

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2722.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from H.R. 2722.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during a vote on H.R. 251, the Homes for Heroes Act of 2015. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea."

KATE'S LAW

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Establishing Mandatory Minimums for Illegal Reentry Act, also known as Kate's Law.

This bill mandates 5-year minimum prison sentences for illegal immigrants who return to the U.S. after being deported. It comes in direct response to the murder of Kathryn Steinle in San Francisco by a man who had been deported from the United States five times.

Kate's Law sends a strong message to any person considering illegal reentry: Come back, and you will face serious consequences. This bill strengthens the rule of law and leaves no room for selective enforcement by the administration for any sanctuary city.

Madam Speaker, my deepest condolences go out to Kate's family and her loved ones. We cannot undo this tragedy, but we must work to prevent others by securing the border and strictly enforcing the law.

OPM DATA BREACH

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, last week I was profoundly disappointed to learn just how large the recent data breach was in which personal information was accessed in the files of the Office of Personnel Management.

That breach and the one before it were unacceptable, and it is a problem that requires an all-hands-on-deck approach to prevent future cyber attacks to protect those whose information has been accessed.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to represent 62,000 Federal employees in Maryland's Fifth District. They deserve to know—and all our hard-working Federal employees do—that the personal information they submit when they serve our country is safe and se-

cure and that they will be protected against identity theft if their information was accessed.

The resignation of Director Archuleta does not solve the underlying problems that made OPM vulnerable to these kinds of attacks. I intend to work closely with interim Director Beth Cobert to make sure OPM has the resources it needs to upgrade its systems and prevent a reoccurrence of this event. But this breach and the one that preceded it underscore the larger issue of cybersecurity and how we must do more to make America's networks the safest in the world.

FETAL ORGAN HARVESTING AND TRAFFICKING

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

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I rise to raise awareness about a disturbing development. Today video surfaced of Dr. Deborah Nucatola, Planned Parenthood's senior director for medical services, admitting—in fact, bragging—about the harvesting and trafficking of fetal organs after abortions.

To those who haven't seen the video, I urge you and encourage you to watch it. But you need to be forewarned: the casual and callous way she details how babies can be killed in such a way that their tiny hearts, lungs, and livers can be taken and sold for profit is simply horrifying.

To quote Dr. Nucatola: "We have been very good at getting heart, lung, and liver. So I am not going to crush that part. I am going to basically crush below, I am going to crush above, and I am going to see if I can get it all intact."

Madam Speaker, this is one of those moments as a nation that we have to ask ourselves: "Who are we? Are we really going to tolerate this inhumanity? Are we going to look the other way while babies are brutally killed and organs are harvested for profit?"

These are not specimens. They are babies for goodness' sake. I may only have 1 minute today, but I promise, Madam Speaker, we are not done talking about this.

HONORING TIM WATSON OF FREMONT

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the heroic actions of Tim Watson of Fremont, California.

Last month, Tim, a Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority busdriver, was driving his bus along I-680 when he got an important alert. It said to be on the lookout for a child abducted at the Milpitas library that morning. It also included a description of the suspect and child.

Quickly realizing that they may be on the bus, Tim pulled off the road. He

made up a story to the other passengers that he needed to look for a missing backpack so he could go through the bus and get a good look at the suspect and the child without anyone realizing something may be amiss.

After the search, his suspicion increased, and he called the dispatch center. He was told to continue on his route and that police would follow along the way. He drove his bus slowly, going at less than 30 miles per hour, when Fremont police were able to meet the bus and capture the suspect when it stopped at the Fremont BART station.

Madam Speaker, Tim's quick thinking allowed this kidnapping suspect to be apprehended without incident and for the child to be rescued safely.

Thank you, Tim. Your bravery and quick thinking saved a life, held someone to account, and is an inspiration to all of us.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2722

Mr. SANFORD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as cosponsor of H.R. 2722.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2722

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2722.

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

There was no objection.

IMMINENT THREATS TO OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to stand with my fellow members of the Republican Women's Policy Committee to discuss an issue of concern that is on the minds of every American, especially moms. The topic of concern to so many today is our national security and the need to maintain a strong military presence.

Madam Speaker, we currently face many threats abroad, including the terrorist group ISIS and the newly crafted nuclear agreement with Iran. As threats continue to grow overseas, so should our response. We need for our Commander in Chief to lay out a plan of success. We cannot stand idly by while the Islamic State continues to grow. This barbaric group is an imminent threat to the United States and our allies all over the world.

Yet another national security concern facing us today is Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism. Just last night, Iran and the other world powers reached a so-called nuclear deal. I remain deeply skeptical of this so-called deal. Furthermore, Iran has threatened our greatest ally, Israel. Prime Minister Netanyahu has already called this deal "a historic mistake."

The President promised us that he would walk away from a bad deal, but instead he has forsaken his promises, neglected our allies, and disregarded the concerns of the American people. Because of the many freedoms we enjoy here in the United States, we will always have a target on our backs. This is precisely why we must maintain a robust military presence.

At home in North Carolina, I have the privilege of representing the Nation's largest Army installation, Fort Bragg. Despite the mounting threats abroad, the Army began its reduction of 40,000 troops last week. This included a loss of 842 soldiers at Fort Bragg. I firmly believe that any troop reduction is not in the best interests of the national security we have.

However, in light of this troop reduction, I did receive a piece of positive news regarding a decision by the Air Force. The Air Force has decided to stop pursuing their destructive proposal which is to close the 440th Airlift Wing. Our military is one of the best and the brightest. These men and women are the most well trained and well equipped in the world. We are blessed to live in a country that stands for justice and embodies freedom and exemplifies liberty.

Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for having this Special Order. It is wonderful to join my female colleagues here on the House floor to talk about this very important issue.

Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today to sound the alarm about the mistake of historic proportions agreed to by the Obama administration last night in Vienna. In his haste and desire to reach an agreement at any cost, the President has agreed to far-reaching concessions in nearly every area that was supposed to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. In contravention of his stated goal, the deal agreed to by the President last night affords Iran legitimacy for a partial nuclear program now and for a full and unfettered program after 15 years.

Madam Speaker, let me repeat myself for the sake of clarity. Under this deal, Iran will be able to develop a nuclear program with absolutely no restrictions less than 15 years from now. Under this deal, Iran will be allowed to continue to operate more than 6,000 centrifuges and will hold on to nearly 300 kilograms of enriched uranium.

Iran will also receive hundreds of billions of dollars in sanctions relief and regain the access to conventional arms and missiles that it has been denied for nearly a decade. Iran will be free to transfer these weapons to Hezbollah, the Syrian Government, and Yemeni rebels, who all threaten our ally Israel and further inflame the region already in crisis. Iran will be free to use the weapons and money provided by this agreement to fuel its terrorist aspirations around the region and the world.

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

Wagering the peace and security of the United States, Israel, and the world on a small chance that a hateful and deceitful regime will suddenly change its entire comportment is not only wrong, it is foolish and it is dangerous. Iran's decades-long record of state-sponsored terrorism will not change simply because this deal has been signed.

Just this past Friday—this past Friday, Madam Speaker—in Tehran, Iranian mullahs led people in chants of "death to America." Yet, less than 72 hours later, the President is signing a deal with those fanatics, a deal that will eventually pave the way for Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon.

As Prime Minister Netanyahu told us in this Congress, in this very Chamber this year, "a bad deal is worse than no deal." Madam Speaker, this is a bad deal.

The President expects Congress to stand idly by and do nothing while he trades the security of the U.S. and its allies for a legacy-burnishing accomplishment. He expects us to sit on the sidelines while the administration offers one concession after another to the Iranians and agrees on a deal that would endanger the stability of the entire Middle East and jeopardize U.S. national security. That must not happen.

As the 60-day review process mandated by the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act begins, Congress must unequivocally reject this agreement by voting for a resolution of disapproval. We will not stand idly by while the American people's security is traded for some empty promises. A nuclear-armed Iran would start a new arms race in the Middle East and pose an interoperable threat to the national security of the United States and our allies—especially Israel.

Madam Speaker, as Prime Minister Netanyahu said in this very Chamber, again: "Standing up to Iran is not easy; standing up to dark and murderous regimes never is." But for the sake of our

children and our children's children, we must face down this threat now before it is too late.

□ 1615

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

Iran has a record of deception and hostility towards American interest. No amount of wishful thinking will change their core tendencies. Congress must use this opportunity to stand up for what is right.

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

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my dear friend, the gentlewoman from North Carolina, for organizing this session today.

Last week, when she organized this Special Order, I don't think you were really entirely aware how timely the topic would be today. I am so pleased that you did organize this, so thank you.

Now, many of us are still reviewing the text, having just received the 150 pages, that make up this deal with Iran; but from what I have heard thus far, it leaves me highly skeptical that the accord that was reached does not advance our interests in the region and signifies a retreat from the world stage.

Let me first say that, even if we take the President at his word, the words that I heard this morning—and we assume for a second that this deal cuts off "every pathway to a nuclear weapon"—there are still significant ramifications for granting \$150 billion in sanctions relief to a country whose unofficial motto, that we just heard from the gentlewoman of Missouri, has become "death to America."

As Israeli Ambassador Dermer told some of my constituents just last night at a Christians United for Israel speech, a \$150 billion infusion of cash into Iran's coffers is like a trillion dollars flowing into the United States Treasury; and that money will go toward funding the Ayatollah's terror machines, ranging from Assad's regime in Syria, Hezbollah in Lebanon, the Houthis in Yemen, Hamas, the Islamic jihad in Gaza, and the many other of Iran's terror proxies throughout the region.

This is compounded by the fact that the deal will lift the conventional arms embargo in Iran in no more than 5 years and the embargo on missile sales to Iran in no more than 8 years. What the deal appears to do is give the Iranian regime \$150 billion in sanctions relief, while simultaneously allowing

them to buy more conventional weapons, weapons that we know have been used in the past to actually kill American soldiers.

Now, this isn't to mention the unintended consequence that effectively shreds our foreign policy playbook that has guided the U.S. on the world stage for decades. This is a historic mistake—not only what Prime Minister Netanyahu has said is a historic mistake for the world, but it will allow Iran to continue to pursue its aggression and terror in the region. As the Congresswoman from Missouri said, it will start a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

Just today, former CIA Director, General Hayden, testified that not only do we need to understand that our nuclear focus does not make other realities go away, even if we had a successful conclusion to these nuclear negotiations, issues will remain.

I just want to close by reminding what our issues with Iran include. We know and believe they are the largest state supporter sponsor of terrorism. They hold American hostages without a fair trial. They support Palestinian terrorism, and they destabilize Iraq where we have invested so much treasure and lives. Hayden concluded the issue is not just Iran's nuclear problem; the issue is Iran itself.

Madam Speaker, no deal is clearly a better outcome than a bad deal; and I, too, am extremely concerned the Obama administration has negotiated a bad deal. I assure you that my colleagues and I will leave no detail of the final negotiated terms unexplored as this decision comes with consequences that will reverberate for generations moving forward.

The world cannot afford a nuclear Iran and thus cannot afford a deal with unacceptable terms.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina and also my colleague from Indiana.

Madam Speaker, I rise to express my deepest concern that the President of the United States is signing an agreement with a leading state sponsor of terrorism, Iran. This administration has collectively created a pathway for Iran to create a nuclear bomb.

This agreement endangers the lives of Americans by providing billions of dollars in sanctions relief for Iran to continue killing Americans. The lack of adequate safeguards and controls in this plan that literally allows Iran to choose if and when they agree to verification is deeply troubling, and it should be to every American, especially when we start by lifting sanctions without any verification.

Also, let's not forget that by lifting the weapons embargo, Iran will increase their stockpile of missiles, ICBMs, directly from Russia—able to strike this homeland and other more

advanced weapons that will lead to an arms race in the Middle East.

Once again, the President is bypassing the American people by threatening a veto of any legislation that comes from here that would curb his agreement.

The President of the United States continues to reject the will of the American people. As this unrest continues, the United States has to maintain our rich partnership with our allies, including Israel, sitting directly in line with Iran.

I just want to say to my colleagues here, very quickly, let's not forget that it was just a couple of months ago that Prime Minister Netanyahu of Israel stood in this very place right here. It was an unbelievable moment for this country.

He traveled all the way here to tell this body and to tell the American people how bad of a deal and how dangerous this agreement is. If you weren't here, I can tell you there was electricity in this place. People were moved, and America heard for the first time what a danger this was not only to us and our homeland, but the existential threat to the nation of Israel. They were moved, and the next morning, our Nation was not the same.

I just appreciate so much my colleague from North Carolina for allowing us to talk about this tonight. See, the American people know that this is not just a bad deal; this is not just a danger to our Nation. This is the complete unravelling of the Middle East as we know it today, and we are going to do everything we can—I can tell you I will do everything I can—to make sure that this bad deal goes away and we do what we are called upon when we raised our right hand to take these positions, which is to protect this Nation from attack.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. I yield to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Madam Speaker, when it comes to the deal with Iran, I want to express how incredibly serious this is. That is because the stakes have never been higher.

Are we willing to continue to gamble with America's future and American lives?

Iran is a snake in the grass. Its leaders have made it very clear that they want to implement sharia law, not freedom. Iran does not value human life the way we do. They have actually shown that they are willing to support terrorists. They have shown that they are willing to hurt their own women and children.

On the other hand, we have a President of the United States of America that said he will veto any efforts to stop this bad deal. That shows he has no interest in listening to the American people.

How can we claim we are fighting terror when we are giving the leading state sponsors of terrorism a break to the tune of billions of dollars? At this

rate, we will all but build the nuclear weapons for them in 15 years.

Now that a deal with Iran is in place, here is what is most concerning: They will turn around and build a nuclear weapon anyway, funded by the profits made from the lack of sanctions.

This is not a joke. This is not a game. Iran has a history of noncompliance. A great indicator of what is going to happen in the future is what has happened in the past. How do we know they will never change? How do we know they will change? We don't. Chances are, they won't change.

Ronald Reagan was an advocate of peace through strength. He said that the world would experience peace when the United States was a beacon of strength.

I ask you all to stand strong with the United States against Iran and against any administration that would like to silence us, the American people.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Chair, I thank my friend from North Carolina.

This is a great opportunity today for all of us ladies to be down here on the floor together, having a little conversation about what we recognize and can see matters to the majority of Americans, and that is the safety of this country and our national defense, our ability to defend against enemies. To my friend from North Carolina, there are a lot of those out there right now.

As we watch the lack of leadership in this administration, we have seen these enemies raise their heads, and it is by no mistake because they will seek to fill a void, and that is exactly what is happening around the world.

All of our colleagues that have talked earlier in this hour about the bad, bad deal with Iran, this comes at a time not only where we are seeing the atrocities of ISIS and other groups around the world, but also at a time when we have cut our military not through the muscle, but into the bone.

All of us here, we all have military interests in some respect throughout our districts. I know you have a large military presence in your district and others here joining us today, our colleagues; so everyone here has not felt the pain of what these cuts look like.

To my colleagues, if we don't do something about this sequester here, when it goes into full implementation—we are already cutting combat aviation brigades. We will have to cut even more.

Of course, I represent Fort Rucker, where we train these folks at the Army Aviation Center of Excellence, so, certainly, these realities are not lost on me; and I know you represent Fort Bragg and others here. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has a large military presence.

I guess the conversation that I want to have with you guys today on behalf of our constituents is: What are we going to do about it? We have got to

figure this out because, if we don't, it is going to be irresponsible as it relates to our readiness and our ability to defend this Nation.

We owe it to our military families, our men and women that wear the uniform, to ensure that they have everything that they need every time we send them into harm's way. This is really a dangerous time in our country, and certainly, it is not lost to everyone here as it relates to Iran and the bad deal that was negotiated there.

We have got to be willing to do our part as it relates to that deal. Here in this legislative body, we have to be willing to use the tools that we have and stand up against it and use the courage that we all have in our hearts to fight against this, knowing that it is going to not just have a huge impact on our security here at home, but our very important allies in the Middle East.

I just got back from a codel in the spring where we went to Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Israel. Our allies over there are looking at us right now, going: What? What?

Anyway, I share my frustration with you, and I know you share it with me as well. We need to give the Army what they need. We need to give our military what they need and know that we are having the appropriate impact in the parts of the world that are under so much pressure right now as it relates to this plan.

I hope we can continue this dialogue. I appreciate all of you coming to the floor and letting me be a part of this.

I am very concerned. This is what literally keeps all of us up at night, worrying about the future of our country and our safety not just here at home, but for all the men and women that are serving our country abroad.

Again, I hope that we collectively can put our heads together and figure out a way to end this sequester, particularly as it relates to defense, once and for all.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. I yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to be here and to be a part of today's Republican Women's Policy Committee on this Special Order on national security, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for bringing us together on this very important topic.

I rise today to specifically address the President's attempts to strike a deal with both Iran and Cuba.

First, Iran—after four missed deadlines, President Obama announced a deal this morning with Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism and a nation whose Ayatollah famously called the United States “the Great Satan.”

□ 1630

It was a deal praised by the likes of Syria and Russia and condemned by our allies, such as Israel. What is more,

under the agreement, international inspectors must ask Iran's permission before reviewing its nuclear sites, by the way, after which, Iran has 2 weeks to decide whether to even grant it. All told, Iran would have 24 days to drag out this process and conceal signs of noncompliance.

Instead of peace through strength, this agreement amounts to unrest through appeasement. Under the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, Congress does have the power to vote down a bad deal that threatens our national security. I believe this is a bad deal, and I intend to use what we can to show the President we do not support this deal.

Unfortunately, the President's efforts to cozy up to rogue nations doesn't end there. President Obama is attempting to normalize relations with Cuba. Here again, the President is clearly more interested in striking a deal—any deal—rather than knowing the details of the deal.

Consider this: Cuba was listed as a state sponsor of terrorism until the end of May, and now the President wants to open up an embassy on the shores of Havana. So can you tell me what has changed?

Just last week I led nearly 20 of my colleagues in sending a letter to the President, citing a report from the Department of Homeland Security which found more than 21,000 Cuban nationals with felony convictions living within our borders.

These individuals are rated by our Department of Homeland Security as a threat level 1, meaning that they are the worst of the worst. They have no legal status as they have been given orders to be removed, but they are roaming our streets because Cuba will not take back its criminals.

Madam Speaker, if the President insists on opening the door to negotiations with tyrants like Raul Castro, the very least he could do is to force this nation to follow the law on this simple matter and take back these criminals into his own country. Listen, when it comes to Iran and Cuba, the President must put national security and the well-being of the United States before his political legacy.

Again, I thank my colleague and friend from North Carolina for this Special Order today in order to bring these very important issues to the American people.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for pulling us together.

Madam Speaker, when you talk about issues that are women's issues, right now national security is at the top of the heap.

As we have talked about soccer moms and Walmart moms and all of these other iterations and descriptions during the years, right now we are

looking at a category of security moms because the issue of security is what mothers are talking about.

I appreciate so much the gentlewoman from North Carolina's leadership, and we have two other colleagues who have yet to join us—Ms. ROSLEHTINEN from Florida and Mrs. LUMMIS from Wyoming—to talk about this issue.

Coast to coast, this is what people are talking about, and they sit in disbelief at what this administration is doing.

Whether it is Iran or whether it is other foreign policy, our friends and allies look at us, as the gentlewoman from Alabama said, and they ask: “What are you doing? Where have you been? What are you thinking?” As we would say in Nashville, “They have got a thinking problem.”

Our enemies look at us and say: “Asleep at the wheel. This is our opportunity.” That is exactly what Iran is doing, and they are looking at what we are doing to our military.

I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama for talking about her love for Fort Rucker and the men and women there. I know the gentlewoman probably sits down with those in her district at Fort Rucker, like I do with the families, with the leadership team, with the men and women in uniform at Fort Campbell, which is located in my district.

They are terribly concerned. They have a mission to fulfill, and it is despicable that this administration will continue to try to cut and cut and cut our military, cut the numbers, don't give them raises, don't give them all the tools and training, don't give them the Flying Hours Program that they need for redeployment.

Guess what, Madam Speaker. Every bit of that affects the effectiveness of our men and women in uniform.

The gentlewoman from Alabama will expand on the point of the cuts that are taking place at Fort Rucker and what that means to her constituents.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman and just her shared concern here that we have for our men and women in uniform, for Army aviators, and for their families as well.

If the sequester goes into full effect not only when we are cutting from 12 CABs now—combat aviation brigades—to 10, there is a potential that we could have to go to 9.

What that means directly for Rucker is that we will decrease our student load, the number of Army aviation pilots that we are training. What that means for our country is that we are no longer ready.

I mean, you could make the argument that that, in fact, is the case now. They are going to do everything we ask them to do with what they have. We know that about the United States military, the best in the world. Yet, we are spreading them more and more thin.

We are fighting an enemy overseas right now. Whether you want to call it “war” or not, it is happening, and our men and women are in harm’s way. There are boots on the ground, and if these cuts move forward, they are going to suffer more.

I appreciate the gentlewoman for drawing attention to Rucker, and I know that she feels as passionately as I about the military.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I do, indeed.

The gentlewoman makes a point that is so very important, the readiness and the ability to fight 21st-century warfare on a lot of different fronts.

Madam Speaker, my colleagues and I will say part of that is naming and knowing your enemy, radical Islamist extremists. That is the enemy, and that is one of the reasons that this deal that the President announced this morning is so terribly disturbing to us.

His advisors had said that no deal is better than a bad deal. Guess what. What we saw from the President this morning is a pretty bad deal.

Here is what Iran gets to keep in this deal: 5,060 centrifuges. It includes an 8-year limitation on uranium enrichment. Think about that, an 8-year limitation.

So, then, are we setting a time certain that Iran can move forward? This is something that our constituents and the American people need to know about.

Then you look at the other components of this, the IAEA’s not having the ability to just move forward and inspect anytime anywhere, but having to give that 2-week notice. That is something, again, of tremendous concern.

The President has threatened to veto any legislation that impedes the nuclear deal. My hope is that Congress is going to stand up and say “no” to the President in this deal and that we will say “yes” to increasing the security of this Nation.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for sponsoring this Special Order, which allows the women of the Republican Conference to talk about an issue that is affecting all Americans, men and women.

Benjamin Netanyahu is calling this deal a historic mistake. Historic. Think about Israel and history. And when you have its prime minister calling this a historic mistake, we should be paying attention.

Madam Speaker, there is a very real and present danger of nuclear proliferation because of this deal; so it is critical that America not let her military preparedness for deterrence deteriorate. It will have exactly the opposite effect of that which the administration intends.

Consequently, we need all three legs of the nuclear triad—land, air, and water—for a strong defense and deter-

rence against attack. With a triad of bombers, submarines, and ICBMs, missiles are the most affordable, and they are on alert, protecting America and deterring her enemies 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

We should be talking with Poland, with the Czech Republic, and we should make sure that they have an adequate missile defense. We are going to have to start talking to Saudi Arabia.

If Israel and Saudi Arabia are already today talking about the consequences of a deal with Iran, what does that tell you? It tells you just what the gentlewoman from Alabama was telling us a few minutes ago when they visited there, which is that security in Saudi Arabia—homeland security—is an enormous issue.

It is because there are always terrorists coming into Saudi Arabia, trying to get at Mecca and Medina, trying to do something that will cause a conflagration around the world, that will incite religious battles.

When they have one of their most feared adversaries now being in a position after 8 years and having now the money because of the lifting of the sanctions to go ahead with a nuclear program, what do you think they are going to do? What are the Saudis going to do? It is critical that we maintain for world peace and the deterrence of nuclear war our own ability to respond and to deter.

Madam Chairman, I thank you for this Special Order, and I thank you for your diligent work in this regard.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague and chair of the Republican Women’s Policy Committee, Congresswoman RENEE ELLMERS, for leading the charge on this Special Order so that we can discuss issues of national security.

As we have heard, Madam Speaker, and will continue to hear tonight, there is no shortage of national security threats that are facing us today. That is not what should scare us.

What should scare us is that the Obama administration has no strategy, no plan in place, to address some of the most serious threats that are out there.

Perhaps the most pressing issue currently facing U.S. national security, the security of our friend and ally, really—the Democratic Jewish State of Israel—and, indeed, global security is a nuclear-armed Iran.

□ 1645

If we want to discuss national security threats, we can spend all day discussing the ones the administration just set into motion when it and the rest of the P5+1 nations announced this nuclear agreement with Iran.

Let’s set aside for a moment, Madam Speaker, the fact that the administration just guaranteed that Iran will be-

come a nuclear threshold state as a result of this deal, and we can all set our timers on when that first Iranian bomb will be produced thanks to this weak and dangerous deal.

Let’s focus on the fact that the administration just guaranteed that the Iranian regime’s billions of dollars that it is going to have to fill its coffers to underwrite its support for terror aimed at the U.S. and aimed at our interests around the world and especially our ally the democratic Jewish State of Israel.

Remember, this is the same regime that was responsible for building and providing the vast majority of roadside bombs that killed and injured thousands of our brave men and women who served valiantly in Iraq. It is the same regime that has propped up the murderous Assad regime in Syria, that supports the Shiite militias, all of which contributed greatly to the rise of the Sunni terror group ISIL, which has now become one of the greatest threats to U.S. national security as well.

This regime is responsible for the bombing of the U.S. Marine barracks and the U.S. Embassy bombings in Beirut and continues to support Hezbollah and Hamas as the terror groups that target Israel.

If this terrifying scenario wasn’t bad enough, Madam Speaker, the Obama administration has included in this sweetheart of a deal for the Iranian regime lifting all U.N. Security Council resolutions, including the arms embargo, and that won’t even last the duration of the deal, but it will be only in 5 years.

Madam Speaker, what has Iran done to deserve a lifting of the arms embargo, the lifting of sanctions against its ballistic missile program, its support for terror? Iran, in fact, continues to stoke sectarian violence, foments instability in the Middle East, flexing its muscles with the arms and military equipment that it already has.

Now, we are prepared to lift the arms embargo on that murderous regime, lift the restrictions in place on its ballistic missile program, the most expansive program out of any country in the region.

What kind of message did we just send to our partners in the region who fear Iran’s hegemonic ambitions? We just allowed their most feared enemy to become a nuclear state, to have access to have even more money to support its illicit activities, and to bolster its conventional weapons and ballistic missile program.

Talk about threats to our national security, Madam Speaker—wow. This nuclear deal that the Obama administration announced this morning just guaranteed an all-out conventional and nuclear arms race that very well could lead to what the President claimed he was trying to avoid, a war.

Whether it is Iran or whether it is Cuba, as Mrs. BLACK of Tennessee pointed out, President Obama is going legacy shopping. I fear that Israel will

be next on Obama's legacy shopping list. I worry that President Obama will force Israel to accept a bad peace deal with the Palestinians.

Madam Speaker, let's shut down Obama's legacy store. We just can't afford it. I would like to thank Mrs. ELLMERS for her leadership on this national security threat.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. I now yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK).

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, just this past Monday the Iraqi Government declared that it was beginning a major military operation to retake western Anbar province from ISIS. This area of operation, including major cities of Ramadi and Fallujah, is the same region which ISIS seized this past May.

Following this announcement, American-led coalition airstrikes permeated Anbar province. I fervently support U.S. and coalition military targeted airstrikes which continue to attack the Islamic State within Syria and Iraq. Along with airstrikes, U.S. troops serve as a part of an advise and assist role in Iraq and continue to do so in Afghanistan.

Since September 11, 2001, the Army's 10th Mountain Division has been the most actively deployed division to Iraq and Afghanistan, and I am honored to represent the 10th Mountain Division, a light infantry division comprised of competent, resilient, and skilled warriors.

In New York's north country, we understand what fighting for our Nation's liberties and freedoms truly means; and come this winter, during the holidays, when we are at home with our loved ones, these brave soldiers from the 10th Mountain Division will be serving our Nation in highly kinetic combat zones.

When I speak against ISIS, their barbaric tactics, and the instability they create around the world, I am speaking for my constituents, the brave servicemen and -women who are overseas right now, fighting to protect our national security.

I speak for their loved ones, the military families who are back in the north country at Fort Drum, worrying about their safety, and looking forward to the day they arrive back home.

This is why I am extremely frustrated when cuts to our defense budget continue. Sequestration is a real threat to our national security. Sequestration was proposed by this administration, signed into law by this President, and passed by a previous Congress.

As ISIS remains a major source of terrorism and instability throughout the Middle East, here, in Congress, we must discuss real solutions related to stabilizing the region, continued threats to our own national security, the readiness for our Armed Forces, and the tools they need to keep our country safe.

The National Defense Authorization Act provides our Nation's Armed

Forces with the resources they need to defend our national security against ISIS, and soon, this imperative piece of legislation will be on its way to the President for his signature.

A veto could threaten the safety of our Nation's servicemembers and our country's defense. Our national security is gravely at risk, as long as ISIS remains intact and our troops are tasked with doing more with less.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting our Armed Forces in fighting against defense sequestration, and I implore this President to sign the National Defense Authorization Act.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. I would like to say how much I appreciate receiving General Townsend to the XVIII Airborne Corps as commanding general from the 10th Mountain Division.

I know that you appreciate him as much as I do.

Ms. STEFANIK. Absolutely.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

Ms. MCSALLY. Madam Chair, I appreciate you organizing this so that the women in our Conference can speak about something that is vitally important to our communities.

Everywhere I go in my district, my constituents are concerned about the security of our Nation and making sure that our men and women in uniform have everything they need in order to defend America.

Having served 26 years in uniform myself and representing a district of 85,000 veterans and two military bases, right now, we have over 750 of them deployed overseas in the fight against ISIS and also to work with our allies to deter Russian aggression.

People are deeply concerned about what appears to be—and not just appears to be—a failed defense strategy and foreign policy out of this administration. I can tell you, as I look around the world—and I have been doing national security for 30 years—we are in a more dangerous world than I have ever seen in my lifetime. I have got the experience of six combat deployments and a couple master's degrees.

Taking a look at this, we don't have enough time in an hour to go around the world with the threats that are emanating. The one that is obviously taking up the news today is the bad deal related to Iran and their march towards a nuclear capability.

I am going to read the whole thing tonight and tomorrow and make sure that we see all the details, but it seems like, on its surface, the goalposts have been moved; and the deal that has been negotiated is one where, myopically, this administration wanted to get a deal, really at all costs.

That cost is quite high to our national security, to the security of our friends and our allies, with significant destabilization in the Middle East, while we have Iran, which is the greatest state sponsor of terror, continuing

to destabilize and fight proxy wars in the region and continuing to threaten Americans.

They have blood on their hands of American soldiers in Iraq and in Lebanon and other places. They are continuing to threaten Israel, destabilizing the region, and propping up nonstate actors in their proxy wars; and none of that is changing.

Now, we basically are legitimizing that and not addressing any of these other issues while potentially lifting the arms embargo. This is potentially a very reckless direction that we are going in. My constituents have been talking to me even today about the concerns and just the myopic focus of this administration on this particular bad deal.

If we take a larger view of the Middle East, there appears to be an absolutely incoherent strategy in the larger Middle East. While we have Qasem Soleimani, the general responsible for the Quds Force, responsible for all these terrorist activities that I mentioned, actually commanding the ground forces in Iraq to take back Tikrit, while we are providing the air power and sort of pretending that we are not operating in the same space for the same objectives, then we see what Iran is doing to continue to destabilize both in Yemen, in their support to Hamas and Hezbollah.

All of this is just absolutely incoherent. If you were to try to ask somebody what are we trying to do in the Middle East relative to Iran, which is the hegemon in the room, as a state sponsor of terror, I don't think anybody could really answer that. I don't think this President can answer this. There is deep concern about this lack of coherency.

When it comes to the fight against ISIS, we are doing these anemic attacks from the air. Having been a fighter pilot myself and having been involved in the targeting process—from being a flight lead in an A-10, all the way up to running the counterterrorism operations in Africa—I am very familiar with the targeting process.

We are in a situation where ISIS is continuing to gain momentum, to recruit foreign fighters. Over 20,000 have been recruited, and it looks like they are taking us on, and they are winning because we are putting the bar so high on what targets that we can actually strike—legitimate targets that we are having pilots fly away from—and let continue to thrive and murder massive numbers of civilians in Iraq and Syria; gaining a foothold; gaining territory; and, in using social media, gaining new recruits because it looks like they are winning.

We have an absolute incoherent military strategy in the fight against ISIS not using our power in the way that it should be used, with all that it can bring to the fight, in order to achieve our national security objectives.

We had the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs in

front of us on the House Armed Services Committee a couple weeks ago, where they said, related to this strategy, hope is not a strategy, but it looks like that is exactly what we are relying on. We are hoping that the Iraqis have an inclusive government, which they have shown time and time again that they are failing to do.

While Iraq has their national security interests certainly in the region, we have our own interests in making sure that ISIS does not gain a strong foothold with resources and the desire to recruit, train, and inspire individuals to attack Americans and take away our way of life. This strategy has just been failed coming out of this administration.

Russia, just another example, the squadron that I commanded is soon coming back from a deployment to Russia, A-10s over in the region to help assure and train our allies against the continued aggression that we are seeing from Russia.

Our incoming potential Chairman of the Joint Chiefs declared last week in a hearing that he believes Russia is actually the largest threat that we are potentially dealing with; yet the weakness from this administration in standing up and leading to defend our national security interests and reassure our allies is allowing Putin to fill that vacuum.

The Baltics and the other allies that are in the region, after basically the Russians were able to invade Ukraine, are wondering who is next and what is at stake with our NATO partners. This is just another example.

What China is doing in the South and East China Seas is just one more example of us not leading and not being able to assure our allies, showing weakness. Our friends are wondering can they count on us anymore, and our enemies are no longer afraid of us. This is the dangerous world we are in.

Some of these factors were going to be happening anyway, but American leadership can make or break situations, and we can change the course of international events if we are leading or not leading. This administration says that they are leading from behind. In the military, we call that following. There is no such thing as leading from behind.

We need to make sure we have a strong national security strategy, that we have a capable military. The impact sequestration is having on our military, I have friends and individuals I know that are still serving and trying to serve, and they are rearranging deck chairs right now, trying to deal with the lack of resources and diminishing capabilities in training and readiness.

That is not a strategy-based budget; that is a budget-based strategy. I have been very strong in speaking against sequestration. I think we need to work together in order to make sure we can give the men and women in the military everything they need to defend America.

The last point I will make—and there are many to make, but we don't have enough time—is that we have passed the National Defense Authorization Act for the last 54 years.

□ 1700

This is an important piece of legislation that gives the troops the authorization, the pay raises, and everything that they need—combating sexual assault—all the different things that we have authorized in the NDAA, and this President is threatening to veto it.

I really hope that those around America who are listening to this will rise up and call their Members of Congress, call their Senators, call the White House and tell them that you don't play politics with our men and women in uniform. This is about national security and national defense. You need to sign that bill.

We are working through conference right now to hopefully get it done before we go into recess. This is an important piece of legislation, and we should not be playing political games with our national security.

So thank you, Madam Chairman, for organizing this. Thanks for the opportunity to come down and speak on behalf of our constituents, on behalf of those in my district right now that are serving overseas, the men and women in uniform. We owe it to them to make sure that we have a strong national security, that we have a strong military, we give them everything they need, and that we provide leadership in the world.

We have got to continue to provide oversight to the failed foreign policy and defense policy of this administration, and I look forward to continuing these discussions.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the members of the Republican Women's Policy Committee, I would like to end this Special Order today by thanking our troops and their families. These men and women voluntarily venture into harm's way to protect our freedoms, ideals, and way of life.

It is equally as important that we recognize the sacrifices that military spouses and children make as well. They deserve our unwavering support for putting the safety and security of our country first.

May God continue to bless this great Nation and our men and women in uniform.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time to conclude this Special Order on national security.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2898, WESTERN WATER AND AMERICAN FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3038, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015, PART II

Mr. NEWHOUSE (during the Special Order of Mrs. ELLMERS of North Caro-

lina), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-204) on the resolution (H. Res. 362) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2898) to provide drought relief in the State of California, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3038) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON H.R. 3049, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

Mr. ADERHOLT (during the Special Order of Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina), from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-205) on the bill (H.R. 3049) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2722

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2722.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2722

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2722.

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

There was no objection.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, we are going to spend about an hour here talking about something that is of great importance to the American people, to the economy, to the strength of America, and, indeed, the discussion we just heard about national security. It