

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Richard Schultz Schweiker, former member of the United States Senate.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That when the Senate adjourns today, the Senate stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Richard Schultz Schweiker.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 349. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts.

S. 1603. An act to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

### IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep disappointment in the decision by the House leadership to back off from a direct vote on a resolution of disapproval of the Iran nuclear accord as provided under the Corker Act.

Clearly, the President has not complied with the requirements of Corker to provide Congress with the full text of its agreement with Iran, most specifically, the side deals referenced in the agreement between Iran and the IAEA.

H. Res. 411, which declares the administration out of compliance with the Corker Act, is well-founded, but there is no reason to cancel the vote on the resolution disapproving the agreement as specified in the Corker Act and as promised by the House leadership for the last 6 weeks.

H. Res. 411 rightly disputes September 17 as the deadline for congressional action to stop this treaty from taking effect, and I support that resolution, but it cannot authoritatively settle this dispute. That leaves the deadline as an open question, and this House must not let that deadline pass without definite action as provided by Corker.

I oppose the act because it guts the Treaty Clause of the Constitution that requires treaties to be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the U.S. Senate. Despite the President's contention that this is an agreement and not a treaty, the fact that it explicitly modifies the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty makes it obvious that it requires Senate ratification.

Unfortunately, the Congress overwhelmingly approved the Corker Act, establishing a very different framework with respect to this particular treaty. Instead of a two-thirds vote of the Senate to ratify it, Corker, in es-

sence, requires two-thirds of both Houses to reject it through a resolution of disapproval, an almost impossible threshold.

Under Corker, the resolution of disapproval is the specific legal act required to reject this treaty. This is what the leadership had promised the House would vote on this week, until yesterday. Now we are to vote on a legally meaningless bill to approve the treaty that is expected to be voted down. It is specifically designed to have no legal effect but merely to give Members political cover.

Thus, the House will fail to take action on a resolution of disapproval called for under the Corker Act by the disputed September 17 deadline. On that deadline, the President will declare victory, implement the treaty, and the Congress will be left sputtering. The world will correctly interpret this dereliction as a capitulation by the House to this treaty. And years from now, maybe, possibly, the courts will intervene to declare the President's action illegal or maybe not.

Mr. Speaker, the House is right to dispute the September 17 deadline because clearly the President did not comply with provisions of Corker and provide the full text of the side agreements to the Congress; but the House is dead wrong to refuse to take action on the resolution of disapproval prior to the disputed deadline to assure that the House has spoken clearly, unambiguously, and indisputably according to the provisions of the Corker Act that the Congress, itself, enacted in May. Once it has acted, the House can still dispute whether the President's submission meets the requirements of Corker, but it will not have this momentous question dangling unresolved and in dispute.

The argument we hear for this course is that the Senate is unlikely to take up a resolution of disapproval; therefore, we should hold the President to the letter of Corker. Well, what the Senate does is up to the Senate; but for our part, the House has a moral obligation to act within the undisputed timeframe to legally reject this dangerous action by the President.

There is little doubt that this treaty will trigger a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. The leaders of Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia have already made that abundantly clear. There is little doubt it is unverifiable.

There is no doubt it will release \$150 billion of frozen assets to Iran with which it can finance its terrorist operations and continue its nuclear research.

□ 1100

I fear the Iran nuclear agreement may be just as significant to the fate of the 21st century as the Munich Agreement was to the 20th century. The American people and the world deserve a clear, unambiguous, and indisputable act of the House to repudiate this act. What the House leadership is now pur-

suing falls far short of this moral imperative.

### IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, last month, I traveled to Israel with more than 35 of my colleagues to meet with key leaders in that country, including Prime Minister Netanyahu, and learned firsthand what our closest ally in the Middle East thinks about the proposed Iran nuclear agreement, also known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action between the P5+1 countries and Iran.

The consensus view from the Israelis across the political spectrum, from the Prime Minister to the opposition leader in the Knesset, Isaac Herzog, from the President of the State of Israel, Reuven Rivlin, to the military leaders in the Israeli Defense Forces, they all agree that the deal negotiated by Secretary Kerry and championed by President Obama is a dangerous and historic mistake.

This confirms what we have learned in briefings and hearings in Congress. This deal will not deliver the safety and security the American people deserve. Instead, it will transform Iran from the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism with an illicit nuclear program into the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism awash in billions of dollars in sanctions relief with an internationally sanctioned nuclear program on an industrial scale.

This is not just a bad deal for Israel. This is not just a bad deal for America. A nuclear Iran is a global threat to everyone everywhere. Consider the counterparty to this deal. Since the seizure of the U.S. Embassy and the taking of 52 American hostages during the 1979 revolution, the Islamic Republic of Iran has taken the long view on its global ambitions of exporting its revolution, supporting terrorist proxies like Hamas, Hezbollah, Houthis, and Boko Haram.

The Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and the leader of its elite Quds Force, Qasem Soleimani, is responsible for the killing of over 500 U.S. soldiers in Iraq.

The Iranian regime has covered up and lied about its nuclear program for decades, deceiving international inspectors, agreeing to intrusive inspections, and then allowing those inspections to be implemented only provisionally and selectively. Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, regularly chants "death to America" and openly calls for the annihilation of the Jewish people and the destruction of Israel.

In Jerusalem, we visited the Yad Vashem Holocaust memorial museum. There, we saw exhibits recounting the horrifying images of the Holocaust. During our visit with Prime Minister

Netanyahu, he made a profound observation. He said they compare this to the 1930s.

This is not like the 1930s. In the 1930s, the Nazis concealed their intentions for the Jewish people in the Holocaust. Here, they are actually telling us. They are telling us what they want to do to the Jewish people and death to the Great Satan. Let's not give them the tools to actually carry it out.

The President's promise of anytime, anywhere inspections has been replaced with managed access to suspect nuclear sites in which international inspectors must appeal to Iran, Russia, and China. This bureaucratic process could take up to 24 days at least, during which Iran would remove anything covert or in violation of the agreement.

The Associated Press now reports that at least one of two secret deals between the IAEA and Iran—secret deals neither Congress nor even the Secretary of State has been allowed to see—allows Iran to use its own inspectors at the military complex long suspected as the headquarters of Iran's nuclear weapons and ballistic missile program.

Given the Iranian regime's past behavior and contempt for U.S. negotiators it knows are weak, there is little doubt Iran will cheat and dare the Obama administration to find violations which prove the very deficiencies of the deal it negotiated.

Even if Iran does not cheat, even if Iran actually complies with the deal, three bad outcomes are guaranteed. First, Iran will be allowed an arsenal—not a bomb—an arsenal of nuclear weapons in as little as 10 years.

Under the agreement, Iran is not required to dismantle key bomb-making technology, is permitted to retain vast enrichment capacity, may continue research and development on advanced centrifuges, and will be allowed to acquire intercontinental ballistic missiles in as little as 8 years. Intercontinental ballistic missiles—those are not for Tel Aviv; those are for Washington, D.C., and New York.

Second, Iran gets sanctions relief, at least \$56 billion almost immediately, and that is according to the Obama administration itself. Independent analysis projects the relief could be as much as \$150 billion. As a member of the Task Force to Investigate Terrorist Financing, I have heard extensive testimony that, when these funds are released, a significant percentage will go to Iran's terrorist proxies in Gaza, Lebanon, Iraq, Yemen, Nigeria, and elsewhere. Experts warn it will be impossible to snap back effective sanctions.

Third, because Iran's neighbors know this deal reverses a decades-long bipartisan U.S. policy blocking Iran's nuclear program, this agreement will spark a nuclear arms race in the broader Middle East. Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt have already signaled their intent to acquire nuclear retaliatory capability if this deal is finalized. The people who know Iran the best trust them the least.

This President says it is this deal or war, but that is a false choice. Rejecting this deal will keep most sanctions in place and allow Congress and our allies to turn up the pressure on Iran to get a better deal. In fact, I signed a letter with 366 colleagues outlining the conditions we would consider to be part of a better deal, none of which were included in the one before us.

On the last night we were in Israel, one of the last nights, as we finished dinner at a restaurant on the Sea of Galilee, the owner of the restaurant took the microphone and announced that Members of the American Congress were here to stop this bad Iran deal. The whole restaurant stood up and sang "God Bless America."

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, on the Iran deal, I proudly stand with our allies in Israel, not with the mullahs in Tehran.

#### WHY THE IRAN AGREEMENT MUST BE OPPOSED

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I want to just associate myself with the comments of my good friend from Kentucky, who was just up here and I think eloquently was giving a case as to why this deal with Iran is such a bad deal.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that the national security consequences of the nuclear agreement with Iran will haunt America for generations if Congress does not step in to stop it. This shouldn't be about party. It should not be about loyalty to the President because, if one thinks about this current President, whether you like him or don't like him, whether you agree with him or don't agree with him, this administration ends in 15 months, but the national security consequences of this deal will go on and haunt America for generations to come.

This deal, this agreement, needs to be evaluated on the substance and how it will impact America and will it make America safer.

Mr. Speaker, an overwhelming bipartisan majority of Americans and a bipartisan majority of this Congress are against this agreement. It makes America less safe. If it survives, it is only because the President was able to ram it through on a wholly partisan basis. That is not something to celebrate, Mr. Speaker. The fact that there is zero bipartisan support for this pact in the United States Congress further demonstrates just how dangerous this is for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in my very first speech on the floor of this House in 2011, I stated my belief that Iran was the greatest national security threat that we had. Today, I am even more committed that Iran is the greatest threat that we have to our own national security.

By proving that aggression and defiance will be rewarded, this agreement

makes the world less safe and, tragically, war more likely. What are we saying to our neighbors? If Iran gets a nuclear weapon, surely its neighbors will go on a nuclear arms race as well and will make this dangerous part of the world even less safe than it already is, far more volatile.

These concerns have been bipartisan. According to Democratic Senator BOB MENENDEZ, this agreement doesn't end Iran's nuclear program, it preserves it. According to Democratic Senator CHUCK SCHUMER: "If Iran's true intent is to get a nuclear weapon, under this agreement, it must simply exercise patience."

Simply put, this agreement won't block Iran's path to a nuclear weapon. Instead, it leaves Iran's nuclear infrastructure intact and amounts to a containment strategy. Settling for only containing a nuclear Iran is a grave mistake that leaves the long-term safety of the United States and our allies vulnerable to nuclear blackmail by Iran.

We are all familiar with the basic reasons for why this reckless agreement should be opposed. The agreement relies on a sure-to-fail inspections regime that falls well short of anytime, anywhere inspections that are so critically needed. It fails to deliver on the commitment to dismantle Iran's nuclear infrastructure.

Iran actually receives a signing bonus that trades permanent sanctions relief for temporary limitations on its nuclear program. This will provide Iran, the world's greatest state sponsor of terror—and that is not up for debate; that is not disputed—with \$150 billion, which they will no doubt use to fund terror through their proxies in Hezbollah and Hamas, through Assad in Syria, and through cells in South and Central America—sunset provisions, which simply gives Iran a patient path to a nuclear weapon.

This agreement lifts conventional arms embargo in 5 years and ballistic missile embargo in 8 years. Why were these even on the table, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, I ask you: What do you use an intercontinental ballistic missile for? It is not to drop leaflets; it is not for humanitarian needs. It is to deliver a nuclear warhead to Washington, to New York, to Chicago.

I am perplexed because, Mr. Speaker, like many here in this body, I have three children, and they have children. We have constituents that are out there. I have a 13-year-old, an 11-year-old, and an 8-year-old. By the time my 8-year-old goes to college, she will not know a world without Iran having a nuclear weapon. The chants of "death to America" in the streets, at some point in time, we have to take their word that that is exactly what they want to do.

When we look at this agreement, this legitimizes Iran's nuclear program and provides Iran's illicit nuclear pursuit with international stamps of approval. This is what Iran has been desperately