

movement called Boko Haram is considered the “primary perpetrator of religiously related violence and gross religious freedom violations,” there have been 50 churches attacked, killing some 366 people. Thirty-one attacks have been documented on Christians, killing 166 people. Among the other violence, 23 attacks on Islamic clerics or senior figures critical of that group have killed some 60 people.

Over 18 months going back from July of 2013, the Religious Violence Project tracked some 203 incidents of sectarian violence that resulted in more than 700 deaths and attacks by militants and terrorist organizations in Pakistan, primarily against their Shia community. Attacks on other minority populations in Pakistan included the Christians, Ahmadis, Hindus, Sikhs, and other groups that were subjected to targeted bombings, shootings, and rapes.

Mr. Speaker, the trend toward the type of violence that has been documented by the Commission in recent years is profoundly disturbing and should be addressed in a thoroughgoing manner by member countries at the United Nations and at all appropriate venues of international engagement, in a credible and reliable manner. Interestingly, Mr. Speaker, the *Los Angeles Times* just reported that yesterday, several of the 14 new States elected by secret ballot to the United Nations Human Rights Council are widely considered by human rights advocates as violators of personal freedoms. The new countries elected to the Human Rights Council are Russia, China, Cuba, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, and Vietnam. Again, they are considered by human rights advocates to be violators of personal freedoms.

In view of this development, it concerns me that our own administration has downgraded the status of the State Department’s Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom. This is an important position, Mr. Speaker. It is a reflection of who we are as a Nation. Also, the position of the special envoy to monitor and combat anti-Semitism remains unfulfilled in our government as well. I would like to see us elevate the principle of religious freedom as a core measure of civil society and diplomatic intent, institutionalizing this as a priority with the Department of State and building upon the very commendable work of our last Ambassador, who is now gone, Ambassador Suzan Johnson Cook.

The time to do this is now. Otherwise, we risk sending a very dangerous signal that, again, really doesn’t fit who we are as a Nation. We must care about this fundamental principle of the rights of conscience and religious liberty. We cannot afford to convey a message that religious freedom really doesn’t matter all that much to us while so many lives throughout the world hang in the balance, while so many people still look to us for the ideals which bring about civil society

in its fullness, where we respect one another’s differences, work them out through comity, work them out through legislative debate and not at the point of a sword or at the end of a gun.

Mr. Speaker, the world is screaming for meaning. Religious liberty is a cornerstone of human dignity and a foundation for civil society itself. We don’t think about it very often, but it is true here. We don’t think about the fact that we could enter our church or synagogue or mosque each Sunday, Friday, Wednesday freely, for the most part, without threat of fear of intimidation, without the government listening to us, without persons seeking to do us harm.

People can preach and teach as they see fit within the civil society to try to reflect their deeply held faith traditions out of respect to not only those who follow them but those whom they wish to convince or tell their story to. This is a great tradition in America. We have our differences, but we respect those. We actually honor that right, the right of conscience to speak freely and the right of religious liberty in the public square.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be interesting to point out that it is the image of Moses who looks down upon me right now as I am speaking, who looks upon this body as we deliberate, one of the great lawgivers of all time who actually also happened to be a great religious leader of all time.

Our country is replete with the strong condition for the exercise of religious liberty both at home, within our churches, and in the public square. This is one of the reasons that people are so attracted to America, because it is a principle consistent with human dignity. It appeals to the hearts of all persons to be able to exercise freely who they are and what they would like to believe with respect to others.

This is a great tradition that we have institutionalized in law and have tried to project through our diplomacy. That is why it is so important that we actually fill this open Ambassador’s position and we do so now, and we elevate the ideals of religious liberty and the rights of conscience as a core part of our diplomatic outreach in order to give people hope, a hope that they are yearning for, a hope that they need, and a hope to give balance and equality in the 21st century to a world that is very unsure as to where it is going next.

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

SANCTIONING IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity and the

privilege to be able to be here in the well of the greatest deliberative body on Earth, the United States House of Representatives, to talk about what I believe is one of the most crucial issues facing the national security not only of the United States but for freedom-seeking people all across the world.

You know, I had a tremendous privilege. This last week, seven Members of Congress—Democrat, Republican, and myself—were privileged to be on a trip that was life-changing in many ways. We had the privilege of going to Israel. We met with leaders of Israel. We met with the people of Israel, and we talked about issues of national security.

Israel is a Nation that has been literally under attack since the time of its founding of the modern Jewish State in May of 1948. Very wisely, the United States President at the time—a Democrat, Harry Truman—gave Israel what she needed more than anything else: to be able to show the world that she could be an independent, sovereign power. It was this: President Harry Truman recognized Israel as a sovereign, independent nation. That told the world that the United States of America would have Israel’s back because we recognized her right to exist, unlike Israel’s current neighbors—many of whom, particularly in Hamas and the Palestinian Authority—to this day continue to deny Israel’s right to exist and Israel’s right to defend herself. As is often said, Israel lives in a very tough neighborhood. We had the privilege to find out more about the concerns and the issues that face our greatest ally in the world that we have, and that is the Jewish State of Israel.

While we were there, Mr. Speaker, our delegation was able to quite literally witness world history as it happened. Secretary of State John Kerry decided to add Jerusalem to his itinerary in addition to Cairo. He went to Jerusalem because he was in the process of speaking about the Palestinian-Israeli talks for a so-called two-State solution, but something even more important that week was at stake, and it was this: a meeting in Geneva, Switzerland. It was a meeting of the nations that talked about whether or not the economic sanctions that have worked so well to prohibit Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons—the question was, Will those sanctions now be lifted?

As we went through the course of our time in Israel last Thursday, we were about to have our scheduled meeting with Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu. The meeting had been rearranged, and rightly so; because Secretary of State Kerry was in town, the prime minister adjusted his schedule. We, Members of Congress, adjusted our schedule so that the Prime Minister could meet with Secretary Kerry according to his timetable. That was the right thing to do.

When we filed into the office that we usually meet the Prime Minister in late Thursday afternoon, it was very

evident when we sat down that something was clearly amiss. The first remark from the Prime Minister was, had we heard the news? We looked at each other, we looked at the Prime Minister, and we said, What news would that be? We had been in meetings all day long. We had no idea what he was talking about. Just prior to our meeting with Prime Minister Netanyahu, he had been briefed on the events in Geneva, Switzerland. Israel was not there. They were not present at the P5+1 meetings.

The news wasn't good. It wasn't good at all. As a matter of fact, the Prime Minister said to us, Iran is getting the deal of the century. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister had the attention of the seven Members of Congress—Democrat and Republican—sitting around that table.

He went on to say some very firm words. This is a poster that was created by Senator MARK KIRK of Illinois. He said this to us: This is a very, very—and he said it a third time—very bad deal. It is not only a bad deal for Israel because, as he told us, you know, we are only the little Satan, according to Iran. You, the United States, are the big Satan in Iran's eyes. In other words, if you think this is bad for us in Israel, imagine what this will be for the United States.

□ 1800

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus just a little bit on the chart that Senator KIRK put together because I think it talks and speaks very eloquently of why the P5+1 deal was very, very bad and why the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, was rightly concerned about not only the national security of the Jewish State of Israel, but the national security interests of the people of the United States and of freedom-loving people around the world.

Let's look at this very important document that was put together by Senator KIRK. Iran's deal of the century: what is it that Iran would get?

What is remarkable, Mr. Speaker, is what Iran would get in this deal. They would get, in cash, \$3 billion. As a matter of fact, some of the literature that I have read since Thursday when we were with the Prime Minister has said that upwards of \$50 billion would be freed and available to Iran; but, at minimum, they would have access to \$3 billion in cash.

Remember, this is an actor, the state of Iran, which was found illegally creating nuclear material for their stated purpose of creating a nuclear weapon to use to wipe out not only Israel, but the United States of America off the face of the map.

If there is anything that history has taught us, Mr. Speaker, it is this: it is that when a madman speaks, freedom-loving nations should listen.

The leader in Iran is called the supreme leader. He is not called that for no reason. It isn't the president of the

country who is truly the throne in Iran. It is the religious leader named Khomeini. The presidents come and go, but Khomeini, the supreme leader, remains the same.

His announced intentions are completely clear. Iran seeks to be the hegemon. In other words, Iran seeks to be the dominant power in not only the Middle East region, but they also have evidence of dabbling in the far East in China, in the Philippines, and in South America. They intend to have their fingers in places all over the world because they intend to dominate. They intend to dominate with the shia religion. They intend to dominate through the use of nuclear weaponry through the most vile form of violence that there is in the world in order to achieve their objectives.

So, again, let's look at what Iran would have gotten had the nation of France not intervened and put a stop to this disastrous effort and agreement that would have had the potential of changing the course of human history.

Again, here is what Iran would get. They would get \$3 billion in cash, at minimum. Some report upwards of \$50 billion in cash. They would get \$9.6 billion in gold reserves for the Iran regime; over \$5 billion in petrochemicals for the nation; \$1.3 billion in automobiles. Iran is heavily engaged in the production of automobiles and this would have given them that revenue. Also, enriched uranium for one bomb.

Why in world would P5+1, the nations that met in Geneva, Switzerland, allow Iran to have enriched uranium for one bomb, when they have already stated their intention if they have that bomb?

We also know that Iran has plans to be involved in having intercontinental ballistic missiles. In other words, they not only want a bomb, Mr. Speaker, but they want a delivery system. And they need a delivery system that goes just so far to be able to get to Israel, but they seek a delivery system, Mr. Speaker, that could take their bombs to United States targets as well. United States targets here in the homeland, but United States targets as well overseas.

And it just doesn't end with Iran, Mr. Speaker. If Iran gains a nuclear weapon, what the world must know is that the weapon will not simply remain within the boundaries and in the hands of a nuclear Iran. Oh, that it would be, that would be bad enough.

What we do know is that Saudi Arabia has already had to make plans to defend herself. She already has a preorder into a nuclear Pakistan, foreign order for a nuclear weapon, because Saudi Arabia knows they will be a target from a nuclear Iran if Iran obtains that weapon. So, therefore, we will see another nation—Saudi Arabia—that will have to have a nuclear weapon.

But it won't stop with Saudi Arabia, Mr. Speaker. We know that each will be seeking a nuclear weapon.

Let's not forget that prior to July 4, 2013, the violent terrorist organization

known as the Muslim Brotherhood was the legitimate government of the state of Egypt. Imagine the violent terrorist organization known as the Muslim Brotherhood with a nuclear weapon. Also, imagine Turkey with a nuclear weapon.

Imagine then that we are no longer talking nation-states. What we could be talking about very well with Iran having a nuclear weapon would be some of its umbrella protectorates, i.e., Hezbollah. The terrorist organization primarily located in Lebanon, just north of Israel's border, also would, in all likelihood, have access to a nuclear weapon or have one located on Israel's northern border.

Syria could also have a nuclear weapon; and from there we could be talking about, Mr. Speaker, al Qaeda having a nuclear weapon, with miniaturization. Perhaps the al-Nusra Front, perhaps Boko Haram or any of the other myriad terrorist organizations that there are around the world.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the entire paradigm of the world's structure could change quite literally. And for what? What is it that we would have gotten out of this very bad deal that the United States was about to enter into? It makes no sense.

We would have gotten zero centrifuges dismantled.

What is a centrifuge? That is what is used by Iran to enrich uranium; the fissile material that is required to create a nuclear bomb. We would have gotten zero dismantled. Iran would have continued to maintain control and ownership of their centrifuges. Let's face it and let's not kid ourselves: if those centrifuges would have continued to run and spun enriched uranium, we would have gotten zero ounces of uranium shipped out of Iran.

That is the whole ball game, Mr. Speaker.

The estimate today, as we stand here, is that Iran already has enriched uranium to the tune of 9 to 10 tons—well over the amount needed to have a nuclear bomb.

You see, that must be the first condition, not the last and not one that is off the table. That is the first condition to lift any sanction. We must first make sure that all of the enriched uranium leaves the nation of Iran because, again, we know their stated intention. That must go.

We also get out of this deal zero facilities closed. We know there are multiple facilities against and in violation of U.N. resolution after U.N. resolution after U.N. resolution. Iran has continued to be one of the biggest violators of U.N. resolutions that there is in the world today. One nuclear facility after another, including a plutonium facility, a heavy-water reactor in Iraq—that doesn't have to close.

Why would we do this? Why would we allow them to continue the means of production for nuclear weapons when we get nothing in return? They get \$3 billion. Some say \$50 billion. We get nothing in return. Are we mad?

Thank God for the French. Thank God for the French foreign minister, who said this was a sucker's deal. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said this is a very, very bad deal and said it is the deal of the century. Why would we continue to reward bad behavior and a bad actor? Why would we allow no delay on the plutonium reactor? Why would there be no stop in missile testing?

Let's face it, what do they want the missiles for? Who is attacking Iran right now? And yet we would allow them to continue to test missiles and the delivery system for a nuclear weapon?

No stop in terrorism. Who is the exporter of terrorism? It is Iran. Who exports terrorism to Lebanon? It is Iran, through Hezbollah. Who exports terrorism in Syria, where Bashar al-Assad has killed over 100,000 of his people? It is Iran. Imagine Iran with a nuclear weapon and the terror that would be exported once they have that nuclear weapon and no stop in the human rights abuses.

All of this they get. They get a plutonium reactor, 3,000 new centrifuges, the enriched uranium for a bomb.

While we were over in Israel this last week, we had heard from the Prime Minister that there are well over 18,000 centrifuges running today. The first level of purity that is reached in uranium is 3.5 percent. The second level that is reached is 20 percent. From there it is a hop and a skip literally only weeks to get to 90 percent purity, which is what is required for a nuclear bomb. We are virtually sitting on the edge of a nuclear Iran, with no wiggle room left.

Finally, we are beginning to see the beginning of the economic sanctions coming to work, just when they are coming to bear, just when Iran is about to buckle at the knee, come to the table, and actually agree to something over here on this side of the scorecard. You see, Mr. Speaker, it is a big goose egg on this side of the scorecard—what the freedom-loving people of the world seek, what the American people seek, what the Jewish people of the State of Israel seek. We get zero on this scorecard while the Iranian nuclear program is allowed to continue at pace, moving forward toward the ultimate goal of the nuclear weapon and the means of delivery. And all the while working on miniaturization so that the nuclear warhead can deliver its deadly, lethal target to the most vulnerable people in the world.

And wouldn't it be horrible and wouldn't it be sick if a city here in the United States would be a recipient of one of those nuclear warheads? Why? Because in the midst of foolishness, the P5+1 thought it would be a good idea to let the Iranians continue their nuclear program.

May it never be.

There was an article that was just published. It was published by someone that I have great admiration for in The

Wall Street Journal—a very smart guy by the name of Bret Stephens. Bret had a column that came out. He talked about, again, this last weekend and the fact that the world dodged a bullet, just barely—not because of the Obama administration's efforts, I am sorry to say, and not because of the efforts of the United Kingdom, I am sorry to say, but because of the French. And we have them to thank.

The talks unexpectedly fell apart at the last minute when the French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius publicly objected to what he called a sucker's deal, meaning the United States was prepared to begin lifting sanctions on Iran in exchange for tentative Iranian promises that they would slow their multiple nuclear programs.

Now, this is very important that I read this, Mr. Speaker, because Bret Stephens goes on to say in his article:

Not stop their nuclear program, not suspend their nuclear program, mind you, much less dismantle them, but merely reduce their pace from run to jog when they're on mile 23 of their nuclear marathon.

He said:

It says a lot about the administration that they so wanted a deal that they would have been prepared to take this one.

And what this deal would have meant, quite simply, Mr. Speaker, is that we would have seen an Iran with a nuclear bomb very soon, and the means to deliver it and put the world on edge.

May it never be. Thank God for the French.

That is what happens when the line between politics is a game of perception and policy as the pursuit of national objectives dissolves.

I think this was a very important weekend. And it is important to know that this isn't over. You see, what happened is that there was a delay. A delay, I suppose, for what? To buy the vote of the French, to take their arm and twist it behind their back?

□ 1815

Because now the pressure is on France and the P5+1. The pressure is on France. Seven days from today, Mr. Speaker, there will be another meeting. Our Secretary of State, John Kerry, who insists that this deal and that he and the United States aren't blind and aren't stupid with this deal—he insisted this on "Meet the Press" last Sunday. He is stating that he believes that there will be a deal with Iran and that there will be one quickly.

My question would be, Mr. Speaker, to the Secretary of State or to anyone in the Obama administration who is in the process of working on this deal with a nuclear Iran: Is this what the deal is that you are intending to strike? We get zero, and Iran gets the ability to develop a nuclear bomb. What is the deal? What is in that?

I think we need to ask the lead negotiator, whose name is Wendy Sherman. She is President Obama's lead negotiator, chief nuclear negotiator, in this very crucial negotiation which has the potential to change the course of history.

In 1988, Wendy Sherman was a social worker. She worked on the Dukakis campaign. She worked at the Democratic National Committee. This is the person who is striking this deal right now on a nuclear Iran. She also was the CEO of the Fannie Mae Foundation. It was a charity that was shut down 10 years later for what The Washington Post called "using a tax-exempt contribution to advance corporate interests."

From there, Wendy Sherman went to the State Department. There she served as the point person in nuclear negotiations with North Korea. She met with Kim Jong Il, himself. She found him witty and humorous, a conceptual thinker, a quick problem-solver, smart, engaged, knowledgeable, self-confident. She called him a "regular guy." She was found working for her former boss at the Albright Stonebridge Group before she went to the No. 3 spot at the State Department. From there, the arc of her career has gone to her now being in charge of this effort of giving away the ability to Iran to be able to continue on a pace to develop a nuclear bomb.

Again, may it never be.

When we were in Israel on Friday evening, we found out, Mr. Speaker, that the Obama administration had gone much further in this effort than even we had thought, because the story came out in the Daily Beast in an article by Eli Lake. He said that in this very bad deal with a nuclear Iran that once the current President was elected in June, Rouhani, that the Obama administration began then to already ease the sanctions on Iran. It is something that I think none of us could even begin to imagine. Even without consulting Congress, the Treasury Department issued notices in June that they would no longer be checking on those who are violating the sanctions' deals.

In other words, there wouldn't be the type of sanctions going out and the type of punishments, if you will, for bad actors who were doing trades with Iran. In other words, beginning past June, according to the article that came out on Friday, the Obama administration was already evening out the scorecard. In other words, they were already giving bonuses to Iran.

Why?

Because Rouhani was seen as a "moderate," someone the Obama administration could work with. Even in September, President Obama, himself, wanted to be able to meet and talk and discuss without any precondition at all with the leader of Iran.

You see, there is a read that happened among the leadership in Iran. They looked at the United States. They tested our pulse. They tested the pulse of the Obama administration, and they saw that they could get what Benjamin Netanyahu called a very, very, very bad deal for freedom-loving people across the world. As a matter of fact, the leadership in Iran saw something

else. They saw that they could get a sucker's deal—in the words of the French diplomat and negotiator—but that is not what the American people want, Mr. Speaker.

They want to know that when they tuck their children in bed at night that the world will be secure for them and that they won't have to worry about a nuclear weapon coming within the borders of the United States of America or of any nation. No one wants to see a nuclear nightmare, but the Obama administration needs to recognize that, in order to alleviate the burden of a nuclear nightmare, we must never, ever, ever allow Iran to have a nuclear bomb and the means to deliver that bomb.

You see, when we were in Israel, Mr. Speaker, we were told by some of the leadership in Israel that there are 25 nations that have the civilian capability of having nuclear power but that only five nations enrich uranium in order to have the fissile material. When you have a responsibility, you have to act responsibly, and those nations have acted responsibly with the fissile material. The argument from Iran is quite different. Iran says they have an indigenous right to enrich uranium, that all nations do.

All nations don't have the right when they have spoken irresponsibly, when they have acted in violation of U.N. resolution after U.N. resolution, when they have said "no" to International Atomic Energy Commission inspectors coming to Iran to check on what Iran is doing in regards to uranium enrichment, in regards to nuclear reactors or to the plutonium heavy-water reactor. The door is slammed in the faces of the inspectors. When they ask to come in, they are told "maybe some other time." Think of that with your teenager. You want to go in and check on your teenager's room, and your teenager says, "Maybe not this time, Mom. How about you try me tomorrow?" Does that raise a few suspicions in your mind? Usually, it does. In the case of the security of the people of the world, that should definitely raise our concerns.

So why would we give the benefit of the doubt to a nation that has thumbed its nose at the United Nations Security Council? that has thumbed its nose at the International Atomic Energy Commission inspectors? Why would we give them the benefit of the doubt? Why would the Obama administration give them the benefit of the doubt?

When Wendy Sherman has negotiated what is arguably one of the biggest failures in North Korea, with North Korea's obtaining nuclear weaponry and missile capability, that is absolute failure—failure for the world and failure for this negotiator. Now the same negotiator is trying to strike this deal where it looks, to me, like Iran is getting it all—it is a clean sweep—and the freedom-loving people of the world are getting a goose egg. This is a very bad deal.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time to pull Wendy Sherman back and off of this

project. This isn't working. I think the United States should pull back and not be a part of the P5+1. I think we need to take a big step backwards and take a deep breath and do a thorough review of the history of Iran and of Iran's violations.

This is bipartisan, Mr. Speaker. This is not Republicans beating up on the Obama administration. There are numerous Democrats, including Senator MENENDEZ on the Senate side, including many of my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle. They are pro-Israel. They are pro-American national security. They don't want to see a nuclear Iran any more than Republicans do. This is not a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker. This is completely bipartisan. In fact, I believe, if we were to put a resolution on the floor of this House that were to call on the Obama administration to say "no" to this very, very, very bad deal—to a sucker's deal in the words of the French diplomat—I believe that we would see a very strong bipartisan agreement.

Why?

Because, as a body—Democrat, Republican—we are truly, not just in word but in deed, pro-Israel. We are first pro-United States, first pro our national security interests. That is totally bipartisan.

I am privileged to sit on the House Intelligence Committee. We deal with the classified secrets of the Nation. I compliment my colleague DUTCH RUPERSBERGER as much as I compliment my colleague MIKE ROGERS, the chair of the committee, because they have made a decision that, when it comes to America's national security, the partisanship gets checked outside the door. We are completely bipartisan when we go on that committee, as it should be.

So, when it comes to making sure that a rogue—perhaps even an evil—regime does not have access to a nuclear weapon, that is probably the most bipartisan move that could ever come out of this body, and I believe that it will because I trust my Democrat colleagues to also believe and understand that a nuclear Iran is a very, very bad idea. I believe the Senate will see it the same way. I think we will see, again, agreement on both sides of the aisle because this is about America. This is about our national security. It is about the security interests and the future of the world. It is about the national security interests of our friend, the Jewish State of Israel. It is about her survival. It is about making sure that violent terrorist organizations never, ever, ever, ever, ever have access to nuclear fissile material and the means and capability of creating a nuclear bomb and delivering it on innocent people anywhere across the world.

We want a peaceful world, and we will not have a peaceful world if madmen have a nuclear weapon. It is a bipartisan issue—it is a peace issue—and it is an issue, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that should capture our attention.

Might I ask how many minutes I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to again refer to one of my colleagues who has also eloquently written on this subject, and I would like to give her credit as well. She is a former Member of this body but a wonderful Member with whom I had the privilege of traveling to the Middle East. She was defeated in her last election, but she served this body very well. She is a Democrat colleague. I have great respect for her. She and I traveled to Israel. We traveled to Pakistan. We traveled to Kuwait. Her name is Shelley Berkley, and she is from Nevada. I would like to read a few of the words from former Representative Shelley Berkley.

She said that the deal that is in the works with Iran is far worse than anyone could have possibly imagined. She said that the details are still emerging on this deal that was nearly put together over the weekend in Geneva, and she said:

By all accounts and despite all denials, the United States is actively pursuing a catastrophic agreement with Iran. It is one that would facilitate the nuclearization of one of the most extreme, violent, and anti-American tyrannies on Earth, with consequences that will be regretted for generations.

You see, Shelley Berkley of Nevada gets it. She understands that this isn't a short-term action. She understood that if Iran obtains a nuclear weapon that this will change the course of history for generations, and it is one that would be near impossible to roll back because, again, of the idea of proliferation. It wouldn't be just Iran who has it, as if that isn't bad enough; it would be rogue terrorist organizations across the globe.

Former Representative Shelley Berkley writes:

The centerpiece of the deal from the West's perspective is Iran's agreement to convert its stockpiles of 20 percent enriched uranium to fuel for civilian use and to halt further enrichment to 20 percent for 6 months.

Now, it is interesting. We just met this last week with the leader of intelligence in Israel. He told us that part of this very, very, very bad deal would include Iran's not firing up their heavy-water plutonium reactor in Iraq—"Araq," some people say. He said the joke on all of that is that this reactor won't even go on line for use until next August, so Iran gives up absolutely nothing in this deal. You see, it is a scam. They don't even have an ability over the next 6 months to fire up this reactor. So Iran's agreeing not to develop any plutonium from that reactor is a zero. It is a goose egg. It is a nonstarter.

These are the negotiators? I know one thing. I wouldn't want them negotiating my salary at my next job. They don't get it. They don't understand what is at stake—or do they? That is how important this is.

□ 1830

“The entire question of 20 percent enriched uranium,” says former Representative Shelley Berkley, “is a smoke screen.”

For many years, making a bomb went like this: first you spent a lot of time enriching uranium to 3.5 percent purity. That is difficult, but that is exactly what Iran would be allowed to continue to do. Then you enriched what you had created to 20 percent purity. When you had enough of that—and the centrifuges Iran has now are better and faster and quicker than what they had before, five times faster, as a matter of fact—you would be in a position to easily and quickly convert that material to 90 percent purity that is good enough for a nuclear warhead.

In recent months, Iran has advanced dramatically in both the number of centrifuges—again, nearly 19,000 centrifuges today at its disposal and their efficiency. Today, experts say that in just a few weeks’ time Iran could go from 3.5 percent all the way to 90 percent, which is “bingo,” bomb-making material for Iran. The whole issue of 20 percent enrichment has become absolutely irrelevant. Instead, the most important questions are how much 3.5 percent enriched uranium they have and whether they are allowed to keep their centrifuges spinning. If the answer to both is yes, they are moving forward on a bomb.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, if we have a deal with Iran, the number one parameter that must be included—and I spoke with both the current intelligence director and the former intelligence director of Israel, and they both said: A nonnegotiable is that Iran has to give up the 9 to 10 tons of enriched uranium that they have on hand. Why wouldn’t you? Why wouldn’t they be forced to give up the fissile material to make a bomb? It only makes sense.

Number two, they need to give up the ability to make further enriched uranium. Those are the centrifuges. That has to go as well.

The world is saying if you want to have the material, the nuclear material, that you need for a peaceful civilian use of power, if you want, for instance, nuclear reactors, that is fine. The world has no problem with nuclear power for true electricity, or if they want radio isotopes for cancer research, no problem. But that means that the material comes into Iran, and it is used for a civilian purpose, and we have inspectors. That is reasonable.

We have countries like Spain that have civilian-use nuclear reactors. They bring their uranium in, and they don’t enrich it themselves, and there are inspectors. The same with Sweden. The same with other countries.

This is fine to have nuclear reactors for electricity. We would back that, but what we will not back, what we must not ever back is the ability for Iran to create a nuclear bomb. That does not change in the current Obama

administration effort of the deal that came out and was thankfully put on hold by the French at Geneva at this P5+1.

The new agreement would allow Iran to continue to freely enrich to 3.5 percent at its Natanz and Fordow facilities. That is beyond all comprehension. How can you have a deal if Iran is continuing to enrich their uranium at two facilities and to continue building centrifuges that can easily and quickly be installed?

“At the end of the 6-month period,” Representative Shelley Berkley writes, “Iran would be even closer to breakout capacity.” Meaning the ability to build a nuclear warhead so quickly that no one could mobilize forces in time to stop it.

In other words, what we would have given Iran last weekend is the luxury of time, time to develop a deadly nuclear weapon. It takes time for a nation, the United States, Israel, the United Kingdom, Canada, any nation, it takes time for a nation to mobilize, to come against a bad actor nation, like Iran, in its development of a nuclear weapon.

Again, that is why this is so important—this chart that was created by Senator MARK KIRK. He accurately reported what the score will be for the world. We will get nothing, and Iran will get everything; and that must not be.

With that, Mr. Speaker, 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 a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for activities associated with the ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Native American code talkers.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POLIS. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I get to my remarks, I briefly want to address the nuclear proliferation issue in Iran. The gentlelady from Minnesota, as well as myself, and the vast majority of Members of this body, have been supportive of crippling sanctions against Iran. Many of us believe that that has helped drive Iran to the negotiating table.

We hope for, of course, a peaceful outcome that takes nuclear weapons off the table and prevents Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons; and, of

course, we continue to keep the use of force on the table if our diplomatic solution fails to be enacted that reaches President Obama’s objective of preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

The issue has had strong bipartisan support, nearly unanimous, here in this Chamber, with regard to continuing the pressure on Iran to rejoin the responsible nations and renounce the acquisition of nuclear weapons.

But I am here today to talk about something closer to home, Mr. Speaker, in fact, at home, Mr. Speaker, namely, the need to act on immigration reform. It has been 138 days since the Senate passed a commonsense bipartisan immigration reform bill. I was proud to be part of a bipartisan group of Members here in the House that introduced H.R. 15, a companion bill to the Senate’s immigration reform bill that makes additional improvements on outcome-based border enforcement and would address our broken immigration system and replace it with one that reflects our values as Americans, helps create jobs here at home, reduces our deficit by over \$100 billion, and restores the rule of law here in our country, which is currently being undermined by the presence of 10 million, 15 million, 8 million—nobody knows how many people are here illegally.

The issue will not resolve itself, Mr. Speaker. I call upon this body to act immediately and bring to the floor H.R. 15 and pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Later on in my remarks, given that this is the week of Veterans Day, I will be talking about the contributions that many members of our military have made who are from immigrant backgrounds, including the talent that our military is missing out on today, including DACA, or deferred action recipients, who are able to work legally in our country, but are not allowed to serve in our military.

H.R. 15 would solve that issue, and we will be talking about the many contributions that immigrants have made and continue to make with regards to our military.

My colleague, Mr. TONKO from New York, is here; and I would be happy to yield to him for a moment.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Representative POLIS, for bringing us together for what I believe is very thoughtful discussion about immigration reform, for we are by definition a Nation of immigrants.

I believe that the passion that is the luring card to America is that American Dream. People for decades and centuries throughout the history of this Nation have pursued that American Dream with the opportunity to climb those economic ladders, those opportunities that present themselves in this country, where we are emboldened by immigrants; and certainly the military is no exception.

Tonight, we will be talking about the empowerment that comes with H.R. 15,