

Foremost among these are the dangers the men and women of our nation's law enforcement departments face every time they walk their beats and patrol their communities.

Their families, the persons who know them best and love them most, deserve to welcome them home at the end of each shift, safe and sound.

Mr. Speaker, we must confront the reality that police departments and the communities they protect are all too often adversarial.

We must all work together—law enforcement, community residents, public officials—to make our communities places where we trust one another and cooperate to achieve our mutual goal of safety and security of for all persons.

The murder of Deputy Goforth also reminds us that we must do more to stem the tide of gun violence that tears through this country.

Neither our country nor our hearts can afford to lose people of such quality as Darren Goforth to gun violence in the staggering quantities that we do.

Mr. Speaker, over 32,000 Americans die from gun violence each year.

So, while Darren Goforth's death is most certainly a tragedy, death by gun violence happens all too often in our country.

This normalcy of gun violence is inexcusable.

Mr. Speaker, according to media reports, the person who ended Deputy Goforth's wonderful life, struggled with mental illness for quite some time.

We absolutely have to do more to ensure that society's most dangerous weapons stay out of the hands of the most mentally or emotionally unstable persons.

It is important that we do this because it is estimated that 61.5 million Americans experience mental illness in a given year.

This is why we must, as a nation, attach as much importance and provide the same level of resources for mental health as we do for physical health.

We can no longer afford to ignore the struggles of nearly 20 percent of the population and fail to provide adequate treatment and services that could alleviate some of that struggle and prevent horrific events like the one that claimed the life of Deputy Darren Goforth.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today mourning the loss of Deputy Darren Goforth but I have hope.

I have hope that out of this tragedy we will be moved to act to make this country safer for the men and women who risk their lives to keep their communities safe.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in honor of Deputy Darren Goforth, an extraordinary human being and a shining example of what is meant when we remember him and say: "he was one of Houston's finest."

#### IRAN

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as this President comes closer to his final year in office, it is no secret that he only cares about shaping and molding his legacy.

When discussing the Iran deal last year, his Deputy National Security Ad-

visor said to reporters: "This is probably the biggest thing President Obama will do in his second term on foreign policy. This is health care for us."

Four years earlier, that health care—ObamaCare—was described by our Vice President as a "big—explicative—deal," but only time will shape this President's legacy.

Seventy-five years ago, Winston Churchill proclaimed that Neville Chamberlain had a "precision of mind and an aptitude for business which raised him far above the ordinary levels of our generation."

Although this description is far too generous to describe our current President, who has no aptitude for business, Mr. Chamberlain was portrayed in a very different light than he is today. If he could be characterized in one word today, it would be "appeaser."

Regardless of his intellect, Mr. Chamberlain's incorrect decision to concede to Adolf Hitler's demands for the purpose of avoiding a conflict in Europe overshadowed anything else he ever accomplished as Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, the Iran deal, I believe, is President Obama's Chamberlain moment.

As the Associated Press reported 2 weeks ago, under this deal, Iran "will be allowed to use its own inspectors to investigate a site it has been accused of using to develop nuclear arms."

These reported "secret deals" acknowledge what many of us have known to be true and confirm what President Obama and his administration still deny—that this deal is based on trust.

This deal is based on trusting the Iranians in that they will not break their promise to build a nuclear bomb. How can we trust Iran's Supreme Leader, who chants "death to America" and "death to Israel"? How can we trust a Supreme Leader who said this week that Israel will not exist in 25 years?

As the former Democratic chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee appropriately said, this deal would be "the equivalent of having an athlete accused of using performance enhancing drugs submit an unsupervised urine sample."

Any deal with Iran must protect America's interests at home and abroad, and this deal does not.

As Israel's Prime Minister warned in his speech before this very Chamber only a few months ago, Iran's regime poses a grave threat not only to Israel, but to the peace of the entire world.

The President and his deal supporters have ignored these warnings. This deal will shift the balance of power in the Middle East. This deal goes against the wishes of Israel, our greatest ally in the region.

I challenge all of my Democratic colleagues who support this deal to come to the floor and look into the camera—and, quite frankly, look in the mirror—so, when history comes full circle, the American people will know who in this

body let our Neville Chamberlain give Iran the bomb.

□ 1045

Despite the warnings from those within his own party and leaders of ally nations, this President has made it clear he is not concerned about the safety of Americans.

This President and his administration have made it clear they are not concerned about Israel. This President and his administration have made it well known that they are not concerned about the fate of the world. And this President and his administration are only concerned with the legacy they have in the future.

For that reason, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this President prepared to suffer the same legacy as Neville Chamberlain?

I urge President Obama and his administration to simply let their conscience be their guide.

In God we trust.

#### IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, I will look the camera in the eye and say why I am supporting this agreement. I think there is only one common thing that is agreed upon here in the House and in the Senate: that we don't want Iran to have nuclear weapons.

If the U.S. were to walk away from this deal and say we want to go back to the table, they will be sitting in an empty room, and the only people at the table will be U.S. representatives. There will not be any other nations from Europe, Russia, or China; and Iran won't be at the table either.

This is a deal that is not perfect. Sure, it is far from perfect. They say: Well, Iran could become a nuclear threshold state again in 10 or 12 years because of the way this agreement is written. If we walk away today, they are a nuclear threshold state; and they will build a bomb, and they will have it within 3 or 4 months. Then what?

Well, we do have options, of course. They are being recommended by Dick Cheney, John Bolton, and Benjamin Netanyahu, all who were cheerleaders for the Iraq war and who were oh so wrong about the greatest foreign policy mistake in the history of the United States of America. But they learned nothing from that, and they think yet another war in the Mideast is a better solution than this.

Now what does Iran give up? Two-thirds of its centrifuges. They are allowed to keep the oldest, most primitive centrifuges. Ninety-seven percent of its enriched uranium stockpile will be gone. Their mine sites will be monitored 24/7. Their mill sites for uranium will be monitored 24/7. There will be an intrusive inspection regime. They have to fill in the core of the nearly finished Iraq reactor—which can take them on

the plutonium path to a bomb—with concrete and convert that to peaceful use.

Natanz, underneath the mountain that some would have us bomb—unfortunately, it is underneath the mountain—that will become a medical facility monitored 24/7. No. That is Fordow, excuse me, not Natanz. Yet we hear the drumbeat for war over here. They don't want to say they want to have a war, but that is the ultimate conclusion.

If you don't want Iran to have nuclear weapons, this is the best deal we can get, and we amazingly got this deal with the support of Russia, China, and four nations in Europe.

Now, they are already flooding into Iran in anticipation of this deal going forward. They have no intention of going back to the table. The Chinese want the oil. Russians want to sell them weapons. The planes have been totally full coming out of Europe with high-level corporate executives wanting to go into Iran and do business.

No. This is the only alternative before the United States Congress and the only one that can prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon in the short term. Yes, 12, 15 years down the road, we may have to deal with this again. Yet again, 12 or 15 years from now, under this regime, perhaps Iran will have changed. We will see.

So I am proud of this vote, and I think it is the best path. I am also incredibly proud of my vote against popular opinion and such sagacious people as Dick Cheney, John Bolton, and Benjamin Netanyahu about invading Iraq, which has turned the Middle East into an unbelievable mess that will not be undone in my lifetime. ISIS is basically a product of the Iraq war, an invasion by the U.S.

So let's not create even worse problems. Let's take this imperfect agreement, but let's take it because it prevents Iran from having a nuclear weapon and having a weapons race in this incredibly unstable part of the world.

#### IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of the Third District of Kansas and on behalf of American people who are counting on us to put their security before the obvious partisan politics of Washington, D.C. I also join a bipartisan majority, leaders of each party in each Chamber, to stand up and be counted as one of the many voices in this country in opposition to the President's deal with Iran.

Like others who plan to oppose the ratification of this deal, I am not opposed to the idea of diplomacy, but I am opposed to the idea of surrender diplomacy. This administration asked us to trust Iran; but as Iran continues to be the largest world state sponsor of terror, as they continue to shout

"death to America" and call for our destruction and the obliteration of Israel, our greatest ally, how can we trust Iran?

With secret deals, side deals, and self-verification, this President's capitulation will lead to a nuclear Iran for the first time in history and an American endorsement of their efforts to get there.

Well, the Ayatollah has convinced the President that it only needs nuclear capacity for peaceful purposes. But why does Iran need nuclear capacity at all? Iran has the world's fourth largest proven oil reserves, totalling 157 billion barrels of crude oil, and the world's second largest proven natural gas reserves, totalling 1.193 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

With such a robust energy sector, why should Iran, a nation that has consistently defied the international community on this issue, be granted the ability to proceed with a nuclear energy program? Why should we trust Iran? Have they earned the right to be trusted?

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, this is a gift to the ayatollahs of Iran. For starters, it releases hundreds of billions of dollars in assets to the regime in Iran, giving them a gift basket full of cash to flood terrorist organizations which seek to harm Americans and our allies.

The deal gives the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism a stamp of legitimacy and the means to expand its destabilizing influence through massive amounts of sanctions relief, even before Iran has demonstrated full adherence to the deal's term. It does, however, bring home the four Americans being imprisoned in Iran.

When questioned as to why, this administration claims that it did not demand the release of American prisoners because it wanted to limit negotiations to just Iran's nuclear program.

On the contrary, Iran won key non-nuclear concessions through the process. The deal grants amnesty to Qasem Soleimani, the head of the Quds force in Iran's Revolutionary Guard, who is one of the world's most leading terrorist masterminds and the man thought responsible for the death of at least 500 United States troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

It also lifts the conventional arms embargo on Iran in spite of public testimony from Secretary of Defense Ash Carter and Joint Chiefs Chairman Martin Dempsey that we should do so "under no circumstances."

Lifting this embargo means Iran can begin to stockpile conventional weapons, and Russia and China can begin to legally profit off major weapons exports to Tehran.

Yet perhaps the most troubling aspect of this deal is its inspections regime. Gone are the anytime, anywhere inspections that were required by Congress and outlined by the administration. In its place, a 24-day notice period for Iran, combined with secret side

deals that this Congress has no knowledge of and in which the proponents of the plan are happy to be blissfully ignorant.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents of this deal know that it does not make us safer or more secure. They know that we cannot trust Iran. They know that the verification process is weak and is built upon secret deals, they know we shouldn't lift the arms embargo, and they know that the hundreds of billions of dollars being released to the Ayatollah will end up on the battlefield in the hands of terrorists who will use it to kill Americans and our allies. Mr. Speaker, they know this is a bad deal.

I'm proud to have my name listed along with Democrats and Republicans in a bipartisan majority opposing this deal.

Mr. Speaker, those who ignore history are doomed to repeat it. In 1994, we heard President Clinton sell his nuclear agreement with North Korea on many of the same talking points President Obama used in his speech to sell this deal with Iran. Yet in 2006, we watched as the North Koreans detonated a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Speaker, there is still time to stop this, and I urge—I beg—my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against this deal so we aren't watching Iranians detonate their own bomb just a few years from now.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 250

In the Senate of the United States, September 9, 2015.

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker served in the United States Navy during World War II from 1944 to 1946;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker faithfully served the people of Pennsylvania with distinction in the United States Congress;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1960 and served 4 terms as a Representative from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

Whereas as a Representative, Richard Schultz Schweiker served on—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was elected to the United States Senate in 1968 and served 2 terms as a Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

Whereas as a Senator, Richard Schultz Schweiker served on—

(1) the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate;

(2) the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Human Services of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(3) the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities of the Senate; and

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was appointed as the Secretary of Health and Human Services by President Ronald Wilson Reagan in 1981 and served as Secretary of Health and Human Services until 1983: Now, therefore, be it