

minds a case that is more ripe under these circumstances.

Finally this, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to ponder the question: Have we accorded the constabulary the right to do wrong such that wrongdoing can be justified because it has been codified in the law that you have the right to do certain things?

I think we have to ponder this question because what happened in this case is highly questionable and highly suspect. I say this as a student of jurisprudence, a member of the bar, and a former judge of a court that held probable cause hearings. I have seen my share. But I know that in this case, the Justice Department should investigate.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to pray for this family and pray for justice to be done.

THE NUCLEAR DEAL WITH IRAN AND OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this morning to talk for a few minutes about the primary issue that my constituents are talking about right now, and that is the issue of national security, homeland security, and how what is happening in the world is affecting our communities right where we live and work and where our children go to school. Isn't that what everyone wants to know: that we are going to be safe, that our children are going to be safe, and that future generations are going to be safe here in the United States?

Mr. Speaker, as we look at these issues of illegal immigration, as we look at ISIS and the threats that are carried out, such as what happened in Chattanooga, and as we look at the Iran deal, we know this affects where we live and where we work.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to spend just a few minutes talking about the Iran nuclear deal.

One of the members, retired, of a military organization, MOAA, came up to me Saturday as I was talking to them. He said: MARSHA, this is a bad, bad deal. It is a bad, bad deal.

I have got to agree with him. It is. Of course, he speaks from the perspective of having worn the uniform and served, having had a full military career. It is interesting. They know a bad deal when they see one, and in this Iran nuclear deal that is proposed, they see the tenets of a very bad deal.

Let's look at a few of these components that will not serve us and future generations, our national security, or our homeland security well.

As you review this deal, you see that Iran retains the ability to enrich uranium. That does not stop. It is going to continue on. We can already see how a nuclear Iran would create an arms race in an area which is already volatile. Any capability to enrich uranium may

cause a nuclear arms race to happen and further destabilize the Middle East.

You see, Mr. Speaker, we are not prohibiting them from doing anything. All we are doing is basically setting a date certain 10, 15, or 20 years down the road. Now, think about your children and grandchildren 10, 15 or 20 years down the road. If Iran has a nuclear weapon, what are they going to say at that point in time? How is it going to affect them?

Think about the region. A Saudi official has said: "Politically, it would be completely unacceptable to have Iran with a nuclear capability and not the kingdom." I am quoting a Saudi official's remarks.

Any deal must have full transparency, and we need to know that there can be and will be because there must be anytime, anywhere inspections. It is my fear that a deal with Iran is not going to accomplish this.

The Wall Street Journal reported yesterday—and, Mr. Speaker, I will submit this for the RECORD—"Iran Inspections in 24 Days? Not Even Close." It was a Wall Street Journal article, and I commend it to my colleagues to read as they review this and think about how they are going to vote on this deal.

The Wall Street Journal stated: "The Obama administration assures Americans that the Iran deal grants access within 24 days to undeclared but suspected Iranian nuclear sites."

When you look at the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, it reveals that actually it is going to be closer to months. They can end up holding inspectors at bay for months.

Again, from the Journal I am reading and quoting: "So from the moment the IAEA first tips its hand about what it wants to inspect, likely three or more months may pass."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, does this sound like the type of deal that you would want to make with a country whose people recently were out chanting "death to America" and burning our flag to celebrate the Muslim holy day with the Supreme Leader in attendance at that rally? Does this sound like the type of deal that should be approved by our Secretary of State and supported by our President? Why? Why would they want to do this? Why would there be a deal that sets a date certain and kind of lays out that path? Simply put, there is no way—no way—that we can trust Iran to allow inspectors unfettered access to both civilian and military sites to verify that they are not pushing a nuclear weapon. So we would be left wondering if—if—they are going to hold up their end of this so-called nuclear deal.

Mr. Speaker, a senior commander in the Revolutionary Guard has recently said that inspectors will not be allowed on military sites. General Hossein Salami said: "We will respond with hot lead . . . We will not roll out the red carpet for the enemy."

In addition, Mr. Speaker, it is extremely concerning that Iran is asking for sanctions on weapons sales and ballistic missile technology transfers to be lifted. It is a bad, bad deal, as my constituent said. I commend further study to my colleagues.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 21, 2015]

IRAN INSPECTIONS IN 24 DAYS? NOT EVEN CLOSE

(By Hillel Fradkin and Lewis Libby)

The Obama administration assures Americans that the Iran deal grants access within 24 days to undeclared but suspected Iranian nuclear sites. But that's hardly how a recalcitrant Iran is likely to interpret the deal. A close examination of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action released by the Obama administration reveals that its terms permit Iran to hold inspectors at bay for months, likely three or more.

Paragraphs 74 to 78 govern the International Atomic Energy Agency's access to suspect sites. First, the IAEA tells Iran "the basis" of its concerns about a particular location, requesting clarification. At this point Iran will know where the IAEA is headed. Iran then provides the IAEA with "explanations" to resolve IAEA concerns. This stage has no time limit.

Opportunities for delay abound. Iran will presumably want to know what prompted the IAEA's concern. The suspect site identified by the IAEA is likely to be remote, and Iran will no doubt say that it must gather skilled people and equipment to responsibly allay IAEA concerns. Iran may offer explanations in stages, seeking IAEA clarifications before "completing" its response. That could take a while.

Only if Iran's "explanations" do not resolve the IAEA's concerns" may the IAEA then "request access" to the suspect site. Oddly, the agreement doesn't specify who judges whether the explanations resolve concerns. If Iran claims that it has a say in the matter, the process may stall here. Assuming Iran grants that the IAEA can be the judge, might Iran claim that the "great Satan" improperly influenced IAEA conclusions? Let's assume that Tehran won't do that.

Now the IAEA must provide written reasons for the request and "make available relevant information." Let's assume that even though the IAEA may resist revealing the secret sources or technical means that prompted its suspicions, Iran acknowledges that a proper request has been supplied.

Only then do the supposed 24 days begin to run. First, Iran may propose, and the IAEA must consider, alternative means of resolving concerns. This may take 14 days. Absent satisfactory "arrangements," a new period begins.

During this period Iran, "in consultation with" the Joint Commission, will "resolve" the IAEA concerns "through necessary means agreed between Iran and the IAEA." The Joint Commission includes China, France, Germany, Russia, the U.K., the U.S., the European Union and, of course, Iran. Not exactly a wieldy bunch.

The Iranians will likely claim that "consultation" with the Joint Commission doesn't bind Tehran, just as the U.S. president isn't bound by consultations with Congress. The agreement says the consultation process will not exceed seven days, but Iran can point out that the nuclear deal doesn't specify when Iran and the IAEA must reach agreement and "resolve" IAEA concerns.

In the absence of Iran-IAEA agreement, a majority of the Joint Commission has seven days to "advise" on the "necessary means" to resolve the matter. Iran may fairly argue that the commission's right to "advise" is

not the same as a right to “determine” the “necessary means.” Lastly, the agreement provides that “Iran would implement the necessary means within 3 additional days.” But what “necessary means” are these? As noted, the agreement refers to “necessary means agreed between Iran and the IAEA.” So these additional three days don’t even begin until an agreement is reached.

Now what? Well, the U.S. may take a “Dispute” to the Joint Commission, on which Iran sits, which has 15 days to resolve the issue. Parties may or may not invoke a similar 15 days for foreign ministers to act. Parties may also request a nonbinding opinion within 15 days from an advisory board consisting of three members, one appointed by Iran, one by the complaining country and “a third independent member.”

But Iran may argue that nothing in the nuclear deal specifies how quickly a country must appoint its advisory-board member or even how the “independent member” is selected. In short, this stage may take at least 30 days and possibly 45 of consideration at the different levels, but Iran may argue that the last 15 days don’t start until an advisory board has been duly formed. Then we get another five days of Joint Commission deliberation, before a disappointed U.S. or other commission member seeking IAEA inspections can hobble off to the United Nations seeking resolutions reimposing sanctions.

In short, as Iran is free to interpret the agreement, 63 or even 78 days may pass, plus three potentially lengthy periods that Iran can stretch out: One of “explanations” before the clock starts, one to agree on necessary means and “resolve concerns,” and one for advisory-board selection near the end.

So from the moment the IAEA first tips its hand about what it wants to inspect, likely three or more months may pass. All along, the Joint Commission is required to act in “good faith,” and to make only “minimum necessary” requests limited to verification, not “interference.” Tehran could also cite these terms to challenge particular requests.

The description of this process is based on the English-language text of the nuclear agreement. The text lacks a provision that it is the entire agreement, so Iran may claim support in supposed side agreements or statements during negotiations.

Announcing this “comprehensive, long-term” deal, President Obama quoted President Kennedy’s 1961 call for negotiations with the Soviets. Kennedy reached two notable nuclear agreements. Mr. Obama didn’t mention that within a decade of Kennedy’s 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty, Soviet nuclear forces—once a fraction of America’s—were at parity or had surpassed ours.

During the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, Kennedy reached secret agreements—undisclosed to Americans for decades—not to invade Cuba and to withdraw U.S. weapons from Turkey. By invoking Kennedy was President Obama signaling there is more to this “long-term” deal than we know?

He is a subtle man.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join many of my Democratic colleagues to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and to ask this House to pass legislation for voting rights now.

Mr. Speaker, this was the first nation in our history to be founded with a purpose. Great phrases of that purpose are still being said and quoted around the world from the souls and hearts of Americans: “All men are created equal,” and, “Give me liberty or give me death.” Those words were not to be revered as meaningless, to ring hollow over the years. Today I join my colleagues as guardians of that liberty and advocates for voting rights legislation.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago before Congress, President LBJ said: “I want to be the President who helped the poor to find their way and who protected the right of every citizen to vote in every election.”

“Every American citizen must have an equal right to vote. There is no reason which can excuse the denial of that right. There is no duty which weighs more heavily on us than the duty we have to ensure that right.”

Mr. Speaker, from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, Martin Luther King delivered his “Give Us the Ballot” speech, urging the President and Members of Congress to ensure voting rights for African Americans. He indicted both political parties for betraying the cause of justice. He said—let us be reminded of these words—“The Democrats have betrayed it by capitulating to the prejudices and undemocratic practices of the Southern Dixiecrats. The Republicans have betrayed it by capitulating to the blatant hypocrisy of the right wing, reactionary Northerners. These men so often have a high blood pressure of words and an anemia of deeds.”

Mr. Speaker, today I ask Democrats and Republicans to come together for voting rights legislation now.

Over the past 50 years, our country has come a long way: the end of Jim Crow, integration of our public schools, and the election of our first Black President. While we have made great progress over the past 50 years, we must continue to fight for justice and equality at the polls.

In the past few Presidential elections, we have seen long lines, intimidation, and voter suppression. We must remain diligent in our efforts to root out voting discrimination because of the Supreme Court’s misguided decision in 2013 in the Shelby County v. Holder matter and the failure of Congress to remedy this dismantling of our Nation’s fundamental rights. We must be more vigilant than ever.

Two years ago, in Shelby, the Supreme Court struck down a critical part of the Voting Rights Act. Some would say it cut the heart of the Voting Rights Act by finding section 4 unconstitutional.

□ 1045

This was a setback to our country and to our democracy by removing much-needed voting protections in disenfranchised communities. Our democracy was founded on the audacious idea

that every eligible citizen should have access to the ballot box.

This is why I am proud to stand with over 70 bipartisan congressional colleagues as an original cosponsor of the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015, H.R. 2867, which would restore and advance the critical voter protections taken away by the Shelby decision.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to bring voting rights legislation to the floor. Now, more than ever, with just 7 legislative days left, we head back to our districts for our August work period. Congress should honor the progress of being able to allow us to say to our constituents, to this Nation, that our country has made sure that there is equal rights and equal treatment.

Let us work together on advancing important legislative priorities, such as the Voting Rights Amendment Act.

Apollo 11 Mission, 46 Years Later

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and celebrate a monumental achievement our Nation’s space program reached 46 years ago this week. On July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, Michael Collins, and the entire NASA team transformed the world’s belief in what was possible.

Following President Kennedy’s charge to land a man on the Moon and return him safely to the Earth before the decade was over, NASA put their talent and treasure into making that dream a reality. No longer was human discovery and exploration limited to our own planet. The Moon, which had always been beyond our human ability to reach, was now within our grasp.

This “giant leap for mankind” propelled American space exploration and inspired generations to pursue science and research as a way of life. Today, human space exploration and discovery sciences are engrained in American society and are prime demonstrations of our Nation’s exceptional nature. As Americans, it is in our DNA to push the boundaries and frontiers of knowledge.

Developing new technologies and expertise is vital as we consider a mission to Mars, take closeup photos of Pluto, and send robots throughout our solar system. The new generation must now work to fulfill the dreams and ambitions of that first group of space explorers.

Let us encourage our children to think seriously about careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics—careers that could lead them to become actual rocket scientists or astronauts. Bold, long-term commitments to the projects that made NASA and our space program great will help inspire our kids.

The Apollo 11 mission changed America and the world, and we remain forever grateful to those who were a part