

growth and undermining American businesses' ability of all sizes to compete in this global market.

Now is the time for long-term reauthorization of the Bank so that American entrepreneurs can use this tool to create more jobs in our country. This can only happen with bipartisan support. I stand and ask my colleagues to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank on behalf of American workers and American businesses.

NUCLEAR DEAL WITH IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the single greatest threat to the national security of the United States is Iran's drive for nuclear weapons. The result of the negotiations being conducted by President Obama and our Western allies will shape the long-term security and stability of the United States for years to come.

Iran is the world's leading sponsor of terror, a stronghold for terrorists whose very mission is to spread oppression. Iranian leaders have called for the complete annihilation of Israel, calling Israel a "barbaric, wolflike, and infanticidal regime." Iranian leaders have said that the United States of America has "no place among the nations."

By its own declaration, Iran is not looking for a peaceful path of coexistence. There can be nothing more dangerous for America or our allies than a nuclear-armed Iran. That is why a bad deal with Iran, one that leaves the door open for Iranian nuclear weapons, must be avoided at all costs.

In order to alleviate these concerns, the President and his national security team have said over and over that a bad deal is worse than no deal at all; but will that sentiment actually stop this administration from entering into a bad deal with Iran? What I have seen so far, through the framework agreement released in April, raises serious concerns.

Under this framework agreement, not a single Iranian nuclear centrifuge will be dismantled. No nuclear facilities will be shut down. While some of Iran's nuclear infrastructure will be temporarily warehoused, most of Iran's nuclear infrastructure will remain completely intact. All of these factors point to a flawed understanding of a "good deal" by President Obama; yet this is the deal we may well be given.

Twenty years ago, the United States was negotiating with another country on nuclear weapons development. During these talks with the Soviet Union and Gorbachev in the 1980s, President Ronald Reagan used the proverb "trust, but verify" throughout those discussions.

I do not see this administration using that same tactic. In fact, it seems to me that in regards to Iran, the Obama

administration is operating on the principle of "trust and don't verify."

As things stand, these ongoing nuclear negotiations are placing far too much faith in a country that has proven itself both deceptive and unpredictable.

Mr. President, a good deal must contain the following five points: first, a deal that requires anytime, anywhere inspections; second, a deal that would only lift sanctions when Iran demonstrates compliance with its obligations; third, a deal must require Iran to provide a complete report of its past nuclear activities; fourth, a deal must require Iran to dismantle its nuclear weapons infrastructure; and, last but not least, a good deal must not allow Iran to become a nuclear state ever.

Without these conditions in place, the United States will, without a doubt, be prioritizing a bad deal over no deal at all.

□ 1030

HONORING DICK HORIGAN ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very dear friend, Dick Horigan.

Richard hails from my hometown of Amsterdam, New York. Dick turns 90 on Friday, and it is worth noting this milestone because he has epitomized the generosity, humility, and dedication of the World War II generation, and he has made Amsterdam a better place as a result.

Richard T. Horigan wasn't born in Amsterdam, nor did he grow up there. In horse racing terms, a sport he continues to enjoy at the nearby historic Saratoga Race Course, Dick was a "shipper" from Scranton, Pennsylvania.

After serving in the Navy in the Pacific during World War II, he enrolled in Georgetown University. On a blind date, he met Marie Smeallie, the beautiful daughter of Donald and Agnes Smeallie of Amsterdam, and they were married shortly thereafter. Upon Dick's graduation from Georgetown law school, Marie convinced him to move to Amsterdam and begin his law practice there.

Since 1951, Dick has been a pillar of our community. Retired now, he was very active in the American Bar Association and the American College of Trial Lawyers. Dick was the consummate attorney and a leader in his field. He was the village attorney for nearby Hagaman, and practiced before the United States District Court, the Northern District of New York, and the United States Court of Appeals.

In the 1970s, he struck out on his own, and his son, Tim, joined him to start Horigan & Horigan, which continues to be one of the top firms not only in Amsterdam, but throughout New York's greater capital region.

While his love of his profession is strong, his love of family is even stronger. When Marie passed away in 1977, he found himself spending more and more time with Ellie Smeallie, who had been widowed many years earlier. In 1979, Ellie and Dick were married. This good-looking couple merged two great families and brought them even closer together.

Dick is the patriarch of 13 children, 33 grandchildren, and, yes, 3 great-grandchildren. While many of them live outside of the region now, they all come back to visit, especially in August, when the historic Saratoga Race Course is open.

In addition to horse racing, his other passions include golfing and helping St. Mary's Catholic Church, where I would often see him at mass in the mornings.

We wish a happy 90th birthday to Richard Horigan. I hope there are many more to come, Dick. You are a beloved, reliable patriarch of an awesome clan. You are a respected, loyal friend to countless many, including myself.

My message here on the House floor is: To a great man, have a great day. It is my honor to recognize your 90th birthday.

ENDLESS WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the week before last, the greatly respected conservative columnist Thomas Sowell wrote:

What lessons might we learn from the whole experience of the Iraq war? If nothing else, we should never again imagine that we can engage in nation building in the sweeping sense that term acquired in Iraq—least of all, building a democratic Arab nation in a region of the world that has never had such a thing in a history that goes back thousands of years.

The week before last, the longtime conservative leader David Keene wrote in the Washington Times about our Middle East wars:

The concept of U.S. national interests was stretched beyond any rational meaning with the argument that "democracies don't go to war with democracies," so rebuilding the world in our own image was seen as our ultimate national interest.

Mr. Keene went on and said:

America took on more than we could possibly handle. The result is a generation of young Americans who have never known peace, a decade in which thousands of our best have died or been maimed with little to show for their sacrifices, our enemies have multiplied, and the national debt has skyrocketed.

The week before last, the publisher of The American Conservative magazine, Jon Utley, wrote an article entitled: "12 Reasons America Doesn't Win Its Wars." The Magazine said:

Too many parties now benefit from perpetual warmongering for the U.S. to ever conclude its military conflicts.

Mr. Utley quoted conservative columnist Peggy Noonan, who wrote:

We spend too much on the military, which not only adds to our debt, but guarantees that our weapons will be used.

She quoted one expert, who said:

Policymakers will find uses for them to justify their expense, which will implicate us in crises that are none of our business.

Conservative icon William F. Buckley, shortly before he passed away, came out strongly against the war in Iraq. He wrote:

A respect for the power of the United States is engendered by our success in engagements in which we take part. A point is reached when tenacity conveys not steadfastness of purpose but misapplication of pride.

He added that if the war dragged on, as it certainly has:

There has been skepticism about our venture, there will be contempt.

A couple of weeks ago, we saw an Iraq army, which we have trained for years and on which we have spent megabillions, cutting and running at the first sign of a fight. We should not be sending our young men and women to lead and/or fight in any war where the people in that country are not willing to fight for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, fiscal conservatives should be the ones most horrified by and most opposed to the horrendous waste and trillions of dollars we have spent on these very unnecessary wars in the Middle East.

Last week, 19 Republicans voted for a resolution saying that we should bring our troops home from Iraq and Afghanistan. The Republican leadership of the Foreign Affairs Committee did not want any Republicans to speak in favor of that resolution, so Mr. JONES, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. MASSIE requested, and received, time from the Democratic sponsor, Mr. McGOVERN.

I did not want to do that, but I at least wanted to point out today that there has been nothing conservative about our policy of permanent, forever, endless war in the Middle East.

In his most famous speech, President Eisenhower warned us against the military industrial complex. We should not be going to war in wars that are more about money and power and prestige than they are about any serious threat to the United States. I think President Eisenhower would be shocked at how far we have gone down that path that he warned us against.

UPCOMING SUPREME COURT DECISION IN OBERGEFELL V. HODGES, TANCO V. HASLAM, DEBOER V. SNYDER, AND BOURKE V. BESHEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the profound hope that, in its upcoming decision, the Supreme Court will strike down laws that prohibit same-sex couples from marrying and to

ensure that all States recognize lawful marriages performed elsewhere.

These four cases—*Obergefell v. Hodges*, *Tanco v. Haslam*, *DeBoer v. Snyder*, and *Bourke v. Beshear*—are an opportunity for the Court to end legal discrimination against committed gay and lesbian couples and their children and to reestablish marriage as a civil right, one that is “fundamental to our very existence and survival,” as it was called by Justice Warren in *Loving v. Virginia* in 1967. As a country, we can no longer allow State governments to burden their citizens by refusing to grant marriage licenses based on whom they love.

Since my earliest days in the New York State Assembly, I have fought alongside the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community for equality under the law. I spoke out in opposition when, in 1996, Congress, for the first time, created a Federal definition of marriage with the Defense of Marriage Act, or DOMA, solely for the purpose of excluding gays and lesbians from receiving Federal marriage benefits; and I have long carried legislation to repeal this insidious law, from offering the Respect for Marriage Act to leading the congressional amicus briefs in both *Windsor* and the current marriage equality cases before the Court. Yet even a full repeal of DOMA would still leave individuals vulnerable to continued State discrimination, which is why there must be a guaranteed right to access to benefits of marriage regardless of where a couple may reside.

When my constituent and friend Edith Windsor began dating Thea Spyer in 1965 and accepted her proposal in 1967, she was not thinking about how the government would view her relationship. She was thinking about the joy and happiness that comes from beginning to shape a life with a partner she loved. Forty years after that proposal, they were able to legally marry in Canada, outside of the country and State they called home.

No one in a free and just country should be forced to leave their home, traveling away from friends and family across State lines, in order to get married. Nor should anyone be faced with the humiliation of being denied government benefits, the tragedy of being barred from a partner's hospital bedside, or the indignity of being refused any of the other thousands of benefits that come with marriage that millions of Americans access every day because a State refuses to recognize their otherwise lawful marriage.

Denying recognition of same-sex relationships signals to the couple, their family, and all others that their bond in love is less deserving of respect, harming the individuals and creating divisions within the fabric of our society.

After Thea's death, Edith bravely fought all the way to the Supreme Court, in the *United States v. Windsor*, to establish what so many of us have

known for decades: that laws that deny recognition of legal same-sex marriages serve no legitimate purpose, stigmatize and shame American families, and are a deprivation of the equal liberty guarantee of the Constitution's Fifth Amendment.

It is time for the long arc of history to continue to bend towards justice and for similarly discriminatory State laws to be struck down once and for all.

Should the Court rule for equality, there will be no losers. No one will be harmed by the granting and recognition of same-sex marriages. Those claiming otherwise are either promoting discredited claims about the dangers of gays and lesbians or falsely believe they have the right to involve themselves in the private affairs of others.

More than 70 percent of Americans already live in jurisdictions that provide for same-sex marriages. It is unconscionable that anyone would propose to continue to deny universal access and recognition, as well as the associated safety and security, to these families.

The Court has the immediate responsibility to expand upon its decision in *Windsor* to ensure that State laws comply with established basic constitutional protections and that all Americans are given the equal respect and support they deserve.

Much as in *Loving v. Virginia*, which also rolled back government-enforced marriage discrimination based on race, outdated prejudices and intolerance cannot be allowed to rule the day. It is time that we make the Constitution's promise of equality a reality for gay and lesbian couples throughout the Nation.

Regardless of the forthcoming decision, we have a long way to go to ensure full equality for LGBT Americans who can still be fired from their jobs, denied housing, and turned away from stores simply for being who they are. We must work together to pass comprehensive nondiscrimination legislation to protect these vulnerable Americans.

SPYING AND SNOOPING BY GOVERNMENT ON AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I store a lot on my computer and on my phone: family photographs, personal calendars, emails, schedules, and even weekend to-do lists, or, as my wife calls them, honey-do lists. But this information stored on a phone like the one I have here is not private from the prying, spying eyes of government.

Most Americans have no idea that Big Brother can snoop on tweets, g-chats, texts, Instagrams, and even emails. Anything that is stored in the cloud is available to be spied on by government, as long as it is older than 180 days.