

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I am actually quite surprised that we find ourselves here tonight attempting to overturn the National Park Service recent policy changes to stop allowing the Confederate flag to be displayed or sold in national parks.

Mr. Chair, just yesterday, this House passed amendment after amendment supporting the removal of the symbol of racism from our national parks, which are visited every day by Americans and foreign visitors of every race.

We have read about the divisive tactics happening in the South Carolina statehouse as they debate the removal of the Confederate flag after the murder of nine Black parishioners.

I never thought that the U.S. House of Representatives would join those who would want to see this flag flown by passing an amendment to ensure the continuing flying of the Confederate flag. I strongly urge every Member to stand with the citizens of all races and to remove this symbol of hatred from our National Park Service.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I want to restate: On June 25 when National Park Service Director Jon Jarvis requested that Confederate flag sales be removed from national park bookstores and gift shops, he also followed a decision by several large national retailers—Walmart, Amazon, and Sears—to stop selling items with Confederate flags on them, and I agreed with these decisions. I commend those for their prompt action.

While in certain and very limited circumstances, it might be appropriate in a national park to display the image of the Confederate flag in a historical context—and I say that as a social studies teacher—the general display or sale of Confederate flag items is inappropriate and divisive. I support limiting their use.

I strongly oppose this amendment, which is an attempt to negate amendments which were approved yesterday without any opposition to limit the displaying of the Confederate flag, and so we should make sure that we uphold what this House stood for yesterday, which is to say no to racism, which is to say no to hate speech.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from California will be postponed.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, as we prepare to finish consideration of H.R. 2822, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate my subcommittee chairman, KEN CALVERT, for getting this bill to this point.

It has not been an easy process, as we just realized a few moments ago. We have had to consider nearly twice as many amendments as any other appropriations bill taken up in the House this year.

While I have not agreed with a considerable number of the amendments that have been made to the bill, I do appreciate that the chairman and I have been able to disagree when necessary without ever being disagreeable. My working relationship with Chairman CALVERT has been first rate. I appreciate the hard work and effort he has put into the bill.

Let me also express my sincere thanks to the committee staff on both sides of the aisle, as well as the personal staff in both of our respective offices for their work on the bill. They put in long hours to smooth a way for consideration of this bill, and I appreciate their efforts.

Once again, I want to say that we have had a good working relationship, Mr. Chair, but I cannot hide my surprise and my outrage that we find ourselves here tonight attempting to overturn the National Park Service recent policy change to stop allowing the Confederate flag to be displayed or sold at our national parks.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I just want to say that I enjoyed and continue to enjoy working with the gentlewoman as we move this process forward and appreciate her courtesy and kindness.

As I say, we will continue to work at this process as we move ahead.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016”.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POLQUIN) having assumed the chair, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2822) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment,

and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 5, to include corrections in section numbers, section headings, cross references, punctuation, and indentation, and to make any other technical and conforming change necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

#### NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of our Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all of my colleagues who are here tonight at this late hour to talk about the weak negotiations that are taking place in Vienna on the nuclear deal with Iran.

We have a number of distinguished speakers tonight who will address this looming topic that is of great urgency.

Let me begin by yielding to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Trusting that Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, has suddenly had a change of heart in its decades-long quest to obtain a nuclear weapon is just simply naive at best.

Legislation that was signed into law in May would allow Congress to review and vote on any deal that the administration makes with Iran. Those I represent believe Congress should have the final say on any deal, and I couldn't agree more.

America's national security, as well as global security, will be jeopardized if the administration gets this wrong. We must ensure it doesn't. The stakes are simply too high.

If Iran is actually serious about re-engaging with the global community,

they cannot continue to hold American citizens as political prisoners or harass and provoke U.S. Navy ships in international waters.

Iran should stop provoking direct military confrontation, immediately release all detained U.S. citizens, and provide any information it possesses regarding any U.S. citizens that have disappeared within its borders.

The fact that the Iranian regime won't even do these basic actions indicates to me that counting on them to honor commitments they make around a negotiating table can't be taken seriously.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. JOHNSON for his comments. I think he highlighted the basic problems that we have in dealing with a rogue regime like Iran that cannot be trusted, that has not been dealing with us in a straight manner. I thank the gentleman very much for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) to address this threat as well.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my concerns over the potential deal regarding Iran's nuclear program, and I stand here thanking my colleague from the great State of Florida for putting this Special Order together on such a very important and timely issue.

I want to read a quote:

They will freeze and then dismantle their nuclear program. Our other allies will be better protected. The entire world will be safer as we slow the spread of nuclear weapons. The United States and international inspectors will carefully monitor them to make sure it keeps its commitments.

Sound familiar, Mr. Speaker? That is what President Clinton told the American people about the North Korean nuclear deal in 1994. Today, North Korea has anywhere from 10 to 20 nuclear weapons in their arsenal, and that number is expected to grow to 50 in the next 5 years.

Now, we are hearing this same type of posturing from this administration about the Iran negotiations. The United States seems destined to repeat history, unwilling to hold their ground, and granting Iran extension after extension and concession after concession.

As a strong supporter of increasing sanctions against Iran, which brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place, it is common sense that additional sanctions could even put more pressure on them when they are already hurting from the low price of their most prized commodity, oil.

Nobody believes Iran when they say their nuclear infrastructure is in place for peaceful purposes. If that were the case, they would have no need to enrich uranium past 3.5 percent. Iran has a record filled with lies, deceit, sponsored terrorism, human rights violations, and the list goes on and on.

Just as North Korea couldn't be trusted two decades ago, neither should

Iran today. Mr. Speaker, a nuclear Iran is not only a grave danger to American interests, but to Israel—our strongest ally in the Middle East—and our many allies throughout the world.

Of course, the world would be a much safer place if Iran were to neutralize their nuclear production facilities, if they would allow inspections at any time, if they would disclose all military implications of their nuclear program, or if Iran were to demonstrate a better record on human rights.

□ 2045

Unfortunately, these are just what-ifs that have failed to happen today and I am afraid will never happen under this proposed deal.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad deal.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. DAVIS, I quite agree with you.

The more we know about this deal, Mr. Speaker, the more we know it is a weak, dangerous, bad deal.

Thank you, Mr. DAVIS, for sharing your insight with us.

I yield to Mr. LANCE of New Jersey, who has long been speaking about the dangers of a nuclear Iran.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida for her magnificent service regarding the foreign policy of this country and her continued expertise that is of benefit to the entire Nation.

In the coming days, the American people and those of us in Congress will be able to scrutinize an anticipated agreement between Iran and the P5+1 countries and Iran's nuclear weapons program.

Congress will debate and consider the administration's proposal, and I will be looking to ensure that any agreement achieves the paramount goal that Iran will never get nuclear weapons.

A nuclear Iran would fundamentally change the international dynamic and put the United States and our allies, including Israel, in extreme peril. The balance of power in the world would slip away from those who have given blood and treasure in the fight for freedom and justice, while rewarding the perpetrators of some of the most heinous crimes against humanity.

The principle of peace through deterrence would be compromised and the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty would be a footnote in history as rival and regional powers race to acquire their own nuclear weapons. A nuclear arms race will be yet another element of unpredictability in the world's most volatile region.

I do not oppose any agreement; I oppose a bad agreement. Sanctions brought Iran to the table, and sanctions will keep Iran there. Any deal that needlessly surrenders that valuable leverage in the name of taking Iran's word is a bad agreement. There is simply not the trust that state sponsors of terror will suddenly and uncharacteristically prove to be honest.

As Ronald Reagan famously said, "Trust, but verify." That was true

then; it is as true now as then. It is certainly true regarding Iran.

A successful nuclear agreement must include tangible Iranian concessions. Steps to dismantle its nuclear infrastructure, a commitment to a robust inspections regime, and a cease to its dubious terror-related activities must be included in any agreement.

The entire world will be watching, not only the 315 million people of this country, but certainly the people in the Middle East, which is extremely dangerous.

This matter of great consequence will have far-reaching ramifications, and certainly, I hope that the President, the Secretary of State, and the administration will heed the bipartisan concerns that exist here in Congress.

The President reluctantly signed the legislation that reached his desk. That was an expression of the will of the American people through elected Representatives here and in the other House of Congress, overwhelming in its nature; and certainly, I hope that the President and Secretary of State and the administration will recognize that the American people are deeply concerned about what appears to be the parameters of an agreement.

There is still time to reach a better agreement. Let me repeat, no agreement is superior to a bad agreement, as Prime Minister Netanyahu stated in this Chamber this spring.

I hope that Iran will come meaningfully to the table. I hope that Iran will cease its terrorist activities across the globe. I hope Iran will recognize that, if it were to achieve nuclear weapons, it would be the beginning of a situation with unintended consequences for the Middle East, the most dangerous part of the world; terrible consequences for our friend and ally, a country that believes in democracy, Israel; terrible consequences for other Arab nations, including Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and places beyond that; and that we want to live in peace with the Iranian people.

The Iranian people are a great people, a talented people, a well-educated people; and certainly, I hope that the people of Iran recognize that it is not in their best interest that their leaders develop nuclear weapons.

Again, I commend with every breath I take the superb work of the gentlewoman from Florida. I am pleased to be able to join with her and with others this evening to caution that we must ensure a strong agreement and, if that is not possible, then no agreement at all.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you very much, Mr. LANCE. May it be so; from your words to God's ears, may we get this strong deal that can truly be verified.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO), my colleague, a man with whom I have had the honor of talking about this issue, the danger that a nuclear Iran imposes for the stability of the world, not just

for Israel, not just for the neighborhood, and not just for the United States.

Thank you, Mr. CURBELO, for your leadership on this issue.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my colleague for her steadfast leadership on this issue, but really on all issues having to do with foreign relations in this Chamber for so many years. She has set the example and a very high bar for all of us who serve in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by reiterating just how serious the security threat Iran is to the United States and to our allies.

As my colleagues have expressed here, Iran can never attain nuclear capabilities. Any deal reached must ensure that the Iranian regime completely abandons its nuclear ambitions and dismantles its nuclear infrastructure.

It is absolutely critical that the Obama administration be unyielding when dealing with Iran. Additional concessions are simply not an option. A weak deal that gives the regime an opening to obtain nuclear weapons down the road is not good for the United States or its allies, especially Israel. It isn't good for the entire world.

Even while nuclear negotiations between the P5+1 and Iran took place, Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei openly supported the destruction of Israel and supported Hamas' attacks against Israel from Gaza. He also boasted Iranian technology was being used by Hamas to attack Israel and openly called for all Palestinians in the West Bank to join Hamas in Gaza in an armed rebellion against Israel, promising to arm those who participated.

We cannot continue to view Iran's nuclear program as existing in a vacuum. It would be irresponsible to ignore the regime's continued support for terrorism, its pursuit of ballistic missiles, and its failure to comply with the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Moving forward, several things must be present in an acceptable deal, including a robust inspection regime and the resolution of issues of past and present concern. Only then could a deal even begin to be considered as acceptable.

Snapback sanctions relief could be difficult to implement and is not in the best interests of the United States. We must protect the sanctions infrastructure that this body put in place rather than rely on reactive tactics if the Iranian regime does not comply with the terms of the agreement.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to an agreement with Iran, we need to ask ourselves: Does this agreement prevent Iran from achieving nuclear capabilities and keep the United States and its allies safe? Anything other than that is totally unacceptable.

The central question here, Mr. Speaker, is: What kind of a world do we want to live in? What kind of a world

do we want for our children, for our grandchildren, for our families?

A world in which the most radical terrorist regime acquires nuclear weapons—whether it is in 2 years, in 5 years, in 10 years, or in 15 years—is totally unacceptable. This is a government that, again, has pledged to annihilate the only democracy in the Middle East, our best ally in the world, the country that stands with us no matter what, our friends in Israel.

Some in this administration have unjustly criticized Prime Minister Netanyahu. For what? It is for simply wanting his country to survive and his people to live in peace and security.

This is the same government that when the Ayatollah sent their representative—then Mr. Ahmadinejad—to Cuba in 2007, he pledged that, together with Cuba's dictators and the rest of their rogue allies throughout the world, they would bring the United States to its knees. I know my colleague recalls that.

What kind of a world do we want to live in? It is still not too late to walk away from this table and to tell the mullahs that they will never acquire nuclear weapons as long as the United States is the greatest superpower in the world and a beacon for democracy, for peace, and for opportunity for all people.

I, once again, thank my colleague for this special opportunity to highlight an issue that is of vital importance for the entire Nation and for the entire world.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. CURBELO, you certainly have been a leader in this fight.

It is interesting that you should bring up the dangerous clown, Khamenei, because he has been replaced by an equally murderous, sadistic thug, Rouhani; but now, the international community likes to call him the "moderate" leader, where they have had more executions in Iran under the so-called moderate than ever.

The "Death to America," "Death to Israel" chants continue, just as they continued during Ahmadinejad's time. Whether it is Ahmadinejad, whether it is a moderate Rouhani, it is a Supreme Leader who calls the shots.

Nothing in Iran, sadly, has changed. They are calling for the destruction of our ally, and they are calling for destruction of this great country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, who was chairwoman when I was on the Foreign Affairs Committee. She has stepped up and always been a voice, especially in this area. I also want to thank Mr. CURBELO and also Mr. DAVIS.

For a moment, I want to just stop here, and let's put some things in perspective. It has been said over and over—but we are going to talk about this—a bad deal is worse than no deal. I am going to say it again. A bad deal is worse than no deal.

A deal the U.S. and the rest of the international community can accept should be one in which Iran is no longer a nuclear threat. At what point did we forget this, Mr. President? At what point did we lay down and decide that a nuclear Iran, if it is 20 years from now, is better than what a nuclear Iran is now? Mr. President, you have got to listen to what you are saying.

Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu explained to President Obama that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action "threatens the survival of the State of Israel." It threatens the survival of the State of Israel.

I believe that Congress should not be party to any agreement that fails to protect the vital interest of Israel and other allies in the region. That is why I voted "no" on the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act.

I am not in disagreement with Congress providing oversight of a final comprehensive deal, but a horrible deal isn't something Congress should even have to consider.

I have previously stated and will say again that I have always made the security of our strongest ally in the Middle East a priority and will not support any deal that allows Iran the opportunity to develop a nuclear weapon.

Though a final deal has not been yet announced, we know, based off the details of the JCPOA announced in April, of the potential for a bad deal. Under the framework announced in April, Iran will be able to maintain over 6,000 centrifuges they possess. Of the 6,000 centrifuges, 5,000 of those will continue to enrich uranium.

□ 2100

Five thousand, what part of not having a nuclear Iran are we kidding ourselves here with?

And then his wonderful snap back provisions. I am one of those that said we shouldn't have a snap back. They should have never gone away in the process.

Why are we talking about snap back provisions when this body has clearly spoken that the sanctions should stay and, if anything, they should get tighter? But we are now talking about snap back provisions. What a world we live in.

If they don't fulfill their commitment, sanctions will magically snap back. When I read that, it just amazes me, Mr. Speaker, that if they don't keep their commitments—why do we believe they are going to keep any commitments?

This is just an amazing thought to me. It took several years of U.S. presuring for our European allies before they started seriously enforcing the U.N. Security Council sanctions currently in place.

While a U.S. President can unilaterally reinstitute sanctions that were previously waived, the European Union has to receive support from all 28 members for reimposition of former sanctions. Think about that. That is something we ought to talk about.

A similar scenario could be observed at the U.N. Security Council. A unanimous vote by all 15 U.S. Security Council members in the affirmative would be needed for sanctions to be put back in place.

How many of us in this room tonight, and how many of you who may be thinking about this, actually believe that will actually happen? Do you believe that would? I don't.

China and Russia, both permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, have the most to gain from having unfettered access to Iranian markets. It has been widely reported that Russia is moving forward with the selling of S-300s, the anti-aircraft weapon, to Iran. Such a weapon system makes the potential for Israeli or American airstrikes against Iranian nukes just that much more difficult to carry out.

Russia, whose own economy is hurting as a result of the sanctions, is looking to diversify its investments in other economies that show strong potential for growth. China is always looking for new sources of energy, and with the elimination of international sanctions, Iran will have the ability to sell more oil on the international market.

Then there is the issue of possible military dimensions. To receive an accurate picture of Iran's nuclear capabilities, it is imperative to know how close they got to developing or have gotten to developing a nuclear weapon. It is only after we can determine if Iran ever developed a nuclear warhead or triggering mechanism that the international community can actually know Iran's breakout time. Iran's PMDs must be made known to the international community prior—to any permanent sanction relief being instituted.

You know, this pending bad deal makes the region and the greater national community worse off.

What I have heard in this Chamber tonight is very disturbing. What I have heard from leaders in this administration is even more disturbing. They have willingly determined, in my mind, to throw Israel under the bus and, I believe, maybe for a peace prize.

Mr. Kerry, maybe you didn't make a mark in the Senate. Mr. Kerry, maybe you didn't make a mark as Secretary of State. Maybe you are looking for a peace prize. Your peace prize should be come home now and walk away from a bad deal. If you want to be recognized in the world for standing up for what is right, then walk away from a bad deal.

No one wants Iran to have a nuclear weapon. They are not capable of handling one. They are the biggest suppliers to terrorism around the world. And yet we are talking about talking to a country that says just recently, just in the last 2 days, their leader has said it is now time for us to spout hatred at the Zionists.

And we are negotiating with them?

They don't want to say Israel has even a right to exist, and we are sitting

at the table with them? We want to let 5,000 centrifuges keep spinning and keep spinning and keep spinning and keep spinning, and we are going to negotiate with them?

You do not negotiate with unstable people, Mr. Speaker. You negotiate with people who want to live in the bonds of a civil society, in a civil world, and Iran's leadership is not that person.

We are fooling ourselves. This administration has become just completely tunnel-visioned toward legacy. When you have a domestic agenda that has been as terrible as this administration, I don't blame you for looking overseas. But your domestic agenda is no comparison to the failure of a foreign policy, when world leaders ask what is America's role because they don't even know.

Tonight I hope the crescendo of voices in this Chamber reaches across the ocean to Vienna. The last words I would like Secretary Kerry to hear before he sits down with the Iranians are "a bad deal is worse than no deal."

"Death to America," not shouted on the streets here in Washington, not shouted on the streets in New York City or San Francisco or Atlanta. It was shouted in the Parliament of Iran just recently, when they said we are not going to allow inspections. And we are sitting down to negotiate with them?

"Death to America"? And we are sitting down negotiating with them as if they are reasonable people?

Have we lost our focus? Have we lost our vision of being the shining light to the world for freedom and hope, and decided that it is much better off, maybe for our political world, or maybe our personal achievements, to sit down with a government that says Israel should not even have the right to exist, and if we could, we would annihilate them tomorrow?

We are going to continue funding those who have lobbed bombs on innocent men and women in Israel and who will sit down at a negotiating table and say: We are not going to allow you to inspect wherever you want; we are going to keep what we want to keep.

And, by the way, even the administration's own belief is we are going to keep 5,000 spinning, centrifuges spinning, 5,000 spinning.

You know what? Some have said time is Iran's friend. I agree. As long as they can keep our Secretary of State at that table, those centrifuges spin. As long as they keep us tied up debating this in this administration, the centrifuges spin. As long as we keep doing this, the centrifuges spin.

It is time to put sanctions back in place because they are spinning. It is time to tighten the screws on Iran because those centrifuges are spinning. It is time for us not to let up because the centrifuges are spinning.

And I do not want to see a world in which my children grow up and the people in Israel grow up knowing that

Iran has a bomb when they are ready to take them out in a certain notice.

Tonight is important. Tonight is important.

Mr. President, I pray that you listen. I don't think you will.

Mr. Secretary, maybe you are looking for a peace prize. How about winning a prize in the hearts of the freedom-loving people all across the world and walking away from a bad deal?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you very much, Mr. COLLINS. I think you laid it out in a thoughtful manner. No deal is better than a bad deal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her leadership on this important issue, your leadership with America's foreign policy. I know that my constituents all the way up in New York are more secure and free due to your work through the years here in the Halls of Congress. I thank you for your leadership.

This past weekend we celebrated the Fourth of July, 239 years since America declared its independence. What makes America great is what we stand for: freedom and liberty.

And then there is Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terror, a nation overthrowing foreign governments, unjustly imprisoning United States citizens, including a United States Marine.

Iran blows up mock U.S. warships, develops ICBMs. They pledge to wipe Israel off the map. And in their streets, in their halls, they are chanting, "Death to America."

And none of what I just described is even part of the negotiations. Think about that.

The President says the only alternative to whatever deal he presents us with is war. I reject that. The deal the President is finalizing may actually pave the path to more instability in the Middle East and a nuclear arms race triggered in the region.

Will the agreement be accurately translated between both languages?

If the President presents Americans with a version in English and the Iranians are interpreting any different terms refuting our interpretation of that agreement in English, then there is no agreement. There is no meeting of the minds.

Will Iran continue spinning centrifuges, enriching uranium and maintaining any of their nuclear infrastructure?

Will weapons inspectors have unfettered access to Iran's nuclear infrastructure? Honestly, I doubt it.

I believe that we are propping up the wrong regime in Iran.

Six years ago, the Green Revolution, millions of Iranians took to the streets protesting after an undemocratic election. The economy in Iran was doing better at that time than it is today. Oil, twice the value as today.

The President said that what was going on in Iran was none of our business, and look where we are today.

I unapologetically love my country, and I am proud to be an American. As elected officials who took an oath to protect and defend our Constitution, we have a responsibility to protect our country.

We must fight on behalf of our great Nation, which generations before us have fought and sacrificed so much to protect. And that is how we celebrate another 239 years of American exceptionalism.

The President, when sitting down at the negotiating table, inherits the goodwill of generations, centuries of men and women who have come before them that sacrificed so much to make America the greatest Nation in the world. When someone says they want to run to be President of the United States, with that, you inherit all of that goodwill, all of that American exceptionalism.

And when sitting at the table, you have no business trying to equalize yourself with the person you are negotiating with. That isn't your goodwill to expend.

It is important for American greatness to grow. And I am concerned that we are on pace to enter into a bad deal with Iran.

Here, with the leadership of colleagues like the gentlewoman from Florida, who I am very grateful for putting together this Special Order tonight, and other colleagues, like the gentleman from Florida, who will be speaking right after me, there is so much passion amongst my colleagues for wanting to do the right thing to protect our Nation, understanding that it is a fundamental basic that the United States strengthens our relationships with our allies and treats our enemies for exactly who they are.

I used the analogy a couple of weeks ago of playing Texas Hold'em, and the President inherits pocket aces every time he sits down at the table. The Iranians may inherit the 7-2 off suit, the worst hand that you could possibly have in poker.

The President, for whatever reason, as a negotiating style, will offer to switch hands. We saw it in Cuba, where dozens of good-faith concessions were made asking for nothing in return. Why is that?

For one, the President isn't a very good negotiator. He still has a year and a half left on his second term in office, and I want him to strengthen his hand. He has it. He inherits it. That is what comes with being the President of the United States. That is what he signed up for.

And what did we sign up for here in the Halls of Congress? To hold this President's feet to the fire if he chooses to sign a bad deal with Iran.

I thank, again, the gentlewoman from Florida for her leadership. I am looking forward to hearing Mr. YOHO and his passionate words to follow.

And I would encourage the President and Secretary Kerry, the leaders of the Obama administration, to do the right thing. Take a walk, strengthen your hand, and don't sell out America's goodwill.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Florida, Dr. YOHO.

□ 2115

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my very dear colleague from Florida for bringing this very important topic to light. This is something the American people need to weigh in on; and this is something, as you heard the passion tonight, the people talking about how this is not a good deal. This is not a good deal for anybody but Iran.

I would like to do a chronological anthology of Iran's nuclear weapons program. If you go back 30 years ago, they were working on gaining the technology and the material to develop nuclear weapons.

John Bolton, in his book "Surrender is Not an Option," talked about the cat-and-mouse game that Iran had played over the last 30 years of saying, No, we are not developing nuclear weapons; and they wouldn't allow the inspectors in.

The U.N. had resolutions and sanctions, and eventually, the IAEA inspectors—the International Atomic Energy Agency—was allowed to come in. They caught Iran redhanded, developing nuclear weapons.

They apologized. They said: I am sorry. You are right. We were bad. We are not going to do it again.

Then it started over again and then over again and over again. For 30 years, we have been playing the cat-and-mouse game. It hasn't gone away. Their mission is to get nuclear weapons.

When I look at George Bush, when he put sanctions in the 2000s on Iran to say enough is enough, the sanctions were in place, and they started. To President Obama's credit, he tightened them up, and it put more pressure on Iran, and then it brought them to the negotiation table.

When you negotiate on a deal—any deal—there should be mutual benefits to both sides. At the end of this, you will see there is no benefit to America, to the Middle East, and to world peace because, when those negotiations started, as my colleague from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) brought up, there was no negotiation to release our four American hostages.

If you think that the sanctions were bad enough to put Iran in this great economic tragedy or pressure that was just crippling Iran and they couldn't do anything and they came to the table to release the sanctions so that they could move on, but during that time period—this is what the American people need to know—during that time period, Iran was extending their arm and

their reach into the Western Hemisphere through Bolivia, through Venezuela; and they were funding their terrorist arm, Hezbollah, that caused two terrorist attacks in Argentina in the nineties that was responsible for over 100 deaths and over 300 injured people—Iran was doing this at the time when the sanctions were on them, and they were supposed to be under this great economic stress—but they were doing that because they were funneling money through Venezuela and getting money for fuel plus armaments that they were selling. During this time, when we think our sanctions are working, Iran is working against us.

I have been here in the House for 2½ years, and I sit on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. During those 2½ years, we have had experts come in, over and over again, telling us about the threat of Iran creating new clear weapons.

Over and over again, they said that Iran would have enough nuclear-enriched material to have enough material within 6 months to a year to have five to six atomic bombs. That was over 2 years ago, so one could only reasonably expect that Iran has enough material for five to six nuclear bombs.

This was backed up by Henry Kissinger and George Shultz in The Wall Street Journal editorial about 3 months ago, that they claim that Iran was about 2½ months to 3 months from having nuclear material.

Then we moved down to the negotiation. The negotiation was started—if people will go back and research the news—from the administration, from John Kerry. He said negotiations have started and that the whole purpose was Iran cannot and will not be permitted to have a nuclear weapon. Now, we are just going to delay them for 10 years.

As my colleague from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) brought up, the snapback, if they break any part of this deal, there is going to be snapback. I mean, you have got to be from another planet to think that that is going to happen because we are going to rely on China and Russia to say: Yes, we are with you.

Russia has already sold \$800 million worth of antimissile defense systems. In addition, during this period, when Iran had all these tough sanctions blocking their economy, Iran has been developing an ICBM program.

An ICBM program stands for an intercontinental ballistic missile system. That is not for their neighbors. That is for Europe. That is for the United States. It is for people way outside of Iran. They have done this with the economic sanctions.

In addition, there is evidence that they have detonated a trigger device for a nuclear weapon. They have gone through expensive remediation, covering up the site, covering up the soil, paving it, and not allowing our inspectors to go in there and inspect that—the IAEA inspectors that we are supposed to depend on to prove that what they are doing is for peaceful purposes.

Then I look at what Iran has done over the years, when we have been in the Middle East, with our brave young men and women in the Middle East, fighting for security for this country and for the neighbors in the Middle East. Seventy percent of the wounds to our soldiers have come from IEDs. Ninety percent of those IEDs were created by Iran.

Then, as we talked about in this nuclear negotiation, Iran has got to be limited to the amount of centrifuges for their peaceful nuclear program.

Now, get this, for a peaceful nuclear program, you need tens of thousands of centrifuges to produce nuclear material to run nuclear reactors; yet, in this deal, we are only limiting them to 5,000 centrifuges. You only need a few thousand centrifuges to create nuclear weapons. It just doesn't match up.

As we talked about, in a negotiation, there should be a mutual benefit. I see no benefit for America.

Again, talking to the experts in Foreign Affairs, I asked them this question: With our negotiation with Iran, where we have given into everything and we have got nothing—keep in mind, we are supposedly the lone superpower of the world—when you go into a negotiation like this and you are operating from a level of weakness and not strength, how does that affect us around the world community?

The experts told me that it has weakened America's standing in the world. It has weakened our negotiation power in the world. It has weakened and threatened our security in the Western Hemisphere.

I agree with Mr. COLLINS. I hope the President is listening, but I am sure he is not; I hope Mr. Kerry is listening, but I am sure he is not, but I hope this message gets to them—that, if they are going to negotiate for America, they should negotiate from a point of strength, a point for what is right, not just for our country, but for the Middle East and for the rest of the world because, if America is not strong and if we do not stand strong, there is not a secure world.

I thank my colleague from Florida for bringing this up because this is a debate the American people need to hear. I hope they put pressure on the people in charge of this and bring this negotiation—as they have said over and over again, a bad deal they will not stand for—this is a bad deal, and this is something they need to walk away from.

We, in the House of Representatives, need to block this in any way that we can. I will not, I shall not, and I cannot support this because what I see is we are trying to prevent that which we can't, instead of preparing for that which will be.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank you, Dr. YOHO, and I think you laid out the chronology of the long timetable of the deceit that Iran has been dealing with in terms of their nuclear program.

I thank all of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, who joined tonight's Special

Order to discuss Iran's nuclear negotiations that are going on in Vienna as we speak. After missing deadline after deadline and allowing for extension after extension, we are now hearing that these negotiations may be open-ended.

It is our job in Congress to conduct proper oversight on any proposed deal and to reject any deal that is not in the best interests of our national security or the security and stability of the entire region.

As current law stipulates, if a deal is submitted for congressional review before tomorrow, then Congress only has a 30-day review period. However, if this deal is submitted after tomorrow, we will have 60 days to review the terms of the agreement.

Why should the administration fear an additional 30 days of review? If this deal is so good, as the administration keeps telling us, then it should be strong enough to stand up to congressional review and congressional scrutiny; but the administration knows just how weak this deal will be.

Mr. Speaker, let's review, as my colleagues have done, how far back we have slid from conditions that we placed on Iran when we started and how much the P5+1 countries have caved through its concessions to this rogue and dangerous regime.

Let's start with this: there are six United Nations Security Council resolutions against Iran and its nuclear program. Each one of those resolutions puts restrictions on Iran and calls for a complete stop on uranium enrichment, a complete stop.

The Supreme Leader argued that it had a right to enrich under the non-proliferation treaty, the NPT, to which it is a signatory, but of course, all of these alleged rights should have been forfeited once it was discovered that Iran had been in violation of the non-proliferation treaty and other international obligations for decades because it has been operating a covert nuclear program; yet the P5+1 countries inexplicably ceded the so-called right to Iran.

In fact, in 2009, the President clearly stated: "Iran must comply with U.N. Security Council resolutions and make clear it is willing to meet its responsibilities as a member of the community of nations."

That ended up not being true, as the President has caved on that commitment. The President has repeatedly stated in the past that Iran doesn't need to have a fortified underground facility in Fordo, a heavy water reactor in Arak, or some of the other advanced centrifuges that they currently possess in order to have a peaceful nuclear program; yet where are we now?

Well, Iran will maintain Fordo and its capacity to produce and store heavy water while continuing to not just operate advanced centrifuges, Mr. Speaker, but to also test and conduct research and development on them as well—how far we have moved those goalposts.

There is also a serious and dangerous issue of the possible military dimensions, PMD, and Iran's past nuclear activity.

Just 3 weeks ago, Secretary Kerry confirmed what we long suspected, that disclosure of past nuclear activity is no longer a must-have for this administration in this nuclear deal.

How would any agreement that doesn't demand that Iran at least come clean about the extent of its program going to be a good deal, Mr. Speaker? Don't forget that the Supreme Leader has also repeatedly stated that Iran's military sites would not be accessible to international inspectors.

Let's not forget one of the most important things here, the ultimate gift we have given Iran. This deal will help legitimize this rogue regime that will not only allow Iran to be viewed as a responsible nation, but it is no longer going to be the pariah state. We are going to say it is a trusted member of the international community, and we have done that. We have granted that legitimacy with these conversations.

Also, the reports indicate—and I don't hear any words to the contrary—that Iran may receive a \$50 billion signing bonus, as if this is the NFL draft, a signing bonus which it will then use to support terror, which it will use to foment instability, which it will use to stoke sectarian tensions, which it will use to continue to threaten Israel, which it will continue to undermine U.S. national security interests.

□ 2130

Mr. Speaker, that is what their signing bonus will do. That is what sanctions relief will do. If the United States is willing to overlook all of these transgressions, all of these crimes, and negotiate a deal with Iran without pressing for changes in its actions, then it will be seen as an endorsement of those actions.

Mr. Speaker, we have every indication that we are not going to get what any of us would remotely consider to be even a halfway good deal. The requirements for a good deal went out the window when the negotiators allowed Iran to maintain its entire nuclear infrastructure and continue to enrich uranium.

It is our obligation, then, to conduct our proper oversight and review and reject any nuclear deal that we feel is not in the best interests of our U.S. national security. If we do that, we must move swiftly to reimpose any sanctions that have been suspended, any sanctions that have been waived against the regime, and to ensure that all sanctions are fully and vigorously enforced. Then we must move to enact additional sanctions on the regime until it meets its international obligations and abandons its pursuit of an illicit nuclear weapons program. Once upon a time, that was the goal.



From the very beginning, Mr. Speaker, I have been saying that Iran is following the North Korean playbook: offering to negotiate in return for concessions but never delivering on anything tangible, only to break off when they no longer need what we have been giving them.

I wrote this op-ed on October 19, 2012, "Ros-Lehtinen: Obama Still Trying to Sweet-Talk Iran Out of Building the Bomb," and I was talking about the North Korea deal and how that dovetails with the Iranian deal. I wrote of the dangers of the Obama administration's naive view that if we keep talking, if we keep engaging with this rogue regime, then Iran will stop its drive for nuclear capability.

I stated then, and I believe now, that this is what we are witnessing today, Mr. Speaker, that the Iranians will give the impression that a deal will be likely only to then pull away, that Iran benefits from dragging out the negotiations as long as possible because, as Mr. COLLINS of Georgia said, the centrifuges are still spinning, and they want to provide its nuclear program extra time in order to convince the world that an agreement is possible, leaving the administration and the EU to quietly ease sanctions enough to revive the stagnant Iranian economy that had been on the brink of collapse thanks to the sanctions that Congress placed on them; because that was the intent and the purpose and the objective of the sanctions, not to get them to negotiate, but to collapse their economy so that they could not pour money into their terrorist activities and their covert nuclear program.

But what we are seeing now is the administration and other P5+1 countries will allow the terms of the JPOA and, thus, the easing of sanctions to continue to be in place despite having overextended several deadlines. Iran never had any intention of coming to a real agreement, and we would be foolhardy to believe that it does now, not when it is already getting everything it wants. Why should they concede anything now?

Mr. Speaker, the only way that Iran will say yes to a deal is if it is so bad and so weak that Iran would be stupid and silly to walk away from it. Yet that is precisely what we are looking at right now, Mr. Speaker. Either Iran keeps dangling an agreement in front of the P5+1 and continues to get more sanctions relief, or the P5+1 completely and utterly capitulates to Iranian demands.

So it is incumbent upon us, Mr. Speaker, to reject any deal that we view to be weak, any deal that we perceive to be a bad deal, any deal that is not in the interests of our U.S. national security interests.

We must also continue to push back on this false binary notion that tells you that it is either this deal—no matter how bad it is—or going to war. That has been a fundamental misunderstanding of the purpose of the Iranian

sanctions themselves. The fact that some believe that Iranian sanctions were designed only to get Iran to the negotiation table could not be further from the truth. The Iranian sanctions were designed to force the region to abandon completely its nuclear weapons ambitions, to give up its enrichment, and to dismantle its nuclear program.

I should know, Mr. Speaker, because I am the author of several Iran sanctions bills, including the toughest set of sanctions against this terrible regime that are currently on the books right now. Sanctions, I might remind my colleagues and the American people, that the Obama administration fought us every step of the way or until it was clear that the administration could not stop our sanctions from becoming law, and then they said, Okay, we will accept them. So there is an alternative to these misguided talks.

That is how I am going to conclude my Special Order tonight, Mr. Speaker. We must abandon these talks that are just patently a farce. We immediately reinstate all sanctions against Iran that have been eased, that have been waived, that have been lifted, and that have been ignored by the Obama administration and enact even tougher sanctions on the regime.

We were on the brink until Iran received the lifeline that it needed. We gave it to them, and now we are the ones dangling on it as Iran's economy is being brought back to life because of sanctions relief, and the regime has been gaining concession after concession while never once making any change that would substantially and significantly set back its nuclear ambitions.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the end, I will conclude with this: Reinstating and strengthening these sanctions, coupled with the credible threat that all options are on the table, including the military option, could act as the deterrent, but only if Iran recognizes that we are in a position of strength. That is why it is important that this body speak up. That is why it is important that we reject any deal we find to be insufficient, but we must also not let billions of dollars flow to the Iranian regime. We must start passing legislation that would impose tougher sanctions.

This is a matter of utmost concern to our national security. I urge my colleagues to remain engaged on this issue.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for July 7 and today on account of a family obligation.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill

of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 91. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 9, 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:

2062. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Beef From a Region in Argentina [Docket No.: APHIS-2014-0032] (RIN: 0579-AD92) received July 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2063. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Beef From a Region in Brazil [Docket No.: APHIS-2009-0017] (RIN: 0579-AD41) received July 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2064. A letter from the Program Manager, BioPreferred Program, Office of Procurement and Property Management, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Guidelines for Designating Biobased Products for Federal Procurement (RIN: 0599-AA23) received July 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2065. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Prohibition on Contracting with Inverted Domestic Corporations — Representation and Notification [FAC 2005-83; FAR Case 2015-006; Item II; Docket No.: 2015-0006, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM85) received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2066. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Prohibition on Contracting with Inverted Domestic Corporations [FAC 2005-83; FAR Case 2014-017; Item V; ; Docket No.: 2014-0017, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM70) received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2067. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Defining Larger Participants of the Automobile Financing Market and Defining Certain Automobile Leasing Activity as a Financial Product or Service [Docket No.: