IAEA monitoring and inspections, as well as by the vast array of U.S. intelligence assets across the region and the world.

The JCPOA is not perfect. Neither side got everything they wanted. And a skeptical international community has deep concerns about Iran's long and nefarious record of human rights violations, financing of terrorism, hostility to Israel and the United States, as well as its destabilizing role throughout the Middle East.

Many Americans, Israelis, and other allies have serious doubts as to whether Iran will actually comply with the terms of the JCPOA, and believe Iran cannot be trusted. I share these concerns. But the JCPOA is not based on trust but on verification through constant monitoring.

While intense inspections by the IAEA under the agreement are not sufficient to satisfy some critics, over 70 nuclear non-proliferation experts such as former Senators Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar; Generals Brent Scrowcroft and Colin Powell; 29 top U.S. scientists; 440 Rabbis; more than 60 former Israeli Security Officials; over 50 Christian leaders; and more than 100 former U.S. Ambassadors have endorsed the agreement publicly. The United Nations Security Council voted unanimously to support the JCPOA as well.

From a practical perspective, it makes little sense for the United States to walk away from the JCPOA given the broad diplomatic consensus and lack of reasonable alternatives to rolling back Iran's nuclear program. Our negotiating partners, who had reluctantly agreed to sanctions in the first place, have said in no uncertain terms that a better deal with Iran under current circumstances cannot be found. In fact, if the U.S. were to now reject the agreement, the broad international support currently in favor of sanctions would disappear, the guarantee of nuclear inspections would vanish, and our nation's diplomatic stature in the world would be greatly diminished.

To be sure, it is vital that the JCPOA be backed by a strong commitment to ensuring that Iran remains in full compliance or face overwhelming military force. Current intelligence confirms that Iran is within months of developing nuclear weapons capability. Under no circumstances should Iran ever be allowed to pursue a nuclear weapon. Yet, before military action is pursued, I firmly believe that our nation must, as it has through the JCPOA, exhaust all of its diplomatic options and give peace a chance.

In His Sermon on the Mount, Jesus Christ said: ''Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.'' Waging peace is hard and requires far more than trust and good intentions. It requires verification and transparency, which this agreement more than provides. For these reasons, I will support the JCPOA and oppose the passage of any legislation disapproving of the agreement transmitted to Congress by the President relating to the nuclear program of Iran.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NICHOLSON BRIDGE

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to help commemorate the 100th anniversary of the completion of the Nicholson Bridge, also known as the Tunkhannock Creek Viaduct. Located in Nicholson, Pennsylvania, which I currently represent, the structure has continually served as a vital piece of infrastructure, providing my constituents with efficient transportation throughout Pennsylvania and New York.

Led by the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad, construction of the Tunkhannock Creek Viaduct commenced in 1912. Its completion, dedication, and opening for use took place on November 6, 1915. This engineering marvel was an integral piece of a larger project known as the Clarks Summit-Hallstead Cutoff, engineered in order to shorten the rail line between Scranton, Pennsylvania and Binghamton, New York. The Clarks-Summit Hallstead Cutoff proved to be a huge success, exponentially reducing travel time and subsequently improving transportation efficiency. The bridge's role in this effort was particularly helpful to the residents of Nicholson, a rural town tucked away between Wyoming County and the Endless Mountains of Northeastern Pennsylvania.

In 1975, the America Society of Civil Engineers designated the Nicholson Bridge as a National Historic Civil Engineering Landmark due to the bridge's significant contribution to the development of the United States, and to the field of Civil Engineering. Furthermore, as of 1977, this structural feat was listed on the National Register of Historic Places—an honor attributable to its architectural, engineering, and transportation significance.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the Nicholson Bridge as it celebrates its 100th anniversary. I know that I speak on behalf of a proud community when I say that I am eternally grateful for this engineering wonder, and I look forward to the structure's preservation over the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION'S CONSTITUTION WEEK

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to an important occasion: Constitution Week. This week is set aside to allow Americans to reflect on their responsibilities under the Constitution and encourage us to study our founding document.

This significant designation was made official by President Dwight D. Eisenhower on August 2, 1956 at the urging of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR). The patriotic celebrations that accompany this week are essential for maintaining reverence for this inspirational charter.

Since our country's inception, we have endured as a society committed to securing and protecting the basic rights of all citizens. While our founding document has been amended throughout our nation's lifetime, the basic rights ratified 228 years ago remain intact today. This body, at the most fundamental level, retains its foremost responsibility of protecting these rights. After all, we are all members of the ''People's House.'' May we never forget where our authority derives.

We have remained a country committed to freedoms through many trials and triumphs over the years. Countless of our fellow citizens have sacrificed their lives in honor of that pledge. From the Continentals who first defended the freshly formed Union, to those who are currently serving in harm's way around the globe; these men and women allow us to enjoy our sacred homeland in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a special mention about the work being done by the Ecor Rouge Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Baldwin County, Alabama, to bring attention to our nation's most important governing document during Constitution Week.

So on this Constitution Week, I encourage all Americans to set aside time to read our nation's Constitution and reflect on the many sacrifices made throughout history to protect this document and our freedoms.

HONORING THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION OF BROWNSVILLE

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the important and meaningful work that the Community Development Corporation of Brownsville has carried out in the lower Rio Grande Valley over the past four decades.

Since 1974, the Community Development Corporation of Brownsville (CDCB), a 501(c)(3) community housing development organization, has been successfully working to utilize collaborative partnerships that create sustainable communities across the Rio Grande Valley. The partnerships have helped ensure quality education, model financing, efficient home design, and superior construction.

CDCB is the largest non-profit producer of single family housing in Texas. In 2014, CDCB built 125-plus homes, assisted 178 families, created 375 jobs, and added $4.6 million to the local economy as well as $2.5 million in additional tax revenue.

One of the CDCB's latest housing development projects, known as La Hacienda Casitas in Harlingen, Texas, was designed and constructed with the help of local contractors, non-profits, and businesses. This project adopted new construction designs that will work to mitigate flooding and erosion that all too often plague the area. La Hacienda Casitas is a model for housing programs across the nation.

For more than 10 years, CDCB's YouthBuild program has been opening doors for 16- to 24-year-olds in Brownsville, Texas, helping them develop life skills and prepare for future careers. By providing opportunities in construction, community service, education and leadership development, the YouthBuild program is preparing students to excel and adapt to diverse workforce opportunities in their communities.

The RAPIDO Project, a pioneering $2 million project funded by federal and state post-Hurricane Dolly funds, is a new approach to traditional disaster recovery housing. This project will help those who have lost their homes move into new ones in a matter of weeks, rather than living in a Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) trailer for an unknown period of time. The RAPIDO Project brings together architects, urban planners, developers and project managers, from throughout the state, in an effort to help redefine disaster recovery housing that is affordable and efficient.

In 2015, the CDCB was awarded the Energy Star Certified Homes Market Leader Award for 80 homes they built last year. The organization received the Maxwell Award of Excellence and the Federal Home Loan Bank System Community Partnership Award. CDCB has also been recognized with the State of Texas Housing Finance Special Achievement Award, and in 2013 the organization was awarded the Highest Cumulative kW Savings Award by American Electric Power Texas.

In July 2013, CDCB became a member of the national Neighborworks Network, an organization focused on supporting housing organizations in bettering their communities.

During the past 40 years, the Community Development Corporation of Brownsville has helped many families in the Rio Grande Valley achieve the American dream of owning a home. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to recognize the Community Development Corporation of Brownsville, led by Nick Mitchell-Bennett, for outstanding, innovative, and important work in the Lower Rio Grande Valley.

IN HONOR OF MS. DURELL DECKER AGHA

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Durell Decker Agha, a wonderful woman and dear friend who died yesterday at the all too young age of 73. Durell was a lifelong resident of the Monterey Peninsula and active in local community and business activities.

Born Jan. 31, 1942, Durell grew up, as I did, in Carmel, attending Sunset School and Carmel High School. I remember Durell's family, the Deckers, fondly. They were always involved in lots of community and neighborhood activities. They liked hosting class parties for Durell and her friends at their home in the country. Durell's father and mother owned a grocery store so food was always plentiful to snack on at their house. Durell's brother Paget was a popular community activist. One of the kindest acts by Durell's Dad was his offer to drive us both up to Salem, Oregon to begin our freshman year in college at Willamette University. The home town kids at Willamette—Durell, myself and another Peninsula kid, Hillary Teague—always checked in with each other. We were each other's family away from home.

After her first year at Willamette, Durell came back to the Monterey area for a short time, before heading off to Europe to travel and attend the University of Bordeaux in France. After a year and a half abroad, she returned to California and finished college at UCLA, earning a bachelor's degree in history, with a concentration in Middle East studies.

Following graduation, she worked at Fourtané Jewelers in Carmel, where she was introduced to Nader Agha, shortly after he immigrated to the Monterey area from Syria. The two married in 1965. While their marriage lasted 17 years, they maintained a lifelong partnership that included running various businesses and managing properties together.

Durell was very proud of her children and loved them dearly. She shared great love and rapport with her grandchildren, sharing books of antiquity with Kaden and gardening with Jasmine. Her family will always remember her very giving and supportive ways, as she always put others before herself. Durell enjoyed reading, antiquing with friends and family, and jewelry. She had a deep love for the Carmel area and its history, which showed in her book and photography collections.

She is survived by many family members, including three children, Mahir Agha of Carmel Valley, Sumaya Agha of Carmel, and Laith Agha of Carmel; two grandchildren; sister-in-law Holly Decker; niece Kyle Holton; and close family members Nader Agha, Nadia Agha and Fadia Alhawach.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the whole House in sharing our deepest condolences to Durell's family and friends. She was a bright light in so many lives, including my own. We will all miss her terribly.

APPROVE THE JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, today I voted for the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. I did so because the world is approximately 90 days away from Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon, and this agreement is the most effective way of stopping that effort dead in its tracks.

After years of sanctions and then direct negotiations, the United States and its partners, the P5+1, have produced a plan with unprecedented concessions from Iran, together with the most rigorous inspections, restrictions and verifications regimen ever negotiated.

The agreement will reduce the number of Iran's centrifuges by two-thirds; prevent Iran from producing weapons-grade plutonium; and eliminate 98 percent of Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium. It grants the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) access to Iran's nuclear program so that compliance is ensured, including notification to the agency of plans to construct new nuclear facilities. No facility—declared or undeclared—will be off limits. Decades of essential monitoring measures are included in the agreement that allow the IAEA to enforce these terms.

The United States can unilaterally resume the U.N. Security Council sanctions if there is any violation by Iran of its commitments in the next ten years, and there can be no veto from Russia or China.

This agreement is without precedent, and so is the current instability in the Middle East, undoubtedly fueled by the actions of Iran. It has the support of the entire United Nations, including the European Union, Russia, and China.

Experts from all aspects of our defense, diplomatic, and scientific communities support the agreement, including 36 top officials in the U.S. military, 29 of our nation's leading scientists and engineers, 100 former ambassadors and diplomats, and more than 4,000 Catholic religious women.

The agreement has the support of more than 400 American Rabbis, as well as former top officials of the Israeli security forces, Mossad Chief Efraim Halevy and former Shin Bet Director Ami Ayalon.

Our nation's most prominent nuclear scientists and engineers described their support for the agreement in a recent letter to President Obama, saying it is ''technically sound,'' ''stringent'' and ''innovative.''

And in their open letter to Congress, Catholic Sisters from across our country called on us to ''risk on the side of peace'' by supporting the JCPOA.

No definitive alternative has been put forth by those who oppose the agreement. Furthermore, should the United States abandon the agreement, our country would be viewed as feckless, a nation whose word cannot be trusted and our international partners would no longer commit to sanctions.

For Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East, this, in my view, is an existential moment. By eliminating the possibility of Iran developing a nuclear weapon, Israel's security is enhanced and so is the stabilization of the region by removing the threat of a nuclear Iran.

For all these reasons and more, I support this agreement and risk on the side of peace by voting for the JCPOA.

OPPOSITION TO IRAN DEAL

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the Iran deal that was reached in July 2015 and make known my opposition to the resolution of approval before the House today.

I must say, however, that as a leading opponent of the Iran deal, I am deeply disturbed by the last minute decision of House Republican leadership to inject irresponsible partisan politics into the upcoming vote. House Republicans are, once again, playing political football with the safety and security of Israel, this time by straying from their original plan of an up or down vote on the deal and forcing an irresponsible three-bill gimmick on the House of Representatives.

With that being said, even though I was skeptical of the negotiations and interim agreement, I tried to get to a position where I could support the final deal. I took my time to understand every word of the final deal, I read the classified materials, spoke to the President, met with administration officials, security experts, and constituents. I listened carefully to every analysis and opinion on both sides of this issue.

This is one of the most profound foreign policy decisions I will have to make in Congress, second only to going to war with Iraq. And despite some positive elements in the deal, the totality has compelled me to oppose it. I came to this decision after an intense analysis of the details and merits of this deal and remain concerned about three major components.

First of all, I believe Iran is highly likely to exploit ambiguities in the agreement. They are unlikely to engage in massive violations, but will perform a series of ''small-cheats'', and they will not face punitive measures for it.

Secondly, the lifting of the arms embargo will create additional pathways for Iran to supply the ruthless terrorist organizations, Hamas

and Hezbollah, with the means to increase their weapons stockpiles. Iran continues to be one of the leading state-sponsors of terrorism, and I doubt that will change any time soon. They have smuggled illicit weapons to Hezbollah, and we can only deduce what will happen in five years once the conventional weapons embargo is lifted.

Finally, this agreement lends international legitimacy to Iran's enrichment capacity in fifteen years.

With that being said, now that it is clear this deal will move forward, it is imperative that both Democrats and Republicans in Congress, both supporters and opponents to this deal, join with the Administration and work together to focus on the road ahead.

We must reaffirm our commitment to continue and strengthen the many facets of joint cooperation between the U.S. and Israel. We can do this by signing another 10-year Memorandum of Understanding for FMF for Israel and ensuring their Qualitative Military Edge in such a chaotic region.

We can continue and accelerate cooperation on missile defense programs such as Arrow-3 and David's Sling, and provide additional resources for Israel to field additional Iron Dome batteries.

And we can continue to enhance our cooperation in order to detect and deter terrorist tunnels that plague Israel's borders.

As Iran continues to spew vitriol toward Israel and call for her ultimate destruction, we are reminded that this nation is not to be trusted.

Congress will play a pivotal role in the implementation of this deal and to that end I will continue to use every tool in my toolbox to ensure Iran never acquires a nuclear weapon. And I will continue to ensure that America and our greatest ally, Israel, can continue to thrive in peace and security.

RECOGNIZING VETERANS' VOICES AWARD RECIPIENT DR. TOURILA

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to celebrate Dr. James Tourila of St. Cloud for receiving a Veterans' Voices Legacy Award. I was proud to nominate Dr. Tourila for this award for his impressive work on behalf of veterans.

Jim achieved the rank of Sergeant in the United States Army and was deployed to Korea from 1975 to 1976. After retiring from the Army, Jim graduated from Bemidji State University and went on to get his Master's Degree and PhD in psychology. From there, Jim moved to St. Cloud where he worked as a psychologist at the St. Cloud VA Medical Center for twenty years. Jim currently practices at the Central Minnesota Counseling Center in St. Cloud.

Jim has supported Minnesota's veterans in more ways than one. He is an enthusiastic hot air balloon pilot which led to the creation of Freedom Flight, Inc. to honor veterans who never made it home. Jim has also served as director of the St. Cloud Honor Flight, which has flown more than a thousand veterans from around the state of Minnesota to see the National Monuments in D.C. Jim has been elected as the VFW National Surgeon General twice and is currently serving his eighth year as the Minnesota VFW State Surgeon.

Minnesota is so proud of Jim and I am happy to be able to celebrate all of his efforts today. His years of hard work have bettered the lives of hundreds of veterans, and because of that, there is no one more deserving of this award.

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

SPEECH OF

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin with a couple quotes from the President about the agreement:

''There is nothing more important to our security and to the world's stability than preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles.

''It does not rely on trust. Compliance will be certified by the International Atomic Energy Agency.''

Mr. Speaker, you would be forgiven if you thought I was quoting President Obama. However, I was quoting President Bill Clinton lauding his nuclear agreement with North Korea in 1994. Additionally he stated, ''This agreement will help to achieve a longstanding and vital American objective: an end to the threat of nuclear proliferation on the Korean Peninsula.''

Mr. Speaker, we now know that reality turned out to be very different. Despite assurances from President Clinton, the North Koreans violated the deal, began a clandestine program to enrich uranium and in 2006 conducted its first underground test of a nuclear weapon.

Once again we are told by a Democrat President that an agreement will prevent an adversarial country from acquiring a nuclear weapon. We would be fools to believe that they will not violate the Obama agreement just as North Korea violated the Clinton agreement. The stakes here are even higher. Iran is a regime that will not hesitate to use nuclear weapons to achieve its long-stated goals: the destruction of both Israel and America.

The Iran Nuclear Deal that was agreed to by President Obama is wholly inadequate and unacceptable. The deal gives up-front, permanent sanctions relief to the Iranian mullahs and allows Iran to have an internationally recognized nuclear program after 15 years that could quickly produce a nuclear weapon.

Most laughable are the ''anytime, anywhere'' inspections. In fact, the agreement grants the Iranians 24 days to allow the IAEA access to undeclared nuclear facilities. This gives Iran ample opportunity to cheat and continue its march toward a nuclear weapon. We have also learned that the Iranians will be able to provide their own samples from their military base at Parchin to international inspectors. This is essentially asking the fox to guard the henhouse.

I also have great concerns about what happens once sanctions are lifted and billions of dollars are flowing back into Iran. While the UN Security Council resolutions allegedly prevent Iran from shipping arms to terrorist organizations such as Hamas and Hezbollah, and to Assad in Syria, nothing prevents them from sending money. In an incredibly dangerous concession, the U.S. even agreed to shorten the length of the arms embargo against Iran. There is no question that this will negatively impact regional stability as well as the U.S. Navy's access to the Persian Gulf. An article in the Washington Post pointed out that the funds available to Iran immediately upon implementation of this deal would equate to approximately 10% of its GDP. That would be equivalent to a $1.7 trillion injection into our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this agreement will prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. I believe it will do just the opposite. In no way should a country that vows to wipe Israel off the map and chants ''Death to America'' be allowed nuclear capabilities. Today marks a turning point for the future of one of our greatest allies, Israel. If this deal goes through, President Obama and Democrats in Congress will own the consequences of allowing the Iranian regime to become a nuclear power.

We can and must have a better deal. A deal that truly allows for anytime/anywhere inspections. A deal that would keep restrictions on Iran's nuclear program for decades. A deal that forces Iran to end its missile development program. A deal that allows Iran truly limited enrichment capability. A deal that releases U.S. hostages in Iran. It is a catastrophic failure that President Obama did not insist on these provisions in the nuclear deal. We should be embarrassed that as the leader of the free world and the most powerful country on earth, this is the best deal President Obama could negotiate.

We have been presented with a false choice of accepting this deal or going to war. We should reject this deal and return to work, not to war. We cannot allow the sanctions to be lifted, we must reject approval of the deal and we must have all the information—including side agreements—before the clock can begin on the deal. I urge my colleagues to stand with our ally Israel and with the American people. The consequences of these votes are truly life and death.

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

SPEECH OF

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, over the past two years, the U.S., Britain, France, Germany, China, and Russia have been negotiating with Iran in order to stop Iran's nuclear weapons capability. On July 14, the international coalition announced that an agreement had been reached. This week Congress will get a chance to vote on the agreement.

I have carefully studied the text of the agreement, attended classified briefings, reviewed classified documents compiled by intelligence agencies, listened to the thoughts and concerns of Wisconsinites, and met with experts on both sides of the issue, including

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu during a recent trip to Israel.

Although the agreement is not a perfect solution to a complex problem, I believe the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) is the best option to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Before negotiations began, Iran was steadily improving its nuclear weapon capability. It was estimated by our intelligence community that Iran was only a few months away from developing a bomb, which is unacceptable.

Under terms of the agreement, Iran must significantly dismantle its nuclear program. Iran's uranium stockpile will be greatly reduced, its number of nuclear enrichment centrifuges cut by two thirds, and its advanced centrifuge research and development severely limited. A group of our nation's top nuclear scientists praised the technical terms of the agreement and argued that it provides assurance that Iran will not develop a nuclear weapon in the next decade.

Iran's history of cheating on agreements, such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, has fostered an environment of distrust, which is why this agreement is based on ''distrust and verify.'' The agreement will be enforced and monitored by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) with our help and resources. The inspection regimen is unprecedented, and most experts believe that it would be very difficult for Iran to cheat without detection. Should Iran fail to comply with the agreement, the sanctions that forced Iran to the negotiating table will ''snap back'' into place. The president has made clear that no options are taken off the table under this agreement.

The JCPOA is not perfect. I have serious concerns with some aspects of the agreement, especially the prospect of Iran receiving billions in sanctions relief that may be used for nefarious purposes. We must continue to enhance the security of Israel and other allies in the region. It is important to make it clear to Iran and the international community that Israel's security is our security.

Given the rhetoric coming from some in Iran and its behavior in the region, Israel is understandably skeptical of any agreement with Iranian leaders. But after speaking to opponents of the agreement, including Netanyahu, I have yet to hear a viable alternative that will maintain an international coalition to continue economic sanctions or support preemptive military action if needed.

It is easier to deal with an Iran without a nuclear weapon than trying to work backwards once Iran has manufactured a weapon. This agreement gives us the best opportunity to avoid military action and may accomplish our ultimate objective: to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, protecting the security of our allies in the region, and avoiding a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF EBBY HALLIDAY ACERS

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of an outstanding citizen and entrepreneur, Ebby Halliday Acers. She passed away on the evening of September 8th surrounded by friends and family at the age of 104.

Ebby was learning tools of her trade before she was 10 years old, selling skin ointment house to house as a child in Kansas. It wasn't long before she had a firm grasp on the importance of customer service. During the Great Depression she supported her family by selling merchandise and, due to her success, she was transferred to Dallas, Texas, as a department manager at the W.A. Green Store in 1938. While words can't begin to portray the profound and long lasting positive impact she had on North Texas in the business sector and local communities, she will be greatly missed.

In 1945 Ebby Halliday Realtors was founded. Over the years, this once-developing business turned into the 10th largest independently owned residential real estate services company in the nation, and the largest in Texas. The company was involved in approximately 19,200 real estate transactions with 1,700 sales associates in 2014. On top of Ebby's business accomplishments, she was very involved in the community. She was a devoted volunteer, educator, supporter of foster children, and wonderful leader.

In 2014, Ebby's Place, which houses a new women's center, and The Ebby House, which is a community for young women to transition out of foster care due to age, were announced. While Ebby didn't have any children, she cared for and helped educate the children of the community. She was involved in many different foundations and organizations such as the Thanksgiving Square foundation, St. Paul Medical foundation, The Dallas County Community College District foundation, Alexis de Tocqueville Society for United Way, State Fair of Texas, and many more.

While her community work spoke for itself, she also received much praise and recognition from multiple associations, the city of Dallas, and the state of Texas. She received the Distinguished Service Award from the National Association of Realtors, was inducted into the Dallas Business Hall of Fame, and earned the Regional Entrepreneur of the Year Award from Ernst & Young. Business and community work weren't her only passions; she always spoke wonders of her husband Maurice Acers. They met by chance on a local business trip; Maurice was a lawyer and former FBI agent.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to celebrate the life of the incredible Ebby Halliday Acers. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in celebrating her remarkable life and service to North Texas and the country.

TRIBUTE TO LUCILLE ALBRIGHT

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate a very special Iowan—Lucille Albright on the celebration of her 106th birthday on Monday, September 14th.

Lucille has lived a wonderful life and her friends and family are very quick to share some of the collective stories and memories that have made up her 106 years. Stories like the time she went on a double date with a friend whose date was future U.S. President Ronald Reagan. They have told me memories of her bus trips to take in a baseball game or visit the raceway and casino near Des Moines. And, her friends and family have noted her strong faith and active membership of Westminster Presbyterian Church in Beaverdale.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Lucille's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Lucille has lived through nineteen United States Presidents and twenty-three Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Lucille in the United States Congress because she is a shining example of Iowa values. I know that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating her on reaching this incredible milestone, and wishing her much health and happiness on this very special occasion.

MOZELLE ADAMSON

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mozelle Adamson.

Mozelle was born May 4, 1934 in Temple, TX to Charles and Rosa Kelly. She graduated from Lampasas High School in 1952 where she was a twirler, drum major and queen of the Future Homemakers Association. After high school Mozelle lived in Waco with her sister and attended business school before marrying Dean Adamson January 4, 1957. Together they raised three children: Mike, Pat, and Brenda. They lived in Killeen where Mozelle was a homemaker to the family while Dean worked in the automotive and real estate industries.

Mozelle was an active member of her community where she served on the Metroplex Hospital Foundation board for many years and was an avid supporter of the Killeen Jr. Livestock Show, Children's Rehabilitation Center in Belton, the Republican Party, Vive Les Arts, and was a member of the Beta Sigma Phi sorority. Mozelle also attended church with her family at the Youngsport Church of Christ.

Family and friends were Mozelle's passion and delight, leaving a lasting impression on all who's lives she touched. A true lady in every sense of the word, Mozelle loved to travel and spend time with her family. Mozelle spent countless weekends with her friends and family at area lakes Buchanan, Belton, and Inks where she enjoyed fishing and boating.

Mozelle is preceded in death by her parents, husband, and her brothers, Archie Kelly and Charles Kelly, and sister Katherine Jenkins.

Mozelle is survived by her son Mike and wife Cindy Adamson of Killeen, son Pat Adamson of Belton, and daughter Brenda Gonyea and husband Mike of Killeen, ten grandchildren, and one great-granddaughter.

Her pallbearers were Kim Kelly, Mark Kelly, Lan Kelly, Chuck Jenkins, Kelly Joe Jenkins, and Butch Kelly. Honorary pallbearers were Gerald Skidmore Jr. and Richard Dean Littlefield.

TEXAS HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 1508

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make it known that the Texas House of Representatives through Robert Haney, the Chief Clerk of the House, has adopted House Resolution No. 1508 by King of Uvalde. This resolution expresses support for the use of sound science to study and regulate modern agricultural technologies, as well as supporting opposition to legislative or regulatory action that may result in unnecessary restrictions on the technologies.

And that's just the way it is.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, A sustainable agricultural system is crucial to the continued production of food, feed, and fiber to meet both domestic and global demand; and

Whereas, In the United States, the agriculture and food production industries employ precision farming equipment, crop protection chemistries, genetic engineering or enhancement, agricultural nutrients, and other modern technologies; such advanced practices protect the safety of the public and reduce environmental impact while expanding yields, improving profitability, and ensuring an abundant and affordable food supply; and

Whereas, Agricultural pests present significant dangers to the industry and to global supplies of the products they attack; accordingly, the environmental risks of forgoing advances in agricultural technologies that protect crops are severe; excessive regulation may scuttle or discourage the use of agricultural chemicals that could improve human welfare; and

Whereas, Crop protection is among the most studied and highly regulated of all industries, at both the state and federal levels; the use of sound science should be the bedrock of our nation's regulatory scheme for the agriculture and food production industries, as these industries are critical to the economic vitality of Texas and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby express support for the use of sound science to study and regulate such modern agricultural technologies as crop protection chemistries, genetically engineered or enhanced traits, and nutrients; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Texas House of Representatives express opposition to legislative or regulatory action at any level that may result in unnecessary restrictions on the use of modern agricultural technologies; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to all the members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably was not present on September 10, 2015 to vote in Roll Call vote numbers 491 and 492. Had I been present, I would have voted no on H. Res. 412, providing for consideration of H. Res. 411, H.R. 3461, and H.R. 3460, and no on H. Res. 411, finding that the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015.

RECOGNIZING VETERANS' VOICES AWARD RECIPIENT SHELBY MARIE HADLEY

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Shelby Marie Hadley of Rice for receiving a Veterans' Voice "On the Rise" Award.

Serving in the Minnesota Army National Guard as an Air Traffic Controller, Shelby was deployed to Bosnia in 2003 and to Iraq in 2008.

Shelby has not only served her country abroad, but here at home as well. She is very active with the St. Cloud area veterans and her community as a whole. She spends time working with various organizations including the Wounded Warrior Project and Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central Minnesota.

In addition to her volunteer work, Shelby has taken her story to the stage and performed in Telling: Minnesota 2015 at the Guthrie Theatre, where she shared the story of her military service. Shelby has a bachelor's degree from St. Cloud State University and is set to complete her MBA program this month.

I would like to thank Shelby for all that she has contributed to her country and community. Your hard work has not gone unnoticed and this award is well-deserved. Good job and keep up the excellent work.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 490 I was unable to be present to vote due to a personal family matter.

Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 1215 BY CAPRIGLIONE

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution as a memorial.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The Transportation Security Administration currently excludes concealed handgun licenses (CHL) from its list of valid forms of identification, causing an inconvenience for the agency as well as for many travelers; and

Whereas, Acquiring a CHL from the Texas Department of Public Safety is a rigorous procedure that requires applicants to submit to a criminal history background check and provide a valid driver's license or identification card and residential and employment information; these measures ensure that CHL holders are law-abiding citizens whose identities have been verified; and

Whereas, A CHL is such a trusted proof of identification that it is accepted for voter registration and many other governmental processes; and

Whereas, Permitting the use of CHLs as valid forms of identification would help advance the TSA's mission of safeguarding our national transportation system and protecting the American public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby urge the Congress of the United States to instruct the Transportation Security Administration to accept concealed handgun licenses as valid forms of identification; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the Texas House of Representatives forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, and to all members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the reguest that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

TEXAS HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 1215

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make it known that the Texas House of Representatives through Robert Haney, the Chief Clerk of the House, has adopted House Resolution No. 1215 by Capriglione. This resolution petitions Congress to instruct the Transportation Security Administration to accept concealed handgun licensees as valid forms of identification.

And that's just the way it is.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The Transportation Security Administration currently excludes concealed handgun licenses (CHL) from its list of valid forms of identification, causing an inconvenience for the agency as well as for many travelers; and

Whereas, Acquiring a CHL from the Texas Department of Public Safety is a rigorous procedure that requires applicants to submit to a criminal history background check and provide a valid driver's license or identification card and residential and employment information; these measures ensure that CHL holders are law-abiding citizens whose identities have been verified; and

Whereas, A CHL is such a trusted proof of identification that it is accepted for voter registration and many other governmental processes; and

Whereas, Permitting the use of CHLs as valid forms of identification would help advance the TSA's mission of safeguarding our national transportation system and protecting the American public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby urge the Congress of the United States to instruct the Transportation Security Administration to accept concealed handgun licenses as valid forms of identification; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the Texas House of Representatives forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, and to all members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING VETERANS' VOICES AWARD RECIPIENT RALPH DONAIS

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ralph Donais of Elk River for receiving a Veterans' Voices Legacy Award.

Ralph served in the Marine Corps from 1964 to 1994 and retired as an Aviation Avionics Chief. During his service, Ralph fought for our country while being deployed for two tours in Vietnam. Ralph's efforts earned him the Meritorious Service Medal along with numerous other awards.

Ralph's commitment to his country and his fellow veterans did not end once he returned to Elk River. Ralph has been involved in the United Veterans Legislative Council of Minnesota and served as chair of the council as well. He also spends time at the Minnesota Capitol to inform and educate legislators as well as testifying in committees regarding issues important to the veterans community.

Additionally, Ralph is a member of many organizations including the Marine Corps League, and the Fleet Reserve Association. Another organization that Ralph is involved with is the Enlisted Association where he has served as Chapter President. Elk River's Beyond the Yellow Ribbon program, which lends a helping hand to veterans and members of our military before, during and after deployments, was started by Ralph and he remains an active member.

Ralph's involvement in his community extends beyond his work with veterans. He lends his vocal talents by serving on the Board of Directors of the North Star Boys Choir and as a member of the St. Andrew Choir.

I would like to congratulate Ralph for receiving this award, but I would also like to commend him for all that he has done for his country and the Elk River community. It takes an extraordinary person to accomplish all that he has, and I am proud to recognize him here today.

65TH ANNIVERSARY OF OPERATION CHROMITE

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday, September 15, will mark the 65th anniversary of Operation Chromite, better known as the Incheon Landing. This decisive invasion and the battle which ensued marked a key turning point at the outset of the Korean War in 1950.

My father, Thomas W. Reed, was a veteran of the Korean War, serving as an ammunition officer with the U.S. Army's 45th and 25th Infantry Divisions. He fought alongside brave South Korean soldiers who were struggling to save their homeland from the onslaught of communism.

For 65 years since, the United States and the Republic of Korea have continued to stand shoulder to shoulder in strength and solidarity to defend freedom, democracy, market capitalism, human rights and the rule of law on the Korean Peninsula. Indeed, our alliance, which was forged on the battlefield, has become a "blood alliance."

I had the privilege of visiting South Korea in April 2011 and the trip left a lasting impression. It was particularly meaningful for me to have been able to visit the Korean War Memorial and Exhibition in Seoul, to lay a wreath and to pray and reflect. My visit served as a humbling and sobering reminder of the cost of freedom that was paid 65 years ago through the service and sacrifice of all Korean War veterans.

I also witnessed firsthand economic prosperity and industrial prowess in Korea that never could have been imagined when my father was there in the 1950's.

Today, Korea ranks as the world's thirteenth-largest economy, the sixth-largest trading partner of the United States, the fifth-largest market for agricultural goods, and the third-largest destination for U.S. foreign direct investment in the Asia-Pacific region. Bilateral trade between our two nations averages about $80 billion each year, further cemented by the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement.

In the 23rd congressional district of New York, which I am privileged to represent, farmers, small business owners, and larger firms are already benefiting from the KORUS FTA. Of note, there are more than 140 family-owned wineries in the area around my hometown, and several of them are enjoying increased exports due to tariff eliminations.

My district is also home to Corning Incorporated, which launched a joint venture with Samsung in 1995 to form Samsung Corning Precision Materials. SCPM is now a global leader in the development and supply of LCD glass substrates.

For so many reasons, Korea constitutes one of America's greatest foreign policy success stories in the post-World War II era. Korea is not only an indispensable ally and friend but serves as the linchpin of regional peace and stability in Northeast Asia.

To this end, Korean President Park Geunhye will be visiting Washington in mid-October. Her visit is a timely and meaningful one, and I offer my expression of welcome and support for a productive and successful trip.

I recall President Park's Address to a Joint Meeting of the Congress on May 8, 2013 when she eloquently stated that "our chorus of freedom and peace, of future and hope, has not ceased to resonate over the last 60 years and will not cease to go on."

I further applaud and support President Park's vision and goals as articulated in her Dresden Address in March of last year on South-North reunification, including a proposal to create an International Peace Park at the DMZ. In addition, the Northeast Asia Peace and Cooperation Initiative (NAPCI) will be an important means to promoting regional peace and prosperity through a trust-building process.

In the post-KORUS FTA implementation era, there are several ways we can continue to enhance our bilateral economic relationship. First, I have supported the Partner with Korea Act, authored by my friend and colleague, PETER ROSKAM, to provide up to 15,000 temporary professional visas for Korean nationals. Second, I support the renewal of the U.S.-Korea Civilian Nuclear Energy Agreement which was signed on June 15, 2015. Third, I support Korea's Creative Economy action plan to enhance mutual competitiveness in the global marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S.-Korea alliance is at its strongest ever and yet our alliance will continue to be tested as was evidenced in light of recent North Korean provocations. It is important we remain ever vigilant and resolute in our alliance to counter any and all threats that could lead to instability on the Korean Peninsula. In the Congress, I will do all I can to support and defend our great ally and friend—the Republic of Korea—and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

HONORING HELEN BURNS JACKSON

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of Mrs. Helen Burns Jackson, the mother of Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson. Rev. Jackson often spoke of his love, his appreciation and close relationship with his mother and my heart goes out to him and the entire Jackson and Burns families. Of course, Mrs. Jackson was, on her part, justly proud of her sons. In her family and her life she leaves a mighty legacy for all of America. The entire Jackson and Burns families are in my prayers in this time of bereavement.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 1605 BY FAIRCLOTH

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution as a memorial.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing is a problem with serious economic, environmental, and security implications; and

Whereas, Illegal fishing accounts for economic losses of billions of dollars per year globally, and millions of those lost dollars result from poaching in the Gulf of Mexico; such activity is largely conducted by foreign fleets at the expense of United States fishermen, coastal communities, and the sustainability of global fish stocks; and

Whereas, Illegal fishing is of particular consequence in Texas, where the Gulf Coast waters supply seafood for the American public and support the hospitality industry, tourism-related businesses, and the vibrant recreational and commercial fishing industry; not only does illegal fishing result in economic losses to the Texas fishing industry and other coastal businesses, but it also is a threat to the sustainability of our fisheries and to the Texas Gulf Coast ecosystem; and

Whereas, The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and the United States Coast Guard are to be commended for their partnership in investigating and apprehending foreign vessels engaged in illegal activity along the Texas-Mexico border; and

Whereas, Foreign nationals fishing illegally in U.S. waters compete for local stock, and they disregard state and federal laws on catch limits; when they sell their fish in the United States, they can flood the market with a cheaper product; moreover, they often use banned longline netting that imperils marine mammals and sea turtles; and

Whereas, Vessels involved with illegal fishing are also associated with, other crimes, including drug trafficking, human trafficking, and illegal immigration, and the incursion by these foreign fishing vessels into U.S. waters constitutes a violation of our sovereignty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby express its commitment to the elimination of illegal fishing, to the long-term conservation of Texas marine resources, and to the protection of the Texas Gulf Coast fishing and coastal communities; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Texas House of Representatives hereby respectfully urge the United States Congress to take action to protect our coastal borders and to end illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing in our sovereign waters; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to all members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING HARKLESS H. HUTCHINGS

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Harkless H. Hutchings, who passed away on August 1, 2015 at the age of 98. As a Colonel in the Ohio National Guard, I appreciate his dedicated service to his country during World War II.

Harkless was born in Rhodell, West Virginia on July 31, 1917. He attended Byrd-Prillerman High School in Amigo, West Virginia. Throughout his life, he attended many high school reunions to reacquaint with old friends.

Harkless began his service in World War II in the Army and later went into the Air Force. He fought bravely in the Pacific Islands throughout World War II. Harkless tragically stepped on a landmine causing him to lose 80 percent of his hearing and sustain severe injuries to his feet. Harkless was sent to a special hospital in Arizona to treat his injuries. During his time in Arizona, he met many famous film stars of his era, including Clark Gable, Bette Davis and Joan Crawford.

Harkless lived an extraordinary life of service to his community and country.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill and the underlying Iran nuclear agreement.

Despite entering these negotiations from a position of strength, the deal before us fails to achieve the goal of preventing Iran's capacity to develop a nuclear weapon. It simply contains or manages Iran's nuclear program.

By agreeing to a lax enforcement and inspection regime and fanciful, unrealistic "snap back" sanctions, the Administration has accepted that Iran should remain one year away from a nuclear bomb. I am not prepared to accept that.

The sanctions relief will provide Iran with billions of dollars—funds that will bolster the Revolutionary Guard and non-state militant groups.

This deal ends the conventional arms embargo and the prohibition on ballistic missile technology. Not only will this result in conventional arms flowing to groups like Hezbollah, it concedes the delivery system for a nuclear bomb.

This agreement will provide Iran with a nuclear infrastructure, a missile delivery system, and the funds to pay for it all.

By the way, the "I" in "ICBM" means "intercontinental." I don't believe that New Zealand and Mexico are the intended targets. The target would be us.

This deal cripples and shatters our current notion of nuclear non-proliferation. If Iran can enrich uranium, which they can do under this agreement, their Gulf Arab neighbors will likely do the same.

I do not want a nuclear arms race in the Middle East—a region of state instability and irrational non-state actors. And how will deterrence work under this scenario? I don't want to find out.

We should not reward the Ayatollahs with billions of dollars and sophisticated weapons in exchange for temporary and unenforceable nuclear restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, I have always supported a diplomatic solution to the Iran nuclear issue, but this is a dangerously weak agreement, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

TEXAS ADOPTED HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 1835

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make it known that the Texas House of Representatives through Robert Haney, the Chief Clerk of the House, has adopted House Resolution No. 1835 by Capriglione. This resolution expresses support for the implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System.

And that's just the way it is.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Many airports, especially those in congested urban areas, are near or over their capacities, and such inadequate infrastructure causes long delays, reduced customer service, negative impacts on the economy, and bottlenecks throughout our entire national air transportation system; and

Whereas, Implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen) would help make air travel even safer and more convenient and environmentally friendly by enhancing the efficiency of airports and airspace procedures; and

Whereas, The long list of airport improvements encompassed in NextGen includes performance-based navigation flight procedures, improved surface management systems, reduced aircraft exhaust emissions, and technology upgrades that bolster all-weather access to airports; and

Whereas, Airport operators must be involved in the development of NextGen capabilities in and around their airports from inception to execution to ensure noise and other environmental factors that affect their communities are appropriately considered; and

Whereas, The latest Future Airport Capacity Task study prepared by the FAA indicates that many of the nation's busiest airports, including George Bush International Airport in Houston, will require new runways to meet projected capacity needs in the coming years even with NextGen, and these findings highlight the critical importance of taking all reasonable steps to reduce airport congestion; and

Whereas, Airports across the nation are ready to work with the FAA, industry partners, the communities they serve, and the U.S. Congress to implement NextGen in order to equip our air transportation system to meet the demands of the 21st century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby express its support for the implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the administrator of

the Federal Aviation Administration, to the president of the Senate and speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to all the members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING VETERANS' VOICES AWARD RECIPIENT MEGAN ALLEN

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Megan Allen of Ramsey for receiving a Veterans' Voices "On the Rise" Award.

At the age of seventeen, Megan enlisted in the Army National Guard and went on to serve two tours of duty in Iraq. Her twelve years of service in the National Guard has had a huge impact on Megan and inspired her to work to better her community. Megan currently spends an enormous amount of time volunteering for multiple organizations throughout the Twin Cities and metro areas striving to better the lives of the homeless communities and children in the area.

Among many non-profits Megan works with, she is most passionate about Girls on the Run, a program that promotes self-confidence and healthy choices for young girls. But this isn't the only program she helps. Megan also supports the Beyond the Line Yellow Ribbon Network, which lends a helping hand to veterans and members of our military before, during and after deployments.

I thank Megan for everything that she has done and continues to do for her community. Minnesota is a better place because of Megan, and she is truly deserving of this award.

RECOGNIZING ISAIAH CASINTAHAN

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to congratulate Isaiah Casintahan on his essay, "The Day that Launched a Better Future," published in the 70th Anniversary of the End of World War II program for recognition of the Japanese surrender documents signing on the deck of the USS *Missouri*, I was honored to be a member of the Bipartisan Congressional Delegation led by Congressman RANDY FORBES and Congressman JOE COURTNEY of Connecticut to Pearl Harbor.

September 2, 2015, commemorates the 70th Anniversary to the end of hostilities between the United States and Japan. Over the past decades, Japan and America have built a strong relationship of trust and continue to work together to ensure a more peaceful world. Congratulations to Isaiah for discussing the history of this important relationship between our two nations.

BATTLESHIP MISSOURI MEMORIAL'S SEPTEMBER 2ND ESSAY CONTEST WINNER: ISAIAH CASINTAHAN, JAMES CAMPBELL HIGH SCHOOL

"THE DAY THAT LAUNCHED A BETTER FUTURE"

On December 7, 1941, Pearl Harbor was taken by surprise as hundreds of Japanese planes attacked the area. "A date which will live in infamy," as said by President Franklin Roosevelt in the wake of the attack. Following the tragedies of Pearl Harbor, the war continued where in August, 1945, the United States dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki; the first and last instances of nuclear weapons in war. About a month later, the war was brought to an official end when "Japanese officials (had) signed the act of unconditional surrender," aboard the USS Missouri, anchored at Tokyo Bay. The ship now sits moored in Pearl Harbor, facing the USS Arizona, as one of the bookends of that war. This year commemorates the 70th Anniversary to the end of hostilities, and though 70 years have passed, it is still of great relevance today. As peace was made on September 2, 1945, it is indeed "the day that launched a better future" between our nations.

But what exactly does an 'better future' entail for us? What has it meant for our nations? In past times, friction and distrust were present as our countries were at war, or dealing with the traumas thereafter. Both of our nations suffered from a great deal of losses as we endured the consequences of war. The attack on Pearl Harbor took the lives of over 2,500 people and wounded as many as 1,000 others. The bombing of Hiroshima "wiped out 90 percent of the city and immediately killed 80,000 people," thousands later dying of radiation exposure. The n 'better future' that we live in today is a world no longer at war, but one enduring the peace between us.

Since the end of World War II, the United States and Japan have relied on each other as allies to recover from the repercussions of war. Over the past decades, we have worked together in order to mend the once frayed relationship between our nations and have built a stronger foundation for peace. For example, after Japan's defeat the United States "led the Allies in the occupation and rehabilitation of the Japanese state. Between 1945 and 1952, the U.S. occupying forces, led by General Douglas A. MacArthur, enacted widespread military, political, economic, and social reforms." These reforms improved economy by setting democratic standards to help those in poverty and implemented a new constitution that would improve the social and political systems by the same standards. Though some changes were reverted back after the Americans left, most are still in effect and support the peace between our nations today.

In addition our nations trust has been heavily reinforced since peace was rooted between us 70 years ago. Our trust for one another continues to evidently grow, as in recent news, the United States and Japan have proposed a new military agreement, in which Japan's military will have a more active role in global defense, bringing our nations closer. The proposal would allow Japan, "To defend regional allies that come under attack, a change that means Japanese missile defense systems could be used to intercept any weapons launched toward the United States." In other words, Japan could be taking part in aiding our defense. This is a big jump in Japan's military relations, as their military powers were limited under the new constitution implemented after World War II. It is found in Article 9 of their constitution that, "renounces war and prohibits Japan from maintaining the war potential." Though changes were already made so that Japan could maintain their defense, the new proposal demonstrates the ample amount of trust that our nations now share and how our nations are moving forward through mutual respect.

In conclusion, since the end of World War II, our nations today have secured a strong relationship that has brought us into better days. The day that has launched us into our future, September 2, 1945, has allowed our nations to endure peace, no longer a World at War. The site of Pearl Harbor where we faced sorrowful losses, and the site of the USS Missouri, where we established peace, remind us why we must safeguard our peace, free from the tragedies of war.

COMMEMORATING THE SMITHSONIAN ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center as it celebrates its fiftieth anniversary this year.

Since 1965, SERC has been the nation's leading research center for understanding coastal zones and the environmental issues they face. With coastal zones home to more than 70% of the world's people, SERC has been at the forefront of monitoring and studying these zones' unique ecosystems and the different factors that affect their health.

While their main research focuses on the areas of climate change, invasive species, biodiversity, land use, and pollution, SERC personnel are also involved in preparing the next generation of environmental scientists. Over the years, SERC has provided learning opportunities for students from kindergarten all the way through the post-doctoral level, partnering with over 150 colleges and universities to conduct professional training and a variety of hands-on experiences in the field.

Headquartered on the Chesapeake Bay in Maryland's Fifth District, SERC encompasses more than 2,650 acres of land and twelve miles of protected shoreline. The scientists at SERC use this shoreline as a natural laboratory and model for long-term ecological research to study the way terrestrial, aquatic, and atmospheric components interact in complex ecosystems.

In 2009, I was a proud cosponsor of legislation that authorized a $41 million expansion and renovation of SERC's Mathias Laboratory, the Smithsonian's first LEED-Platinum building. This sustainable research lab provides a larger space and more flexibility for scientists to explore cutting edge research in an environmentally responsible way. I had the privilege of attending the ribbon cutting ceremony for the lab's reopening last year.

I am proud to celebrate this anniversary and ask that my colleagues join me in commending the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center for its contributions to our understanding of coastal environments and climate change—and saluting those who continue to carry out its important mission.

POLICE SHOOTINGS

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks we've seen a disturbing rash of violence against law enforcement officers around our nation.

Our nation's Blue Line—the first responders, local, state, federal police and law enforcement professionals—often represent the height of both heroism and humility. Each day they leave their families with the possibility that they might not return home—as happened to my great-uncle Philip who was killed in the line of duty in New York City.

Today, each of us can understand that events across our nation have brought about a period of great tension. And, while there is a conversation that we can have as Americans about law enforcement in 2015, the shared objective cannot be realized if we allow hate, demagoguery or violence to dehumanize any person—least of all those officers who serve our communities.

Together, we can address the challenges our nation faces head on—without partisanship, division or hate. But that will take leadership—including leadership from the President who cannot, nor should not, remain silent in the wake of these attacks.

I stand with our nation's Blue Line and we can overcome our challenges together.

TEXAS HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 1605

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make it known that the Texas House of Representatives through Robert Haney, the Chief Clerk of the House, has adopted House Resolution No. 1605 by Faircloth. This resolution expresses a commitment to the elimination of illegal fishing and urges Congress to end illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing in our sovereign waters.

And that's just the way it is.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing is a problem with serious economic, environmental, and security implications; and

Whereas, Illegal fishing accounts for economic losses of billions of dollars per year globally, and millions of those lost dollars result from poaching in the Gulf of Mexico; such activity is largely conducted by foreign fleets at the expense of United States fishermen, coastal communities, and the sustainability of global fish stocks; and

Whereas, Illegal fishing is of particular consequence in Texas, where the Gulf Coast waters supply seafood for the American public and support the hospitality industry, tourism-related businesses, and the vibrant recreational and commercial fishing industry; not only does illegal fishing result in economic losses to the Texas fishing industry and other coastal businesses, but it also is a threat to the sustainability of our fisheries and to the Texas Gulf Coast ecosystem; and

Whereas, The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and the United States Coast Guard are to be commended for their partnership in investigating and apprehending foreign vessels engaged in illegal activity along the Texas-Mexico border; and

Whereas, Foreign nationals fishing illegally in U.S. waters compete for local stock, and they disregard state and federal laws on catch limits; when they sell their fish in the United States, they can flood the market with a cheaper product; moreover, they often use banned longline netting that imperils marine mammals and sea turtles; and

Whereas, Vessels involved with illegal fishing are also associated with other crimes, including drug trafficking, human trafficking, and illegal immigration, and the incursion by these foreign fishing vessels into U.S. waters constitutes a violation of our sovereignty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby express its commitment to the elimination of illegal fishing, to the long-term conservation of Texas marine resources, and to the protection of the Texas Gulf Coast fishing and coastal communities; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Texas House of Representatives hereby respectfully urge the United States Congress to take action to protect our coastal borders and to end illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing in our sovereign waters; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to all members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,151,085,083,623.06. We've added $7,524,208,034,709.98 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING VETERANS' VOICES AWARD RECIPIENT SCOTT GLEW

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Scott Glew of Elk River for receiving a Veterans' Voices "On the Rise" Award.

Scott spent eight years in the Minnesota Army National Guard and was deployed to Iraq. Scott strongly believes that if we encourage students across the country to become more informed and active citizens, we can improve the future of our country. To act on this, Scott decided to begin his career as a social studies teacher following his service to our country.

Scott has not let his passion for education stop at the classroom door. He is an active leader within his school district and serves on the Board of Directors for both the Minnesota Council for History Education and the Minnesota Council for the Social Studies. Additionally, Scott is currently in graduate school at the University of Minnesota researching citizenship and peace.

I admire Scott for everything that he has done to better this country and his community. He is the exact type of person who should be teaching because he is the epitome of an excellent role model. I thank him for his service and for helping educate Minnesota's children. Scott—well done and keep up the amazing work.

LT. CALVIN SPANN

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Calvin Spann, who passed away this last Sunday, September 6, 2015 at his home in Allen, Texas.

Lt. Spann was born on November 28, 1924 and grew up in Rutherford, NJ. While growing up near the local Teterboro Airport, he was inspired to fly. He learned about the physics of flying while a student at Rutherford High School, and at eighteen he volunteered for the U.S. Army Air Corps in the heat of World War II to pursue his dream of flying.

It was in 1943 at Tuskegee, Alabama that Lt. Spann started his aviation cadet training. Not only did he withstand a brutal and rigorous training program, he overcame a selective quota system at a time when all branches of the U.S. Armed Services were segregated. He was determined and focused to earn his wings. Soon after, he was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant.

He was sent to Italy as a replacement combat pilot and joined hundreds of other black men that would comprise the famed Tuskegee Airmen. Created in 1940, the all-black flying unit was a result of Public Law 18, which established civilian pilot training programs at 166 colleges and universities across the country. This law eventually led to the expansion of the Army Air Corps.

Lt. Spann was a member of the elite 100th Fighter Squadron, part of the 332nd Fighter Group and piloted the powerful P–51 Mustang. His service as a fighter pilot included 26 combat missions over Nazi controlled Germany. He participated in the longest bomber escort mission in the 15th Air Force history: a 1,600-mile, round trip mission, from Ramitelli, Italy, to Berlin with the objective of destroying the Daimler-Benz manufacturing plant.

As public opinion toward the Tuskegee Airman changed, Lt. Spann's accomplishments finally came to light. The discrimination he faced during training contrasted greatly with the praise he received from the bombers, whom he escorted. Through his service and

the prestige of the Tuskegee Airmen, Lt. Spann was proud to have played a part in President Harry Truman's decision in 1948 to abolish segregation in all branches of the U.S. military.

Lt. Spann returned home as a decorated war veteran. He received the Air Medal, the Presidential Unit Citation, the World War II Victory Medal, the American Campaign Ribbon, and the European/African/Middle Eastern Campaign Ribbon for his honorable and courageous service.

After leaving active duty in 1946, Lt. Spann wanted to become a commercial pilot. However, he was confronted with racial discrimination in the airline industry and never received his chance to fly again. It wasn't until 1963 that the U.S. Supreme Court ordered major commercial airlines to hire African-American pilots. Lt. Spann was inducted into the New Jersey Aviation Hall of Fame at Teterboro Airport in 2006. In 2007, he was among the Tuskegee Airmen who were collectively given the Congressional Gold Medal by President George W. Bush.

It is an honor for me to represent the 9th Congressional District of New Jersey, which includes Lt. Spann's hometown of Rutherford. He leaves a legacy that is truly a story of his times, a story of heroism and courage even in the face of his own countrymen who tried to keep him out of the air. In the end, Lt. Calvin Spann became a fighter pilot who defended our nation in its ultimate struggle, truly the epitome of our 'greatest generation.'

The job of a United States Congressman involves much that is rewarding, yet nothing compares to recognizing and commemorating the life achievements of individuals such as Lt. Calvin Spann.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, Lt. Spann's family and friends, all those whose lives he has touched, and me, in recognizing the life of Lieutenant Calvin Spann.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 1835 BY CAPRIGLIONE

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution as a memorial.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Many airports, especially those in congested urban areas, are near or over their capacities, and such inadequate infrastructure causes long delays, reduced customer service, negative impacts on the economy, and bottlenecks throughout our entire national air transportation system; and

Whereas, Implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen) would help make air travel even safer and more convenient and environmentally friendly by enhancing the efficiency of airports and airspace procedures; and

Whereas, The long list of airport improvements encompassed in NextGen includes performance-based navigation flight procedures, improved surface management systems, reduced aircraft exhaust emissions, and technology upgrades that bolster all-weather access to airports; and

Whereas, Airport operators must be involved in the development of NextGen capabilities in and around their airports from inception to execution to ensure noise and other environmental factors that affect their communities are appropriately considered; and

Whereas, The latest Future Airport Capacity Task study prepared by the FAA indicates that many of the nation's busiest airports, including George Bush International Airport in Houston, will require new runways to meet projected capacity needs in the coming years even with NextGen, and these findings highlight the critical importance of taking all reasonable steps to reduce airport congestion; and

Whereas, Airports across the nation are ready to work with the FAA, industry partners, the communities they serve, and the U.S. Congress to implement NextGen in order to equip our air transportation system to meet the demands of the 21st century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby express its support for the implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to hold the administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, to the president of the Senate and speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to all the members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING VETERANS' VOICES AWARD RECIPIENT BOB DETTMER

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate State Representative, and former colleague of mine, Bob Dettmer of Forest Lake for being named a recipient of the Veterans' Voices Legacy Award.

Bob served his country in the United States Army Reserve and is a 25-year veteran. He was a Military Intelligence Warrant Officer and served on active duty in both "Operation Enduring Freedom" and "Operation Iraqi Freedom."

In addition to his military service, Bob has served as a teacher and head wrestling coach at Forest Lake High School for 34 years.

In 2006, Bob was elected to the Minnesota State House of Representatives, where he is currently serving as the Chair of the Veterans Affairs Division. He has also worked tirelessly on several veterans' bills.

Outside of his work representing his district in the Minnesota Legislature, Bob serves on the Board of Directors for STARBASE and is a co-chair of the Childhood Obesity Working Group as well as the Military Action Group.

Bob has dedicated his entire life to serving his country and those around him. It is an honor to know him and to have worked with him. Bob states that he is working towards making Minnesota even more "veteran friendly" and I would say that he is well on his way to accomplishing this goal. This award is well deserved.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 1508 BY KING OF UVALDE

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution as a memorial.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, A sustainable agricultural system is crucial to the continued production of food, feed, and fiber to meet both domestic and global demand; and

Whereas, In the United States, the agriculture and food production industries employ precision farming equipment, crop protection chemistries, genetic engineering or enhancement, agricultural nutrients, and other modern technologies; such advanced practices protect the safety of the public and reduce environmental impact while expanding yields, improving profitability, and ensuring an abundant and affordable food supply; and

Whereas, Agricultural pests present significant dangers to the industry and to global supplies of the products they attack; accordingly, the environmental risks of forgoing advances in agricultural technologies that protect crops are severe; excessive regulation may scuttle or discourage the use of agricultural chemicals that could improve human welfare; and

Whereas, Crop protection is among the most studied and highly regulated of all industries, at both the state and federal levels; the use of sound science should be the bedrock of our nation's regulatory scheme for the agriculture and food production industries, as these industries are critical to the economic vitality of Texas and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby express support for the use of sound science to study and regulate such modern agricultural technologies as crop protection chemistries, genetically engineered or enhanced traits, and nutrients; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Texas House of Representatives express opposition to legislative or regulatory action at any level that may result in unnecessary restrictions on the use of modern agricultural technologies; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to all the members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE 14TH ANNIVERSARY OF SEPTEMBER 11TH, 2001

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in recognizing and commemorating the 14th anniversary of the attacks on our homeland on September 11, 2001.

The years that have passed since that day have not dimmed my memory or diminished

my resolve to see an end to terrorism not only in the United States, but around the world.

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 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.

On Tuesday of this week the House Committee on Homeland Security held a full committee hearing in New York City at ''Ground Zero,'' which is now the home of the National September 11 Memorial and Museum.

I will never forget that day.

Today, September 11, 2015 is the 14th anniversary of the attacks that killed 2,977 men, women and children.

I stood on the East Front steps of the Capitol on September 11, 2001, along with 150 members of the House of Representatives and sang ''God Bless America.''

September 11, 2001 remains a tragedy that defines our nation's history, but the final chapter will be written by those who are charged with keeping our nation and its people safe while preserving the way of life that terrorists seek to change.

I visited the site of the World Trade Center Towers in the aftermath of the attacks and grieved over the deaths of so many of our men, women, and children.

I want to thank and commend the work of our first responder community on that day and every day since September 11 for their efforts to protect their communities and our nation from acts of terrorism.

I watched as thousands of first responders, construction workers, and volunteers worked to recover the remains of the dead, and removed the tons of debris, while placing their own lives and health at risk.

The men and women who worked at ''Ground Zero'' were called by a sense of duty to help in our nation's greatest time of need since the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

There is unfinished work for those first responders who were injured or suffered illnesses during and after the September 11, 2001 attacks.

September 11 will forever remain a part of our national memory and for those who serve in Congress a clarion call to be vigilant against those who would do our nation harm.

To respond to the medical needs of the thousands of people who became ill from exposure to the toxic environment at Ground Zero, Congress passed the James Zadroga September 11 Care Act (9/11 Care Act), which provides rescue and recover workers with health care to treat the conditions that resulted from their exposure to toxic dust after the terror attack.

The 9/11 Care Act will expire in October 2016.

I urge my Colleagues on the Committee to join me in seeking reauthorization of the 9/11 Care Act this year.

Under the leadership of President Obama, Bin Laden was found and killed.

President Obama was given a daunting task—after the reckless decision to invade Iraq without provocation.

This single decision to engage in a war of choice and not necessity resulted in the situation that we see in the Middle East with ISIL and the massive displacement of people seeking safety from a war zone that covers Syria and Iraq's borders.

Today, this nation faces new threats from terrorists.

We also have the benefit of first responder professionals who guard us, protect us, and watch over us against those who would seek to do us harm.

The men and women who serve our communities as law enforcement officers, firefighters, EMT's, nurses, doctors, and dozens of other professionals that train to be ready to detect, deter, and defend against another September 11.

I have introduced the ''Families of Responders Identification of Emergency Needs in Designated Situations'' called the ''FRIENDS Act,'' to bring a measure of peace to those who will be called to the front lines in our nation's fight against terrorism and terrorists acts at home.

I thank the staff of the Homeland Security Committee and the first responder organizations for their assistance in improving the bill.

The FRIENDS Act would result in the first report ever produced on the state of family support planning for the families of first responders.

Federal family support planning is important to homeland security because this area of continuity of operations planning addresses the health and safety needs of first responder families during terrorist attacks or incidents as well as other emergencies.

When first responders are called to duty—whether it is September 11, 2001 or to protect and serve during Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, or Sandy or other emergencies—they should not be concerned about the safety needs of their families.

I look forward to the opportunity for each member of the House to cast a vote in favor of first responder families by supporting passage of the FRIENDS Act.

But today let us remember those who perished on this awful day 14 years ago, and rededicate ourselves to honoring their sacrifice by doing all we can to protect our homeland and all who dwell peaceably therein.

FIRST RESPONDERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Of the 2,977 victims killed in the September 11 attacks, 411 were emergency workers in New York City who responded to the World Trade Center. This included:

Fire Department of New York (FDNY): Chief Peter J. Ganci, Jr., 54, the highest ranking uniformed fire officer in the department; First Deputy Fire Commissioner William M. Feehan, 72; Marshal Ronald Paul Bucca, 47; Chaplain Mychal Judge, 68.

Battalion 1: Chief Matthew Lancelot Ryan, 54; Lt. Paul Thomas Mitchell, 46.

Battalion 2: Chief William McGovern, 49; Chief Richard Prunty, 57; Faustino Apostol, Jr., 55.

Battalion 4: Lt. Thomas O'Hagan, 43.

Battalion 6: Chief John P. Williamson, 46.

Battalion 7: Chief Orio Palmer, 45; Lt. Stephen G. Harrell, 44; Lt. Philip Scott Petti, 43.

Battalion 8: Chief Thomas Patrick DeAngelis, 51; Thomas McCann, 45.

Battalion 9: Chief Dennis Lawrence Devlin, 51; Chief Edward F. Geraghty, 45; Lt. Charles William Garbarini, 44; Carl Asaro, 39; Alan D. Feinberg, 48.

Battalion 11: Chief John M. Paolillo, 51.

Battalion 12: Chief Frederick Claude Scheffold, Jr., 57.

Battalion 22: Lt. Charles Joseph Margiotta, 44.

Battalion 43: Lt. Geoffrey E. Guja, 49.

Battalion 47: Lt. Anthony Jovic, 39.

Battalion 48: Chief Joseph Grzelak, 52; Michael Leopoldo Bocchino, 45.

Battalion 49: Chief John Moran, 42.

Battalion 50: Chief Lawrence T. Stack, 58.

Battalion 57: Chief Dennis Cross, 60; Chief Joseph Ross Marchbanks, Jr., 47.

Division 1: Capt. Joseph D. Farrelly, 47; Capt. Thomas Moody, 45.

Division 11: Capt. Timothy M. Stackpole, 42.

Division 15: Chief Thomas Theodore Haskell, Jr., 37; Capt. Martin J. Egan, Jr., 36; Capt. William O'Keefe, 48.

Engine 1: Lt. Andrew Desperito, 43; Michael T. Weinberg, 34.

Engine 4: Calixto Anaya, Jr., 35; James C. Riches, 29; Thomas G. Schoales, 27; Paul A. Tegtmeier, 41.

Engine 5: Manuel Del Valle, Jr., 32.

Engine 6: Paul Beyer, 37; Thomas Holohan, 36; William R. Johnston, 31.

Engine 8: Robert Parro, 35.

Engine 10: Lt. Gregg Arthur Atlas, 44; Jeffrey James Olsen, 31.

Engine 21: Capt. William Francis Burke, Jr., 46.

Engine 22: Thomas Anthony Casoria, 29; Michael J. Elferis, 27; Vincent D. Kane, 37; Martin E. McWilliams, 35.

Engine 23: Robert McPadden, 30; James Nicholas Pappageorge, 29; Hector Luis Tirado, Jr., 30; Mark P. Whitford, 31.

Engine 26: Capt. Thomas Farino, 37; Dana R Hannon, 29.

Engine 29: Michael Ragusa, 29.

Engine 33: Lt. Kevin Pfeifer, 42; David Arce, 36; Michael Boyle, 37; Robert Evans, 36; Keithroy Marcellus Maynard, 30.

Engine 37: John Giordano, 47.

Engine 40: Lt. John F. Ginley, 37; Kevin Bracken, 37; Michael D. D'Auria, 25; Bruce Gary, 51; Steven Mercado, 38.

Engine 50: Robert W. Spear, Jr., 30.

Engine 54: Paul John Gill, 34; Jose Guadalupe, 37; Christopher Santora, 23.

Engine 55: Lt. Peter L. Freund, 45; Robert Lane, 28; Christopher Mozzillo, 27; Stephen P. Russell, 40.

Engine 58: Lt. Robert B. Nagel, 55.

Engine 74: Ruben D. Correa, 44.

Engine 201: Lt. Paul Richard Martini, 37; Gregory Joseph Buck, 37; Christopher Pickford, 32; John Albert Schardt, 34.

Engine 205: Lt. Robert Francis Wallace, 43.

Engine 207: Karl Henry Joseph, 25; Shawn Edward Powell, 32; Kevin O. Reilly, 28.

Engine 214: Lt. Carl John Bedigian, 35; John Joseph Florio, 33; Michael Edward Roberts, 31; Kenneth Thomas Watson, 39.

Engine 216: Daniel Suhr, 37.

Engine 217: Lt. Kenneth Phelan, 41; Steven Coakley, 36; Philip T. Hayes, 67; Neil Joseph Leavy, 34.

Engine 219: John Chipura, 39.

Engine 226: Brian McAleese, 36; David Paul De Rubbio, 38; Stanley S. Smagala, Jr., 36.

Engine 230: Lt. Brian G. Ahearn, 43; Frank Bonomo, 42; Michael Scott Carlo, 34; Jeffrey Stark, 30; Eugene Whelan, 31; Edward James White III, 30.

Engine 235: Lt. Steven Bates, 42; Nicholas Paul Chiofalo, 39; Francis Esposito, 32; Lee S. Fehling, 28; Lawrence G. Veling, 44.

Engine 238: Lt. Glenn E. Wilkinson, 46.

Engine 279: Ronnie Lee Henderson, 52; Anthony Rodriguez, 36.

Engine 285: Raymond R. York, 45.

Engine 320: Capt. James J. Corrigan, 60.

Haz-Mat 1: Lt. John A. Crisci, 48; Dennis M. Carey, 51; Martin N. DeMeo, 47; Thomas Gardner, 39; Jonathan R. Hohmann, 48; Dennis Scauso, 46; Kevin Joseph Smith, 47.

Ladder 2: Capt. Frederick Ill, Jr, 49; Michael J. Clarke, 27; George DiPasquale, 33; Denis P. Germain, 33; Daniel Edward Harlin, 41; Carl Molinaro, 32; Dennis Michael Mulligan, 32.

Ladder 3: Capt. Patrick J. Brown, 48; Lt. Kevin W. Donnelly, 43; Michael Carroll, 39; James Raymond Coyle, 26; Gerard Dewan, 35; Jeffrey John Giordano, 45; Joseph Maloney, 45; John Kevin McAvoy, 47; Timothy Patrick McSweeney, 37; Joseph J. Ogren, 30; Steven John Olson, 38.

Ladder 4: Capt. David Terence Wooley, 54; Lt. Daniel O'Callaghan, 42; Joseph Angelini, Jr, 38; Peter Brennan, 30; Michael E. Brennan, 27; Michael Haub, 34; Michael F. Lynch, 33; Samuel Oitice, 45; John James Tipping II, 33.

Ladder 5: Lt. Vincent Francis Giammona, 40; Lt. Michael Warchola, 51; Louis Arena, 32; Andrew Brunn, 28; Thomas Hannafin, 36; Paul Hanlon Keating, 38; John A. Santore, 49; Gregory Thomas Saucedo, 31.

Ladder 7: Capt. Vernon Allan Richard, 53; George Cain, 35; Robert Joseph Foti, 42; Richard Muldowney Jr, 40; Charles Mendez, 38; Vincent Princiotta, 39.

Ladder 8: Lt. Vincent Gerard Halloran, 43.

Ladder 9: Gerard Baptiste, 35; John P. Tierney, 27; Jeffrey P. Walz, 37.

Ladder 10: Sean Patrick Tallon, 26.

Ladder 11: Lt. Michael Quilty, 42; Michael F. Cammarata, 22; Edward James Day, 45; John F. Heffernan, 37; Richard John Kelly, Jr, 50; Robert King, Jr, 36; Matthew Rogan, 37.

Ladder 12: Angel L. Juarbe, Jr, 35; Michael D. Mullan, 34.

Ladder 13: Capt. Walter G. Hynes, 46; Thomas Hetzel, 33; Dennis McHugh, 34; Thomas E. Sabella, 44; Gregory Stajk, 46.

Ladder 15: Lt. Joseph Gerard Leavey, 45; Richard Lanard Allen, 30; Arthur Thaddeus Barry, 35; Thomas W. Kelly, 50; Scott Kopytko, 32; Scott Larsen, 35; Douglas E. Oelschlager, 36; Eric T. Olsen, 41.

Ladder 16: Lt. Raymond E. Murphy, 46; Robert Curatolo, 31.

Ladder 20: Capt. John R. Fischer, 46; John Patrick Burnside, 36; James Michael Gray, 34; Sean S. Hanley, 35; David Laforge, 50; Robert Thomas Linnane, 33; Robert D. McMahon, 35.

Ladder 21: Gerald T. Atwood, 38; Gerard Duffy, 53; Keith Glascoe, 38; Joseph Henry, 25; William E. Krukowski, 36; Benjamin Suarez, 34.

Ladder 24: Capt. Daniel J. Brethel, 43; Stephen Elliot Belson, 51.

Ladder 25: Lt. Glenn C. Perry, 41; Matthew Barnes, 37; John Michael Collins, 42; Kenneth Kumpel, 42; Robert Minara, 54; Joseph Rivelli, 43; Paul G. Ruback, 50.

Ladder 27: John Marshall, 35.

Ladder 35: Capt. Frank Callahan, 51; James Andrew Giberson, 43; Vincent S. Morello, 34; Michael Otten, 42; Michael Roberts, 30.

Ladder 38: Joseph Spor, Jr., 35.

Ladder 42: Peter Alexander Bielfeld, 44.

Ladder 101: Lt. Joseph Gullickson, 37; Patrick Byrne, 39; Salvatore B. Calabro, 38; Brian Cannizzaro, 30; Thomas J. Kennedy, 36; Joseph Maffeo, 31; Terence A. McShane, 37.

Ladder 105: Capt. Vincent Brunton, 43; Thomas Richard Kelly, 39; Henry Alfred Miller, Jr, 51; Dennis O'Berg, 28; Frank Anthony Palombo, 46.

Ladder 111: Lt. Christopher P. Sullivan, 39.

Ladder 118: Lt. Robert M. Regan, 48; Joseph Agnello, 35; Vernon Paul Cherry, 49; Scott Matthew Davidson, 33; Leon Smith, Jr., 48; Peter Anthony Vega, 36.

Ladder 131: Christian Michael Otto Regenhard, 28.

Ladder 132: Andrew Jordan, 36; Michael Kiefer, 25; Thomas Mingione, 34; John T. Vigiano II, 36; Sergio Villanueva, 33.

Ladder 136: Michael Joseph Cawley, 32.

Ladder 166: William X. Wren, 61.

Rescue 1: Capt. Terence S. Hatton, 41; Lt. Dennis Mojica, 50; Joseph Angelini, Sr., 63; Gary Geidel, 44; William Henry, 49; Kenneth Joseph Marino, 40; Michael Montesi, 39; Gerard Terence Nevins, 46; Patrick J. O'Keefe, 44; Brian Edward Sweeney, 29; David M. Weiss, 41.

Rescue 2: Lt. Peter C. Martin, 43; William David Lake, 44; Daniel F. Libretti, 43; John Napolitano, 32; Kevin O'Rourke, 44; Lincoln Quappe, 38; Edward Rall, 44.

Rescue 3: Christopher Joseph Blackwell, 42; Thomas Foley, 32; Thomas Gambino, Jr., 48; Raymond Meisenheimer, 46; Donald J. Regan, 47; Gerard Patrick Schrang, 45.

Rescue 4: Capt. Brian Hickey, 47; Lt. Kevin Dowdell, 46; Terrence Patrick Farrell, 45; William J. Mahoney, 37; Peter Allen Nelson, 42; Durrell V. Pearsall, 34.

Rescue 5: Capt. Louis Joseph Modafferi, 45; Lt. Harvey Harrell, 49; John P. Bergin, 39; Carl Vincent Bini, 44; Michael Curtis Fiore, 46; Andre G. Fletcher, 37; Douglas Charles Miller, 34; Jeffrey Matthew Palazzo, 33; Nicholas P. Rossomando, 35; Allan Tarasiewicz, 45.

Special Operations: Chief Raymond Mathew Downey, 63; Capt. Patrick J. Waters, 44; Lt. Timothy Higgins, 43; Lt. Michael Thomas Russo, Sr, 44.

Squad 1: Capt. James M. Amato, 43; Lt. Edward A. D'Atri, 38; Lt. Michael Esposito, 41; Lt. Michael N. Fodor, 53; Brian Bilcher, 37; Gary Box, 37; Thomas M. Butler, 37; Peter Carroll, 42; Robert Cordice, 28; David J. Fontana, 37; Matthew David Garvey, 37; Stephen Gerard Siller, 34.

Squad 18: Lt. William E. McGinn, 43; Eric Allen, 44; Andrew Fredricks, 40; David Halderman, 40; Timothy Haskell, 34; Manuel Mojica, 37; Lawrence Virgilio, 38.

Squad 41: Lt. Michael K. Healey, 42; Thomas Patrick Cullen III, 31; Robert Hamilton, 43; Michael J. Lyons, 32; Gregory Sikorsky, 34; R. Bruce Van Hine, 48.

Squad 252: Tarel Coleman, 32; Thomas Kuveikis, 48; Peter J. Langone, 41; Patrick Lyons, 34; Kevin Prior, 28.

Squad 288: Lt. Ronald T. Kerwin, 42; Ronnie E. Gies, 43; Joseph Hunter, 31; Jonathan Lee Ielpi, 29; Adam David Rand, 30; Timothy Matthew Welty, 34.

EMS Battalion 49: Paramedic Carlos R. Lillo, 37.

EMS Battalion 57: Paramedic Ricardo J. Quinn, 40.

Port Authority Police Department: Supt. Ferdinand V. Morrone, 63; Chief James A. Romito, 51; Lt. Robert D. Cirri; Insp. Anthony P. Infante, Jr., 47; Capt. Kathy Nancy Mazza, 46; Sgt. Robert M. Kaulfers, 49; Donald James McIntyre, 38; Walter Arthur McNeil, 53; Joseph Michael Navas, 44; James Nelson, 40; Alfonse J. Niedermeyer, 40; James Wendell Parham, 32; Dominick A. Pezzulo, 36; Antonio J. Rodrigues, 35; Richard Rodriguez, 31; Bruce Albert Reynolds, 41; Christopher C. Amoroso, 29; Maurice V. Barry, 48; Clinton Davis, Sr., 38; Donald A. Foreman, 53; Gregg J. Froehner, 46; Uhuru Gonga Houston, 32; George G. Howard, 44; Thomas E. Gorman; Stephen Huczko, Jr., 44; Paul William Jurgens, 47; Liam Callahan, 44; Paul Laszczynski, 49; David Prudencio Lemagne, 27; John Joseph Lennon, Jr., 44; John Dennis Levi, 50; James Francis Lynch, 47; John P. Skala, 31; Walwyn W. Stuart, Jr., 28; Kenneth F. Tietjen, 31; Nathaniel Webb; Michael T. Wholey; Sirius, K–9.

New York City Police Department: Sgt. Timothy A. Roy, Sr., 36; Sgt. John Gerard Coughlin, 43; Sgt. Rodney C. Gillis, 33; Sgt. Michael S. Curtin, 45; Det. Joseph V. Vigiano, 34; Det. Claude Daniel Richards, 46; Moira Ann Smith, 38; Ramon Suarez, 45; Paul Talty, 40; Santos Valentin, Jr., 39; Walter E. Weaver, 30; Ronald Philip Kloepfer, 39; Thomas M. Langone, 39; James Patrick Leahy, 38; Brian Grady McDonnell, 38; John William Perry, 38; Glen Kerrin Pettit, 30; John D'Allara, 47; Vincent Danz, 38; Jerome M. P. Dominguez, 37; Stephen P. Driscoll, 38; Mark Joseph Ellis, 26; Robert Fazio, Jr., 41.

Private emergency medical services: Keith Fairben, 24—a paramedic who worked for the New York Presbyterian Hospital; Richard Pearlman, 18—an EMT who worked for the Forest Hills Volunteer Ambulance; Mario Santoro, 28—a paramedic who worked for the New York Presbyterian Medical Center; Yamel Merino, 24—an EMT for Metrocare/Montefiore Medical Center for three years; Mohammad Salman Hamdani, 23—a part-time FDNY Certified EMT and also a member of the New York City Police Department Cadet Corps for three years; Marc Sullins, 30—an EMT who worked with Cabrini Medical Center; Mark Schwartz, 50—an EMT who worked for Hunter Ambulance; Jeff Simpson, 38—an EMT who worked for the Dumfries-Triangle Rescue Squad, and also an employee for Oracle Corporation.

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

SPEECH OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letter:

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 opinion, 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 Clexton, 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. Schoultz, 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. Kubic, 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. Schoeppner, 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 Welde, 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. Scearce, US Army, Retired; Brigadier General Robert V. Woods, US Air Force, Retired.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate met at 9:30:04 a.m. in pro forma session, and adjourned at 9:30:30 a.m., until 1 p.m., on Tuesday, September 15, 2015.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 14 public bills, H.R. 3490–3503; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 417–418, were introduced. **Pages H5974–75**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H5975–76**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 348, to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–228, Part 1). **Page H5974**

Suspending 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: The House passed 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, by a recorded vote of 247 ayes to 186 noes, Roll No. 494. **Pages H5947–67, H5968–69**

H. Res. 412, the rule providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 411) and providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3461) and (H.R. 3460) was agreed to yesterday, September 10th.

Approving the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran: The House rejected H.R. 3461, to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran, by a yea-and-nay vote of 162 yeas to 269 nays with one answering ''present'', Roll No. 493. Consideration began yesterday, September 10th. **Pages H5967–68**

H. Res. 412, the rule providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 411) and providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3461) and (H.R. 3460) was agreed to yesterday, September 10th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3 p.m. on Tuesday, September 15th and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Wednesday, September 16th for Morning Hour debate. **Page H5971**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H5973.

Senate Referrals: S. 1629 was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. S. 1461 was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Ways and Means. **Page H5973**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5968 and H5968–69. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:27 p.m.

Committee Meetings

OVERSIGHT OF FEDERAL FACILITY CLEANUP UNDER CERCLA

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy began a hearing entitled ''Oversight of Federal Facility Cleanup under CERCLA''. Testimony was heard from Mathy Stanislaus, Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Environmental Protection Agency; Mark Whitney, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, Department of Energy; John Conger, Performing the Duties of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy Installations and Environment, Department of Defense; and Alfredo Gomez, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office.

STRENGTHENING MEDICAID PROGRAM INTEGRITY AND CLOSING LOOPHOLES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Strengthening Medicaid Program Integrity and Closing Loopholes''. Testimony was heard from John Hagg, Director of Medicaid Audits, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services; Nico Gomez, Chief Executive Officer, Oklahoma Health Care Authority; and Trish Riley, Executive Director, National Academy for State Health Policy, Commissioner, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Federal Lands held a hearing on H.R. 3036, the ''National 9/11 Memorial at the World Trade Center Act''. Testimony was heard from Representatives MacArthur and Nadler; and public witnesses.

STATE PERSPECTIVES: HOW EPA'S POWER PLAN WILL SHUT DOWN POWER PLANTS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Environment held a hearing entitled ''State Perspectives: How EPA's Power Plan Will Shut Down Power Plants''. Testimony was heard from Bryan Shaw, Chairman, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality; Craig Butler, Director, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency; and Jason Eisdorfer, Utility Program Director, Oregon Public Utility Commission.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, hearing to review USDA organization and program administration, Part I, 1:30 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

1 p.m., Tuesday, September 15

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, Hire More Heroes Act, with a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on McConnell Amendment No. 2640, at 6 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

3 p.m., Tuesday, September 15

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 3 p.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1263
Bilirakis, Gus M., Fla., E1259
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1262
Bonamici, Suzanne, Ore., E1260
Byrne, Bradley, Ala., E1263
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E1265
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1271
Cook, Paul, Calif., E1259
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E1259, E1268
DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E1261
Dent, Charles W., Pa., E1269
Emmer, Tom, Minn., E1265, E1267, E1268, E1270, E1271, E1272
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1264
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1264
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E1271
Gibson, Christopher P., N.Y., E1261
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E1270
Israel, Steve, N.Y., E1264
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1272
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E1265
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1267
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E1266
Marino, Tom, Pa., E1267
Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E1271
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1267, E1267, E1269, E1271
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E1268
Roby, Martha, Ala., E1260
Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E1261
Royce, Edward R., Calif., E1274
Stivers, Steve, Ohio, E1269
Vela, Filemon, Tex., E1263
Wagner, Ann, Mo., E1259
Williams, Roger, Tex., E1266, E1267, E1268, E1272, E1272
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E1270
Young, David, Iowa, E1266

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.