

dedicated to militant Islam, is when they are starting to chafe, you turn the screws harder.

We did that thing. We did the right thing. In the Senate, HARRY REID would not bring that up for a vote. The President decided that rather than that route, he would simply provide unilateral sanctions relief to Iran, saying: This is a gesture of good faith. Now we want you to reciprocate with your nuclear program.

Basically, from that time forward, Iran has said: Go fly a kite. We are not giving up anything.

So the agreement we seem to be on the verge of submitting to the Congress allows Iran to keep their entire nuclear infrastructure. The underground bunker at Fordow is fortified for a missile attack. Why do you need to fortify a nuclear facility against a missile attack if it is for peaceful purposes? So they get to keep that.

They have a heavy water reactor in Iraq that they get to keep. That is used to produce plutonium. They don't need it for peaceful purposes. They have advanced centrifuges that they are allowed to keep. Again, no use for those for peaceful purposes.

So Iran is basically in a situation where, if you turn back the clock almost 2 years, when this House voted those sanctions with over 400 votes, if you asked Iran and the Iranian leadership what they most wanted, they probably said: Well, look, we want to keep our nuclear infrastructure, but we want to get rid of these sanctions.

And guess what? That looks to be what is going to happen. And that is going to be a very, very dangerous and bad deal.

I do think it is worth pointing out as much as we can the nature of this regime. They are not only fomenting problems in the Middle East, they are not only dedicated to the destruction of Israel, they are dedicated to the destruction of the United States.

The most deadly attack on U.S. marines since Iwo Jima was in 1983 at the Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, when Hezbollah, which was supported by Iran, bombed and killed 220 U.S. marines, another 21 personnel. That is a major amount of American blood on their hands.

In Iraq, in 2006, 2007, and 2008, they were responsible for killing hundreds of our servicemembers through the Shiite militias that were operating as their proxy forces, and may have killed as many as 1,500. So, again, that is major, major American blood on their hands.

This is a regime that has never, since 1979, showed any evidence of changing or deviating from their ideology-rooted and militant Islam. They are a danger not only to the region, but to the world.

We have seen now for some time, since this President has taken office, Iran has steadily increased its influence and power in the region. They are the number one actor in Iraq, by far. They are now battling for Yemen with

the Houthis. They are the number one patron of Hamas on the Gaza Strip. They are the number one patron of Hezbollah in Lebanon, and they are the number one patron of Assad in Syria. And so this is a massive Shiite crescent throughout the Middle East.

And guess what? When Sunni Arabs see our administration bending over backwards to cut deals with Iran, they see the Shiite-backed militias that are backed by Iran and Iraq—the ones fighting ISIS—that makes the average Sunni Arab say: You know what? I am much more likely to want to join ISIS than have to live under Shiite oppression.

So the President's policy, I think, has been bad for expanding Iran's influence, but I think it also has the effect of driving more Sunni Arabs into the hands of ISIS, and so it is lose-lose policy.

I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for having this discussion. I hope that this bad deal doesn't happen, but if it does, we need to have robust debate in the House. We need to pick apart the deal piece by piece and show how this is not something that is good for security in the world.

We can see that already before the deal has even been agreed to because you see an arms race in the Middle East with the Sunni Arab states that has been underway now for some time. That is a direct result of the bad policies that this administration has engaged in vis-a-vis Iran.

So the regime in Iran is an enemy of the country. We need to recognize that. And we need to make sure that we scrutinize any deal that comes to this Congress that allows Iran to maintain a nuclear capacity and that it is voted down resoundingly.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank my colleague.

There is plenty to consider as the negotiations continue between the P5+1 and Iran as we look forward to what deal will be produced.

Again, with the concerns that have been expressed by my colleagues from Florida and New York, we must be vigilant, particularly when you look at the context of what has been happening with Iran over the 36 years.

Again, today we mark the sad anniversary of the murder of Bobby Stethem at the hands of Iranian-backed terrorists. Bobby is one of many victims that this Islamic regime out of Iran has been responsible for over nearly four decades.

Going forward, an agreement where Iran would not even be required to actually stop enriching uranium merits our grave concern. In light of a final agreement's far-reaching implications for the security of both our allies in the region and our own national defenses, we must be extremely vigilant.

As a Member who sits on a House committee that has been tasked with investigating the financial backers that keep international terror groups well-armed and operating, we cannot

ignore Iran's leading role in international terror financing.

As many experts have warned our Committee, once the administration agrees to lift all economic sanctions and free up billions of dollars to the Iranian regime, there is no guarantee that deepening the regime's pockets will not result in increased financing for acts of terror that will kill innocent people.

In addition, contrary to what has been publicly suggested by the President, it will be all but impossible to simply slap those economic sanctions back into effect should Iran break the terms of a final nuclear weapons deal.

We must look to the past and consider the present situation. We owe as much to all those who were murdered at the hand of the Iranian regime and by terror groups who would use Iranian money and weapons to take the lives of innocent men, women, and children.

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

PIVOT TO AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) until 10 p.m.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, Congress has a chance this week to turn the President's "Pivot to Asia" into a "Pivot to America." The question is: Will we as Members listen to the people, or will we double down on a watered-down policy that has divided both the Democratic and Republican sides of the aisle?

We often complain about lack of bipartisanship, but in this case, we are seeing it stop the trade promotion authority, or TPA, fast track. We must hold firm.

Republicans and Democrats have a long history of being for free trade. We all want our goods to go to international markets and for trade barriers to be removed. We find ourselves at a crossroads today because both parties have voiced a lack of trust in the President's ability to be able to negotiate what is best for America. That is why we are still fighting to stop the trade promotion authority, better known as fast track.

Fast track will not be the panacea of all ills. In fact, if granted, we could see the President move swiftly on the Trans-Pacific Partnership that will likely not deliver the goods, potentially binding our Nation to an agreement that could circumvent U.S. interests and law and have secondary harmful effects in multiple areas.

Dr. Aurolyn Luykx, an anthropology professor at the University of Texas at El Paso, makes this analysis:

I think the consequences could be very dire. We already saw under NAFTA how so many jobs left the United States and also went from Mexico. Then we saw, as well, tens of thousands of low-income Mexican families being put out of work and losing

their land, and we saw how that drove migration to the United States.

The architects of the TPA in both Congress and the White House take offense at any opposition, leveling the charge that we are being protectionists. The White House claims that with fast track they can move the TPP to lower barriers on U.S. exports among the 11 other nations, thus increasing jobs and wages.

Now to the facts.

Contrary to what we hear, we already have high-standard free trade agreements with 7 of those other 11 nations in the proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership. We are writing the rules in the Pacific. Let's write them some more, with good bilateral agreements that will allow the American people to have a voice, not some council or transnational commission that sets our fate.

If you don't believe me, then how about Simon Johnson, a former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund, a professor at MIT Sloan, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics? Maybe he knows something about it. Here is what he says about the myth of needing the TPA to lower tariffs among the proposed members of the Trans-Pacific Partnership:

Almost all tariffs on trade among Canada, Mexico, and the United States are long gone—that was the effect of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Under the Australia and Singapore free trade agreements as well, almost all tariffs on U.S. goods sold in those countries have been eliminated. Goods from the United States have entered Chile without tariffs since January of this year, and most tariffs imposed by Peru have already been phased out.

The TPP will amount to a free trade agreement with Brunei, with a population less than Omaha, Nebraska, I might add, and New Zealand, with a population less than Louisiana. Encouraging exports to these countries is surely desirable, but the economic impact on the U.S. is unlikely to be more than a rounding error.

That leaves three larger countries where the issues are more complex: Japan, Malaysia, and Vietnam. And TPP will also confer special status on foreign investors, allowing them to sue for financial judgments against host-country regulations.

Why we would want to provide such differential protection to nondomestic companies is a mystery. Creating a quasi-legal process outside the regular court system, just for foreigners, can go wrong in many ways.

From my own reading of the TPP, without divulging the details, I would add the concern about private rights in disputes, the transnational panel empowered with a living agreement—and yes, it is there; I have seen it with my own eyes—even after the accord is signed by member nations.

There are also the possible exceptions granted to Brunei, whose legal system is not to the same standard as the other nations.

Of great concern is a stated intention to economically integrate like the EU—Not cooperate, but integrate.

So, one says: What solutions do you have? Here are a few.

First, we must start by listening to the American people. If the majority of Americans—from socialists to progressives, to liberals, to moderates, to conservatives, to constitutionalists, to the Tea Parties—have voiced concerns and do not want TPA granted, then our actions this week will truly reflect if we are being representative of that voice.

□ 2145

Second, the President must demonstrate he can lead on foreign policy. He has yet to do it. Granting fast track to negotiate with 40 percent of the world's economy should be based on how well he has handled negotiations with other nations in his tenure. It is here, in the foreign policy arena, he is found wanting.

The President's talent for negotiation among nations should be measured by his foreign policy record. Have we forgotten the line in the sand, the arming of al Qaeda and other nefarious Syrian rebels to fight Assad, only to watch them morph into ISIS, then dismiss them as a JV team, only to see them tear through Iraq, which fell apart after we abandoned it, after we were assured they could stand on their own if we left early, and now, no strategy to fix it?

Then, there is the Arab Spring, which has morphed into a potential for nuclear winter with Iran. Let's not forget Crimea and Ukraine. I can go on. The question is: Why are we?

As I have said before, like Lucy holding the football, we are told that the President needs the power to negotiate; if we just come and take a kick at it, all will be fine.

We cannot take such chances with our Nation; instead, the President must show us some deeds, not words. He should start by negotiating a bilateral free trade agreement with Japan, an ally, the biggest nation of those that remain and the one that has the greatest economic impact. Intently focus there, bring that to us, and we will likely approve it.

Third, negotiate an interim agreement with China. We still have much to do with raising the bar on Chinese trade due to corruption, piracy of intellectual property, standards of goods, and other concerns. We made those same claims with Japan in the 1960s and with South Korea in the 1980s. Today, we no longer have those concerns.

China lacks lawyers to fight against these problems. Well, we certainly know how to make plenty of those. Negotiate a law school program all across our land's rich institutions to create Chinese attorneys to enforce the economic benefits of the rule of law.

As to goods, China is seeking oil, natural gas, coal, timber, aggregate, beef, and pork to expand their infrastructure and to feed their people. We have an abundance of these and hard-working Americans that will gladly produce and send these goods.

Instead of making China turn to terrorist states like Sudan and trouble-

makers like Venezuela to pursue these resources, how about a trade agreement on these narrow products that will immediately benefit the American people, reduce our debt with China, and strengthen our friendly ties?

It is not impossible. We have the resources. We have the technology. What we need are the guts to do it, a rekindling of the American spirit, and the leadership to get it done. It starts by putting the brakes on fast track. We need the right track instead.

I urge my colleagues, left and right, to stand your ground. It is time for Congress to lead and be the clarion voice of the American people that we represent. That leadership starts this week in the United States House of Representatives.

Let's hold our ground. Let's pivot back to the American people, invest in ourselves, and benefit not just the Pacific, but the entire world, as we have clearly demonstrated we can do in the last 100 years.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a flight delay.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today through June 26 on account of mandatory military service with the Mississippi Army National Guard.

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker pro tempore, Mr. THORNBERRY, announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1568. An act to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 16, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1827. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Annual