

this entire negotiation process. Under TPA, Congress retains its authority to review and determine whether the proposed trade agreement will be implemented through an up-or-down vote.

TPA has been granted to every President since Gerald Ford. This longstanding and proven partnership between the legislative and executive branches is essential to finalizing those free-trade agreements that create countless opportunities for American enterprise. TPA will allow us to actually complete the trade negotiations that are currently underway. America is on the brink of some very ambitious and progrowth deals. It will also provide our negotiators with the credibility they need in order to conclude those trade agreements. Our trading partners must be certain the United States is serious about its trade priorities and that we are serious about our commitments. To get the best deal, there is no doubt our trade negotiators need this vital negotiating tool.

Furthermore, as this administration negotiates the two largest regional trade agreements in history, we must position ourselves to extract the best deals possible. The Trans-Pacific Partnership or the TPP includes countries such as Japan, Vietnam, and Malaysia, which have great, tremendous opportunities for our exports. This agreement will give us greater access to the fastest growing economic region in the world. The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership is between the European Union and the United States, which together account for nearly half of global GDP.

I support the negotiations for each of these regional trade agreements. Both agreements hold enormous potential for continued progress in agricultural exports, and they will create jobs here at home. The United States has negotiated free-trade agreements with 20 countries over the past three decades. These trading partners only represent 10 percent of the global economy, but they consume nearly half of the U.S. exports. Economic growth and American job creation would only expand under TPP, where negotiating countries represent the fastest growing economies in the world.

That said, it is critical trade agreements eliminate barriers and level the playing field for American businesses. Fair, two-way market access that eliminates tariffs is essential to any comprehensive trade agreement.

We are in the 21st century, and our trade agreements should reflect 21st century principles. TPA is critical to providing our trade representatives with the necessary tools to finalize these pending negotiations, while also ensuring that the unsung heroes of the American dinner table—our farmers, our ranchers, our food processors—receive the greatest benefit.

Nebraska's farmers and ranchers are global leaders and the very best at producing safe, high-quality food to feed the world. It is imperative that foreign

markets are open, balanced, and that they provide a level playing field for all of our U.S. products. One of best ways we can do this is by expanding free trade and authorizing TPA.

I encourage my colleagues to support this very important legislation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIRE-FIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to H.R. 1191 is agreed to.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 1140

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1140, which is the text of the substitute amendment to S. 615, which was reported out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CORKER], for himself and Mr. CARDIN, proposes an amendment numbered 1140.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I am thrilled to be here on the floor with my partner, Senator BEN CARDIN, who is the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee. We had an outstanding week last week in our Foreign Relations Committee in passing out this bill that is now before us on a 19-to-0 vote. I thank all of the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which obviously includes Senator CARDIN, Senator RISCH, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator RUBIO, Senator Kaine, Senator JOHNSON, Senator COONS, Senator FLAKE, Senator UDALL, Senator GARDNER, Senator BOXER, Senator PERDUE, Senator SHAHEEN, Senator ISAKSON, Senator MURPHY, Senator PAUL, Senator BARRASSO, and Senator MARKEY.

Also, before we get into discussing the text, I wish to thank Senator BOB MENENDEZ and Senator MARK KIRK, who have been all things Iran. From the very beginning, these two Senators

have led this body to put in place sanctions—crushing sanctions—that have led us to this place. I cannot thank them enough for their leadership in dealing with the issue of Iran.

Last year, we did a significant amount of work on creating some kind of review process relative to a final agreement that might be worked out with Iran. I thank Senator LINDSEY, GRAHAM who has been a stalwart in ensuring that Congress play a role in the ultimate final deal that may or may not occur. Senator GRAHAM has been steadfast in wanting congressional review. Senator JOHN MCCAIN has joined in that effort and has been outstanding to work with, as well as Senator JIM RISCH and Senator MARCO RUBIO, who have also pushed for this type of legislation.

When we began this process, there were some original—or when we moved to the process we are now in, there were some original supporters of this current bipartisan bill who really caused us to have the leverage, if you will, to move to the place where we are today. Again, Senator MENENDEZ certainly was one of those who led us in that effort; Senator GRAHAM; Senator TIM Kaine, who came here as a former Governor of Virginia and who has been so focused on Congress playing its appropriate role. Obviously, Senator MCCAIN, as he has been a leader from the beginning, Senator JOE DONNELLY, Senator MARCO RUBIO, Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP, Senator KELLY AYOTTE, Senator BILL NELSON, Senator JIM RISCH, and Senator ANGUS KING have played a role in creating the leverage, if you will, to get us where we are today.

As Senator CARDIN knows, we now have 62 cosponsors of this legislation that is now before us, obviously from both parties. So I think this is quite an accomplishment.

Obviously, we have a tremendous amount of work in front of us with this bill now on the floor. I know Senator CARDIN and I hope that people will come to the floor and begin offering their amendments, begin debating, begin discussing. Obviously, we won't be taking up any amendments, per the order that is before us, until Tuesday, but we hope people will begin bringing their ideas and amendments to the floor and certainly begin discussing the important issue of Iran.

Let me speak a little bit about what this bill does. First of all, I think everyone knows the administration is part of the P5+1. It is today negotiating an agreement to try to keep Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. I think all of us know there was a political agreement that was achieved the first part of April that was more of a verbal agreement about how the P5+1 and Iran might interact in a manner that hopefully would keep Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

One of the things that I think everyone in this body knows and many people on the outside may not is that Congress has played a substantial and

maybe the biggest role in getting Iran to the table in the first place. There were three sets of sanctions, three types of sanctions that have been instrumental in making this happen. They include the U.N. Security Council sanctions that have been put in place. The executive branch has put some sanctions in place as well. But Congress especially has four tranches of sanctions which have been put in place since 2010 which really have had a crushing effect on Iran's economy. They have created all kinds of inflation, and they have caused them not to be able to export the amount of oil—the 40 percent of the oil that they produce. That has hurt them in manufacturing.

I see Senator MENENDEZ has just come to the floor. He may not have heard me, but I cannot thank him and Senator KIRK enough for their leadership on each set of those tranches—putting them in place, taking the leadership, and bringing Iran to the table.

I think the second thing people may understand is that on the U.N. Security Council sanctions, the White House has the ability, with the other members of the permanent Security Council, to lift those at any time they wish. They can obviously lift the executive sanctions. One of the things that all of us have been concerned about, though, is that Congress put in place the sanctions that really brought them to the table. We want to ensure that Congress has the ability, before those sanctions are lifted, to be able to voice an opinion through a vote.

What this legislation does—and we will be talking about it a great deal over the next week—is four things:

First of all, it forces the administration, in the event a final deal is agreed to, to bring all of those details to Congress, including the classified annexes we would likely not see until 6 months or so after an agreement is reached, without this legislation, if we can pass it.

Secondly, it keeps the executive branch from being able to lift the congressionally mandated sanctions that we put in place, while we have a reasonable period of time to go through the documents that have been provided to us.

Thirdly, it allows Congress to take a vote. The vote can take all kinds of forms. It can be a vote of approval. It also allows the leader to decide not to take a vote at all or we could take a vote of disapproval. If we decided that this was not something that was good for our country, not good for the Middle East, then we could cause this vote of disapproval to take place, and if it passed, it would keep the executive branch from being able to lift the congressionally mandated sanctions we have put in place.

The fourth and very important component is that it causes us to know whether Iran is in compliance. This bill stipulates, if passed, that the President would have to certify to us every 30

days as to whether Iran is in compliance. If there are significant violations, on a 10-day basis, let us know that is taking place so we can respond accordingly.

Let me close by saying this: I believe everybody in this body hopes we are able to achieve a negotiated agreement that will keep Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. I think everyone understands that is the best thing for our country. I think everybody also understands that Iran is a country in which we have little trust. Iran is a country that is the major exporter of terrorism in the region. Iran is a country that has a terrible human rights record. Iran is a country that is really moving ahead relative to its ballistic missile design. And, obviously, Iran is a country that has been doing some things in its nuclear program that give us reason to believe they are moving toward a nuclear weapon.

One of the worst things we could possibly do is enter into an agreement with Iran that doesn't keep them from getting a nuclear weapon—in other words, one that is faulty, that has flaws, and that allows them to get a nuclear weapon. What that would mean is we would have a situation where the No. 1 exporter of terrorism in the region had access to not just a nuclear weapon but very quickly had access to the \$130 billion-plus that they have trapped overseas to conduct even more terrorism in the region, which could allow their economy to all of a sudden be growing at more rapid rates and, again, to have resources available to conduct even more terrorism in the region. As we can imagine, having an actor such as Iran has acted—and we hope at some point that behavior will change—having access to a nuclear weapon certainly would create the possibility of nuclear proliferation in the region.

So I think this is a very important piece of legislation. I thank Senator CARDIN for the way he has come into this and worked with us in a manner to reach an accommodation so that we have sufficient, ample, actually extraordinary support on both sides of the aisle to ensure that Congress has its rightful role in this agreement. It is one of the biggest geopolitical agreements we will deal with probably during the time we are here in the Senate.

With that, I yield the floor to my good friend Senator CARDIN. Again, he has done exemplary work in bringing us to this point. I thank him for all of his efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to thank and congratulate Senator CORKER for his extraordinary work in reaching this moment where we have brought to the floor of the Senate a bill that deals with congressional oversight of the nuclear discussions and agreements taking place between the P5+1, our negotiating partners in Iran.

It was just 3 weeks ago that the framework was announced by the

White House and that Senator CORKER and I started our discussions to see whether we could find a common path forward on a bill which, to say the least, was very controversial; a bill which the President of the United States had threatened to veto; a bill in which there were Democrats and Republicans lined up on different sides of this issue, and it appeared just about impossible that we would be able to reach a bipartisan agreement on a path forward for the legislation.

Senator CORKER exercised the greatest leadership and diplomacy. He mentioned all the members of our committee. Each of those members has pretty strong views on this issue. This was not a simple matter of people saying: Gee, I will just yield to the thoughts of others. The only way we could reach this moment was to ask and solicit and listen to each member of the committee, and that is what Senator CORKER did. He encouraged me to do the same in regard to not just the Democratic members, because Senator CORKER talked to some of the Democratic members and I talked to some of the Republican members. We had to have that type of confidence.

I again congratulate Senator CORKER on his leadership. It has been a real pleasure to work with him. I am proud that we bring this bill forward with a 19-to-0 vote from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

We have a long history in this country of putting aside partisan differences on foreign policy issues. I know we often quote from one of our former colleagues, but I think it is worth putting into the RECORD the comments of Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Jr.

He was a Republican Member of this body who said 63 years ago:

To me “bipartisan foreign policy” means a mutual effort under our indispensable two-Party system, to unite our official voice at the water's edge so that America speaks with maximum authority against those who would divide and conquer us and the free world. It does not involve the remotest surrender of free debate in determining our position. On the contrary, frank cooperation and free debate are indispensable to ultimate unity. In a word, it simply seeks national security ahead of partisan advantage.

Mr. President, that is exactly what the Foreign Relations Committee did. We had a very robust debate, there were many different views, but at the end of the day we spoke with unity. In speaking with unity, our country today is stronger, and that is exactly where we needed to be.

What we are trying to do, and I think as a result of the actions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—and I hope it will be approved by this body and by the House and sent to the President for signature—we are in a stronger position to accomplish our goal. Our goal is pretty simple, to prevent Iran from ever acquiring a nuclear weapon because we know that is a game changer in the region—a game changer in regard to not just one country in that region but to just about every country in

that region. Their security is threatened and the U.S. security is threatened.

So what we did in the bill that we bring forward to you is a compromise—a compromise. Each of us gave and listened and we found common ground. We could use more compromise on the issues that confront this country in the work we do. I would hope my colleagues would look at how we worked out these issues and use it as a model for other opportunities to move forward on issues that are important.

Senator CORKER pointed out why we are here—why we had a bill for congressional review. It started in the 1990s, when Congress passed sanctions against Iran because we saw, at the time, that Iran was developing the nuclear capacity to develop a nuclear weapon, and we said that could not happen. We imposed sanctions against Iran. Congress did this on several occasions in an effort to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state, telling them there would be an economic price to pay until they changed course.

Administrations—including President Obama's administration—worked with the international community and we were able to get U.N. sanctions. Congress's action was responsible for leading Iran to being willing to negotiate, and that is where we are today. Only Congress—only Congress—can permanently remove those sanctions or permanently change those sanctions.

So Congress must be involved in the sanctions and in the discussions. That is exactly what this legislation does. It provides an orderly process for us to review any agreement reached by the President and our negotiating partners with Iran. No congressional action will take place until and unless the President submits an agreement that he has made with our negotiating partners and Iran.

The April 2 framework that was recently announced is not an agreement and is not subject to review. There would be a 30-day review period, during which Congress would have the opportunity to review the agreement. No sanctions or additional sanction relief could be imposed during that 30-day period. If you read the April 2 framework, the President has made it clear that Iran will only get sanction relief if they earn sanction relief, if there is concrete progress made in dismantling their nuclear program. It is hard to believe that could take place within 30 days. So this 30-day period is a very reasonable period for Congress to be able to review any agreement.

As Senator CORKER pointed out, all information—all information—would be presented to us, and we would have an opportunity for full hearings and debate as to what we should do. It would follow the regular congressional order as far as committee hearings and potential action on the floor of the Senate and the House. Senator CORKER pointed out the options we would have. We could approve the agreement, we

could disapprove the agreement, we could pass legislation affecting the sanctions, we could take whatever action we think is appropriate, but no action is required.

The agreement can commence without congressional action. If we do take congressional action, the President has the prerogative of a veto, and if the President vetoes, we have the prerogative of an override of the veto. That is how the checks and balances system of our country should operate.

There is a second major component to this legislation and that is for the oversight of an agreement after it is reached; that is, there would be a quarterly certification by the President of the United States to Congress that Iran is in compliance with the agreement. If there is a material breach, it would trigger an expedited process so Congress could act, that we could not only snap back sanctions that may have been relieved, but if appropriate, we could impose additional sanctions if Iran had a material breach of the agreement. That is very important because I think we all agree, if we are going to have an effective agreement, that agreement must give us time before Iran can become a nuclear weapons country; that we can, through full inspections, determine if they have breached the agreement because, quite frankly, no agreement is going to be based on trust because we don't trust Iran. It is going to be based upon inspections and being able to confirm their compliance with the agreement. If they don't comply with the agreement, we need to make sure we have adequate time and take adequate steps to prevent them from becoming a nuclear weapons state. This review process and an expedited process in Congress puts Congress in the position of working with the administration to make sure we take those effective steps.

As Senator CORKER pointed out, there are other issues with Iran in addition to the nuclear proliferation issues. We have serious concerns about Iran. It sponsors terrorism. Its human rights violations against its own citizens is horrible. Its ballistic missile program is of great concern. The threats against Israel and other countries in that region are all of direct interest to the United States. So, in this legislation, we provide for regular reports twice a year to the Congress of the United States about the activities that Iran is participating in, in regard to terrorism and human rights.

I call our colleagues' attention to the detailed requirements, on pages 37 and 38 of the bill, concerning issues about whether Iran's financial institutions are engaged in money laundering, whether Iran is advancing its ballistic missile program, an assessment of whether Iran has directly supported, financed, planned or carried out any terrorism against the United States, "whether, and to the extent to which, Iran supported acts of terrorism . . .

all actions, including international fora, being taken by the United States to stop, counter, and condemn acts by Iran" involving terrorism; "the impact on the national security of the United States and the safety of United States citizens as a result of any Iranian actions reported under this paragraph. . . ." It is all required that that information be given to us because we may want to use that for other strategies against Iran.

An amendment that was added requires "an assessment of whether violations of internationally recognized human rights in Iran have changed, increased, or decreased, as compared to the prior 180-day [period]."

We are going to monitor their human rights record, and we will have that information. So, yes, we are concerned about issues beyond nuclear proliferation, but this agreement that is now being negotiated by the President deals with preventing Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state.

It is clear. I want to underscore this because Senator CORKER was very strong to make sure it got into the bill. It says that "United States sanctions on Iran for terrorism, human rights abuses, and ballistic missiles will remain in place under an agreement. . . ." We are not talking about actions we have taken against Iran for terrorism or human rights violations. That is a separate issue—a major concern to us. What we are talking about is how do we implement oversight and review an agreement concerning nuclear weapons programs.

And lastly, we make it very clear in this agreement that "the President should determine the agreement in no way compromises the commitment of the United States to Israel's security, nor its support for Israel's right to exist." Israel is a key ally of the United States and our friendship is deep. Our commitment is solid. We make that very clear in the bill that is before you.

Let me conclude with two additional points—one dealing with the amendment process. As Senator CORKER pointed out, we asked Members who believe they can approve this bill to come forward. Let's see the amendments and try to work with you on the amendments. Let's maintain the bipartisan cooperation we have. Let's maintain a strong bill that accomplishes its purpose. Come down and let us take a look at it. Remember, we have a lot of strong views in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and we came together. Let's keep that same spirit, and I would just urge those who may have amendments to come on down and let us see them. We have today and up to before next Tuesday. Share them with us so we have an opportunity to keep the unity we have.

Then, lastly, I just want to join where Senator CORKER began, and that is to thank the incredible effort that took place on behalf of this bill. Senator CORKER already mentioned all my colleagues who were involved here.

Senator MENENDEZ and Senator KAINE are both on the floor. On the Democratic side, they are the authors of this bill. They are the ones who drafted it. They are the ones who are responsible for why we are here today—from the Democrats. I thank both of them. From the beginning they said: We want a process to review. We are not talking about the merits. The merits are something we will pick up later. We want to preserve the normal prerogatives of the Senate, and we want to keep politics out of it. That was their intent from day one. Quite frankly, working with Senator CORKER, that is what I carried out in my negotiations with Senator CORKER; to maintain that balance that was the intent of the legislation. So I thank both of them and the other members of our committee who were involved.

Lastly, on a point of personal privilege right now, because I might forget to do this later, I want to thank Jodi Herman of our staff and Margaret Taylor, Algene Sajery, and Chris Lynch for the extraordinary amount of time they put in.

I want to thank President Obama. I want to thank President Obama for giving me his time so I understood what he was trying to achieve and how we could work together in order to achieve the objectives of the United States, and I thank Katie Fallon and Denis McDonough of his staff for the work they put in so we could reach this moment.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I want to rise in support of this bipartisan legislation, with a sincere hope that we can pass the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act as it was unanimously voted out of the committee.

I have worked tirelessly with the chairman and with the ranking member and with members of the committee—Senator KAINE, who had so much input in the conceptualization of what we wanted to do to bring this bill to the floor with the strongest bipartisan support.

In my view, the best way to send a clear message to Tehran about our expectations is for Congress to pass the Corker-Menendez Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act as it was voted out of committee. The spirit of bipartisanship that underscores Congress's critical role in the highest priority, national security, the nuclear nonproliferation challenge of our time, was unanimously passed out of the Foreign Relations Committee. I hope we can send this same message from the Senate floor.

Countering Iran's nuclear ambitions has been something I have worked on passionately for a long time. Senator CORKER and I fashioned language that became the framework of this final bill to ensure that Congress remains engaged in reviewing and, if there is an

agreement, overseeing its implementation.

So I want to thank Chairman CORKER. He has just done an exceptional job. He had this concept before any of us were agreed to it, and he was willing to work with us—and was dogged, I must say—until we got to the point that we would come together and offer the legislation in a bipartisan way. That has been the hallmark of his chairmanship and it was the hallmark of his time as ranking member when I was chairman. I appreciate the fashion in which he has worked to continue to move the committee, as I started it, in a bipartisan way, because as the ranking member Senator CARDIN says, that is when we are most powerful in terms of foreign policy.

I thank Senator CARDIN for his work in helping to forge a deal that both sides of the aisle can come to this floor and support with a clear conscience, knowing that we have sent a clear message to Tehran and that we are united, as we have always been, on Iran policy, and on this issue we speak with one voice.

The simple fact is, if the P5+1 and Iran ultimately achieve a comprehensive agreement by the June deadline, at the end of the day, Congress must make a judgment on it and have oversight responsibility. This legislation provides it. It establishes a managed process for congressional review and a framework for congressional oversight.

Now, I differentiate between this agreement and others the administration has cited for exclusive Executive action because the sanctions relief that is at the heart of this deal was crafted by Congress and enacted by Congress into law. It is primarily statutory. As the author of those sanctions, working with others, I can tell you we never envisioned a wholesale waiver of sanctions without congressional input and without congressional action.

The limited sanctions relief provided in the law was intended to provide the President with discretion to waive specific sanctions in specific circumstances, such as if a country was making real progress in reducing their oil purchases from Iran. So my goal has always been one goal; that is, to make certain Iran does not have the infrastructure to develop a nuclear weapon.

I have worked on that goal since my earliest days in Congress. Now, as we approach the witching hour for an agreement, the best way to achieve our goal is with bipartisan support on this legislation that strengthens the U.S. hand in moving from a political framework to a comprehensive agreement and sets out clear and decisive expectations for Iranian compliance.

The message we send to Tehran is that sanctions relief is not a given, and sanctions relief certainly is not a prize for signing on the dotted line. This bill ensures that Iran must fully comply with all provisions of an agreement that effectively dismantle its nuclear

weapons program and provide robust inspection and verification mechanisms to ensure its compliance with every word of that deal.

If Iran breaches an agreement, Congress will have the ability to restore sanctions on an expedited basis. Now, as I have said, I have been outspoken on this issue from the beginning, for years, for as long as I have been here. Frankly, I have many questions about the framework agreement. I have questions about the divergent understandings of the agreement.

I have questions about the pace of sanctions relief. I do not believe Iran should get a signing bonus. I am concerned by the President's most recent statement that greater sanctions relief could come upfront for Iran. I have questions about Iran's retention of research and development authorities and to what extent they can advance their research and development, because greater research and development means more sophisticated centrifuges that can spin faster and, therefore, dramatically reduce breakout time toward a nuclear bomb.

I am concerned about the ability to snap back sanctions if there are violations of the agreement. From what I can see, we have a committee process that will not guarantee that the snap-back will take place or that it will take place expeditiously. I am concerned about the International Atomic Energy Administration's ability to obtain "anytime-anywhere" snap inspections. What happened to Iran having to come clean about the possible military and weapons dimensions of their program?

More than anything else, I am concerned about what will happen when the critical elements of the proposed agreement expire after 10 years. Are we relegated to accepting Iran as a nuclear weapons state? The presumption that Iran will become a compliant Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty state in that time for me is not borne out when you see their insistence and our acquiescence to keeping key nuclear infrastructure and key nuclear facilities under the agreement.

It is not borne out by history. Iran has been on a single path toward nuclear weapons for more than 20 years. By deceit and deception—sometimes without detection until there were well-established covert facilities—they have advanced their drive for nuclear power to the precipice of achieving a nuclear bomb. For me, these are all issues that speak more forcefully to the reasons for having congressional review and oversight of any potential agreement.

Now, I did not fashion, along with colleagues, a sanctions regime for the sake of sanctions. It was for the sake of getting Iran to deter its course. There is no one who would want to see the successful result of that design more than I. But by the same token, I do embrace what the administration has said time and time again that no deal is

better than a bad deal. I will independently judge what that deal is when and if there is a final deal.

At a minimum, this legislation gives us the oversight role to monitor and address our concerns. So I urge my colleagues, when the bill comes for a vote, to vote for it as it was voted out of committee, because it does what all of us want to do: provides a clear opportunity for a review of any agreement, so we can express, if desired, our support or opposition to any agreement and have a clear oversight role with established parameters for compliance.

Let's vote on what the agreement does, not what it might have done or could have done if we had different amendments to it. I respect everybody's views and everybody's rights to have amendments. I hope those who have ideas will work with the chairman and the ranking member. But I will oppose amendments, at least with my own vote, that I consider to be poisonous and that undermine the very essence of what we have accomplished in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Sometimes you have to know when you hit a home run and be able to cross the plate and say, We hit a home run—and not think that you are still stuck in the dugout. What we did in the committee is pretty close to a home run as far as I can see it. So let's vote on the merits of the bill that give us the oversight and the ability to pass the judgment that we need to send a clear message that we are united in our determination to prevent Iran from ever becoming a nuclear weapons state, potentially igniting a nuclear arms race in the most dangerous tinderbox of the world.

So I urge my colleagues to suppress any intentions that will drive us to a point that we can't have that strong vote, that we can't send that strong message to Iran. There is no stronger message to Iran, particularly in this critical time, in which I think we strengthen the administration and the P5+1's hand by saying there is a congressional review and potential judgment.

So that final agreement we get, hopefully, can be one we can all embrace. We can do that—we can actually have an effect by passing this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I just want to again thank Senator MENENDEZ for his tremendous leadership on this issue. He brought up a point I wish I had made in my opening comments. I have made it every time I have presented this bill elsewhere. But a lot of people do not realize that at present, because of the waivers that are part of the sanctions that we put in place—some of them through independent pieces of legislation, some of them through NDAA's—in each case the President was given a national security waiver.

Again, as the Senator mentioned, it was never thought that waiver would be utilized to waive things ad infinitum. At present—a lot of people do not realize this—but the President today has the power, without this legislation, to go straight to the U.N. Security Council, without coming to Congress, and implement whatever deal he wants to implement with Iran. He has that ability.

So when you think about what is happening here, and this is what is so powerful about this bipartisan effort, is that we together—we together—have said: Wait a minute. If we pass this legislation, we want to retake the ability ourselves to lift those sanctions or to have them lifted; we do not want the President going straight to the U.N. Security Council.

I know Senator KAINE is on the floor. I cannot thank him enough for getting involved at the time he did. I remember distinctly in the committee meeting, where we had testimony from our Secretary of State, him articulating, better than anyone yet, the fact that at some point down the road we are going to have to permanently lift the sanctions, which, by the way, could be 5, 6, 7 years down the road, long after the sanctions regime has totally imploded. We are going to have to do it permanently down the road.

Would it not make sense for us to go ahead and review this on the front end and have the opportunity, if we think it is not something worthy of this, to disapprove or to approve if we decide to do that.

So I know Senator KAINE wants to speak. I cannot thank him enough for his knowledge of congressional responsibilities as it relates to these kinds of issues and his input, which was invaluable at the time it occurred. He really created the momentum for us to move ahead.

I will yield the floor, thanking him very much for his efforts in this regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the Corker-Menendez bill. I thank Chairman CORKER for his kind words and for the opportunity to work together on something, in what I believe to be the best traditions of our committee and the Senate. I thank my ranking member, Senator CARDIN, for being a great facilitator at the end to help us get over a number of challenging issues, to a point of unanimity on the committee, and to Senator MENENDEZ, whose long-term interest on this issue has been so consistent and so helpful and whose work on this particular piece of legislation was critical.

I believe Senator CORKER began, and I want to begin as well, with a condolence to the family of Dr. Weinstein, a Marylander who—the announcement today about his death in Afghanistan in a drone strike sort of reminds us of the stakes that are involved in these kinds of issues. When we are talking about American military action or

about diplomacy around a nuclear weapons program, it is not a bill we are talking about, it is not a concept we are talking about, we are talking about human lives; that even in the best of circumstances there will be days like today when there will be sad news and Americans who are in harm's way because of the dangerous nature of the world—and I feel like the announcement today about Dr. Weinstein—our condolences to his family should remind us of the seriousness of our obligation.

Senator CARDIN started with that great wisdom of Senator Vandenberg that “politics stops at the water's edge.” Now, we probably all know that was never 100 percent true. I know a little bit about some of the challenges Jefferson and other Virginians had early. There is always politics, but there is a core wisdom to that principle, a very important wisdom.

Of course, we are going to battle because we see things differently, and people seeing things differently can sometimes get to a greater understanding. That is what we hope to do. But the reason politics should stop at the water's edge is because we want to send a unified message to our allies as they depend on us. We need to send a unified message to our adversaries about our intentions.

But I would say in a personal way, because of maybe representing the Commonwealth of Virginia, we have to send a unified message to the men and women in our armed services who serve, who are serving in battlefields, who are serving in theaters of military operations around the world. When we are contemplating decisions about something so big that could potentially lead to war—we just deployed Virginia-based ships like the *Theodore Roosevelt* to Yemen to potentially check Iranian ambitions vis-a-vis the Houthi rebels in Yemen. Those are Virginians, many from other States, who are deployed on those ships.

We owe it to those who are serving and risking their lives to try to be as nonpartisan as we can, so they know they are not serving just because one party thinks they should or the other party thinks they should, but the missions they are undertaking are missions of national consensus. I feel that very strongly. That is why I am so gratified this bill now reaches the floor on a fundamental matter in a bipartisan way.

With respect to our negotiations with Iran, there was a view out there on the table that if Congress wanted to be involved, it must be because we are against diplomacy. In the committee I said that notion was offensive to me. There were those even who suggested that those who wanted a congressional oversight role were prowar, which was highly offensive and insulting.

I am prodiplomacy. I supported the President's commencement of these negotiations in November of 2013. I think America has a wonderful diplomatic

tradition where we have been able to achieve a lot when diplomacy is done right.

I actually think the negotiation period from November 2013 to today has produced tangible benefits for the United States, our allies, and the world because Iran has rolled back its stockpile of 20-percent enriched uranium. They have allowed inspections they didn't allow before. And even nations and leaders who were skeptical about whether the negotiation would work have admitted to me: Maybe I shouldn't have been skeptical. The negotiation period has produced some benefits.

In the framework announced on April 2, I see some items I like and I see some other things I have some deep questions about. But a commitment by Iran, for example, to roll back uranium stockpiles from 10,000 kilograms to 300 kilograms—just a fraction of what would be necessary to produce even one weapon—would be very positive.

But I say all that just to say that as a prodiploamacy Senator, as someone who would love to find a negotiation that would work to a positive end, I believe strongly that a congressional review role of a matter such as this is necessary, it is helpful, and it is something, frankly, that the American public deserves. It is necessary for the reasons that have been described.

Now, a President, under article II powers, has significant ability to conduct foreign policy and even strike agreements without congressional approval. There are many things a President can do in the foreign policy sphere without congressional approval.

But this is fundamentally a negotiation about what Iran must do to get out from under sanctions that Congress has constructed, that Congress has imposed, and that Congress has perfected and approved over the years. If that is the negotiation, there is no way to have an ultimate deal about the unwinding and eventual repeal of a congressional sanctions statute without congressional review. So Congress is necessary to this deal.

Second, congressional review is helpful. It is helpful for the negotiators, as they are in this final chapter, to know that they must negotiate to their very best because they will have to sell this deal to Congress as the elected representatives of the American people. That is a helpful discipline for our negotiators. It is helpful for the Iranians who want to get out from under congressional sanctions to have some sense of how Congress might ultimately look at this deal.

Put yourself in the Iranian shoes. We want them to make huge concessions, not modest ones. But what is their incentive to make big concessions to get out from under congressional sanctions if they have no idea what Congress will likely do? We have put a process in place that will give them some sense of what Congress would do in an orderly way, and that will be an incentive, I believe, for larger concessions.

Not only is this review bill necessary, not only is it helpful, but it is what the American public expects and deserves. I think we have all been looking at the way the American public has been reacting to this negotiation.

The American public is like all of us. They are deeply worried about an Iranian nuclear weapons program. They are like all of us. They would love it if we could find a diplomatic end to the Iranian nuclear weapons program. They are like all of us. They are skeptical about whether Iran will follow an agreement, and they overwhelmingly believe that if there is an agreement, it should be an agreement that Congress approves.

Why do they think Congress should approve it? Is it because we have fantastic approval ratings? Absolutely not. We don't have great approval ratings. But, the American public says: In our anxiety about whether we can trust Iran on a deal, we will feel better if both the executive and the legislative have looked at this deal and concluded—like you would try to get a second opinion from a doctor on something that was very important—that it is a good deal for our country and our national security. They are going to feel more comfortable, given the natural anxiety they have about Iranian compliance.

That is why this bill is so important. Finally, I want to talk about how the bill got here because I do think there is a lesson for the floor activity on the bill but also for the body, more generally.

This bill was filed in original version in 2014, and I did not sign onto it.

Our chairman, Senator CORKER, and I were in the Middle East in January with five other Senators, in Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and Israel.

As we returned after a set of discussions with governmental leaders, military leaders, civil society, and political leaders about many topics, including the Iranian negotiation, Senator CORKER, a friend, sort of challenged me a little bit: Hey, you are the guy who likes to say that Congress needs to play a role. I have been pushing hard for Congress to play a role in an authorization of military force against ISIL. If that is what you think, why aren't you on this bill about congressional approval of a deal with Iran?

I said: You are absolutely right congressional approval, but there are some aspects of the bill I don't like.

The chairman said to me: Then, fine, you rewrite it or propose amendments, and let's see if we can work together.

So I did and others did, and we put our best good-faith proposals down on the table. We found a listening ear, a staff, and a set of Senators on both sides of the aisle who were willing to try to exercise that congressional approval role—but do it in the right way, not the wrong way.

When we filed this bill on September 27, there were two Democratic original sponsors and two Republican original

sponsors. Then there were five additional Democratic cosponsors and five additional Republican cosponsors.

So from the very day this bill hit the floor, we were trying to build it in a bipartisan way to show that the Vandenberg maxim, although it is not as true even when it was stated and it certainly is not as true today as we would like it, still had some power. And we wanted to show the body that we could do it in a bipartisan way so that our allies, our adversaries, and our troops would see that we could act in a bipartisan way on something so important.

There were steps between the filing of the bill and the Foreign Relations Committee action that threatened to push the bill off of the bipartisan rails into partisanship in ways that might have served the short-term purpose but that would have probably killed the bill. The chairman and others made sure that did not happen.

So when we got to the vote in the Foreign Relations Committee—and it went from 2 plus 2, to 7 plus 7, and eventually, 19 to zero—we carefully worked at every step along the way to make this bipartisan and, hopefully, to send an example on the floor that this is what it should be. Robust debate and amendment, of course, is what this body is about. But we want to make sure that review of this most important matter is done in a way that is careful, prompt, and deliberate, according to rules that all can respect and all can understand.

I conclude with thanks to my colleagues on the committee, to the leadership of the chair—both as the original drafter of the bill, then as the drafter willing to entertain other ideas, and then as the chair of this committee, trying to bring this to a productive place.

I thank Senator CARDIN for his great role in helping us bridge differences and, especially, for his communication with the White House. The White House threatened to veto this bill, but Senator CARDIN, probably better than most, was able to listen to the concerns and then try to respond to the concerns in a way that we could make the bill productive.

This matter is so important that we just cannot tackle it in any way other than trying to follow—the best we humanly can—that Vandenberg maxim. I hope, as we get into deliberations on the floor next week, that this would be the spirit of all the colleagues who tackled this most important matter.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator KAINE. I appreciate his outline of how this legislation went from unlikely to have much impact, because we didn't have the consensus and the numbers necessary to get it through the finish line. It would have had a very, very difficult time getting through the committee—let alone the floor of the Senate, the House, and

signed by the President—but for how people listen to each other.

So I am pleased the two of you went on the trip together because I think we need to do more of that in the Senate.

Senator KAINE and Senator CORKER are both individuals who have a deep respect for the proper role of the Senate, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the Senators.

I am proud to serve with both of you. I am pleased to see that we have found ways that we really can bridge differences in order to achieve a common purpose. We were not interested in scoring political points. We are interested in doing what our responsibility is all about.

So Senator CORKER is now probing a way in which we can reauthorize the State Department, the role that our committee should have, and, therefore, to directly deal with our responsibilities in the Senate through the appropriate committee. I think all of these are efforts with which, working together, we can have the Senate perform the proper role in this government of ours to make sure that the legislative branch weighs in where it is appropriate on foreign policy issues.

I thank Senator KAINE and Senator CORKER for giving us a good model as to how legislation should be developed. I was proud to work with Senator CORKER so that we could get the White House and get some of our Members who didn't quite share the enthusiasm of this legislation to a place where they are comfortable in supporting the bill—not only supporting the bill but enthusiastically supporting the bill in order to get it done.

I also appreciate your mentioning Warren Weinstein. Warren Weinstein was a resident of Maryland. His wife, Elaine, I talked to on frequent occasions. She is a very brave woman and did everything she could to bring her husband home. Warren Weinstein was a USAID worker in Pakistan. He did that because he wanted to do good for the world.

He was very well respected, carrying out his mission in a most professional way. He was on his way home, basically, when he was kidnapped in 2011 by Al Qaeda. As we know, the President announced today that he was killed in January, along with an Italian national who was also serving. Our thoughts and prayers first go out to the families. Our hearts are broken.

Senator MIKULSKI, Congressman DELANEY, and I have frequently met with the family over the years to try to put a spotlight at the appropriate time in dealing with the hostage situation. It is very difficult to deal with a hostage situation when it is not a government that is holding the person, and it makes it much more complicated.

But I do think that in addition to doing everything we can to keep our Americans safe who go to these countries on our behalf, using diplomacy, basically, and developing assistance for

a more stable country, we have to do everything we can to keep them safe. We have to recognize the risk factors in circumstances such as this. We have to have strategies to do everything we possibly can to bring these people back home safely.

I know you all share that. But then we have to make the world a little bit safer, and that is what this review statute is all about. I do believe it does give us a better opportunity to get the right agreement from Iran that would prevent it from becoming a nuclear weapons power, which is a game changer for the security in that region.

I wish to mention just one other example. There was an enormous human tragedy when another boat carrying desperate refugees and migrants capsized in the Mediterranean Sea. In the most recent instance over 850 men, women, and children have died. Now these are very desperate situations when you take these dangerous voyages.

The number of people who have died in the Mediterranean—in 2014 we know that well over 218,000 refugees and migrants crossed the Mediterranean Sea, many fleeing violence, conflicts, and persecution in Syria, Iraq, and Eritrea. We also know that Yemen is involved here. Last year's death total surpassed 1,750 victims.

I mention that because what Iran is doing in this region is adding to the migration and refugee issues. Its support of terrorism, its involvement in Yemen, its involvement in Syria, and its involvement in other countries are causing people to take desperate action in order to stay safe. So we are here today to do something about that.

It is just another motivation for us to do everything we can to provide the types of policies that are necessary in that region of the world to make people safer and to have sustainable countries that can protect all of their citizens.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, today we will begin the most important debate this Congress will have this year, probably this Congress, perhaps in the entire tenure any Member of this Senate has. This debate is not just about this piece of legislation but about a nuclear Iran and the consequences a nuclear Iran would create for the world.

Iran is today the greatest threat to the world. Iran already is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, according to the Obama administration's own State Department. We see their regional aggression on display in Syria, in Lebanon, in Iraq, and now in Yemen. They have a very bad habit of killing

Jews around the world, from Israel, to Bulgaria, to Argentina. They hold four U.S. citizens hostage today without just cause or due process. They do all those things without a nuclear weapon and with tens of billions of dollars frozen overseas.

What could we expect if Iran is able to develop nuclear weapons capabilities?

First, we will see more regional aggression as they use their nuclear umbrella to continue their drive for regional dominance throughout the Middle East. They would use the tens of billions of dollars sanctions relief would give them not to build hospitals or schools or roads or to improve the lives of their people but, rather, to prop up their proxies, such as the Hezbollah or the Houthis or the Shiite militia currently at risk of tearing Iraq apart.

Second, they are likely to use those nuclear weapons. Ayatollah Khamenei, the original Supreme Leader, upon taking power said the Islamic revolution did not care about Iran or the Persian nation or its history, they cared about spreading worldwide Islamic revolution. This is not a normal state, and these are not normal leaders.

Third, we will see a nuclear arms race throughout the Middle East. As many Senators in this institution have heard from senior government officials of Sunni states throughout the gulf, they cannot tolerate a Persian Shiite nuclear power. Whether they develop with their indigenous capabilities, in some instances, or whether they purchase it from overseas, we will see the world's most dangerous and volatile region strung with nuclear tripwires.

Fourth, these countries may provide nuclear weapons to terrorists to be used against American troops in the region, against our allies, such as Israel, or other countries or in one of the harbors on America's coasts, if not in America's heartland.

Fifth, terrorists or insurgents could get their hands on nuclear materials if they were able to destabilize or topple the wrong regime, as has tended to happen in the Middle East in the last 4 years and in recent decades.

The President started these negotiations on the grounds that we would stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. Yet he has consistently backpedaled, conceded, and reversed himself. Rather than now trying to dismantle and disarm Iran's nuclear arms program, we are content to trying to manage it, to limit its breakout time to 1 mere year, if that.

The United Nation's Security Council has passed multiple resolutions saying that Iran has no right to enrich uranium. Yet now we are going to concede Iran the right to keep thousands of centrifuges, to continue advanced research into centrifuges, and to keep its stockpile of uranium.

The President said barely more than a year ago, after the negotiations started, that Iran had no reason to

have a hardened underground military bunker in which they kept centrifuge cascades in Fordow. Yet, according to our own proposed fact sheet—much of which Iran disputes—we are going to concede the Fordow issue.

The President said at the very same time after negotiations had begun that Iran had no reason to keep its uranium stockpiles, and Iran had, in fact, reportedly agreed to tentatively export those to a third party. At the last minute, in Switzerland earlier this month, they reversed themselves, saying they were going to insist on keeping their stockpile, and we conceded on that front as well.

We have insisted throughout the period of these negotiations that we would not grant Iran immediate sanctions relief. The President's own term sheet said we wouldn't grant such relief. Iran's term sheet says differently. Just Friday, when confronted with this discrepancy, the President said we may have to find creative ways around this disagreement—creative ways to give Iran, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, on its way to becoming a nuclear threshold power, tens of billions of dollars and reportedly even a \$50 billion signing bonus, as if Iran were not a theocratic dictatorial regime but a blue chip prospect in the NFL draft.

These negotiations have also excluded most of Iran's outlaw behavior—currently developing intercontinental ballistic missiles for which there is no reason other than striking the United States; holding those four hostages without due process or fair trials—and stopping its regional aggression and stopping its support for terrorism.

This legislation has some good elements in it. It would suspend the President's ability to waive any sanctions for approximately 7 weeks while we consider any proposed bill if such a deal is reached at some point in the future. It would also require the President to certify every 90 days that Iran is living up to its obligations under any such deal. But it only goes into effect after such a deal is announced. Any deal along the lines the President proposed 2 weeks ago is dangerous for the United States and dangerous for the world, and it is Congress's job to stop such a deal before it happens.

The sponsors of this bill didn't upend the constitutional baseline. This bill should be submitted for a treaty. The President should have to get 67 votes for a major nuclear arms agreement with an outlaw regime. Instead, Congress has to get 67 votes in the Senate to block such a bill. That is why I intend to support Senator JOHNSON's amendment that would require this to be submitted as a treaty.

This legislation omits most of Iran's outlaw behavior, and it doesn't lay out the terms on which Congress would insist, before there is sanctions relief, in addressing this outlaw behavior. And it may allow the President to argue in the future—if a mere 34 Senators vote

against a resolution of disapproval—and say that Congress has acquiesced in his agreement and that he now has support from the Congress and is not just acting on his own whim.

Therefore, I expect to offer and I expect to support amendments that are offered in three main categories—first, an amendment that would treat any resolution of disapproval as a privileged amendment subject not to a 60-vote threshold but to a 51-vote threshold. We should not let 34 Senators block a resolution of disapproval from going into effect. We certainly shouldn't allow 41 Senators to impede the will of 59 Senators who disagree with any future deal from forcing the President to veto it and depriving him of the ability to claim that Congress has acquiesced to his action.

The second main category would be to limit the administration's discretion in the future on reporting about breaches of an agreement, should an agreement be reached and should it not be blocked by the Congress.

This legislation says the administration should report potentially significant breaches to the Congress and then determine whether those potentially significant breaches are a material breach, which is defined as substantially reducing Iran's breakout time or improving Iran's nuclear program. We should strike those lawyers' vague terms. They should submit every breach to us. They should submit every time the breakout time is decreased or Iran's nuclear program improves its position. It is our job as the people's representatives to decide whether it is material, whether it is significant.

The third category of amendments is that Iran should not get sanctions relief until they live up to their international obligations, until they meet the very baseline terms the President himself laid out at the beginning of these negotiations or even after the negotiations had begun, and until Iran acts like a civilized country.

There should be no sanctions relief until the President can certify that the hardened underground military facility at Fordow is closed. He himself said Iran had no need for it.

There should be no sanctions relief until Iran has lived up to its international obligation to the IAEA—the U.N.'s nuclear watchdog—and disclosed the past military dimensions of its nuclear program, without which inspectors have no baseline to know what the status of their program is today.

There should be no sanctions relief until the President can certify that Iran is not developing intercontinental ballistic missiles. They have missiles that can defend their own territory and that can strike most of their neighbors in the Middle East. They are developing intercontinental ballistic missiles for one reason: to strike the United States with a nuclear warhead.

There should be no sanctions relief until the President can certify that Iran is no longer sponsoring terrorism

because it goes to the heart of the threat Iran poses. Other countries in the world are a nuclear threshold power—Japan, Germany, and South Korea. We don't have debates about those countries being a nuclear threshold power because they are normal countries with normal leaders who do not call us the Great Satan and Israel the Little Satan and threaten to wipe Israel off the map. Until the nature of the Iran regime changes, we cannot allow them to have weapons of this nature. And they will not change until they have renounced terrorism.

Next, the President should have to certify that Iran is not cooperating with North Korea—as it has done countless times on ballistic missile programs and nuclear technology—an outlaw regime whose current nuclear status foretells the future of this deal. In 1994, the agreed framework was supposed to stop North Korea from becoming a nuclear power. Yet, just 12 years later, they have developed nuclear weapons. Now, by most estimates, they have 20—a number that could double in just a few years—with much of the United States falling underneath the threat of a North Korean nuclear attack.

Next, there should be no sanctions relief until all four American hostages are released—Pastor Saeed Abenini; Amir Hekmati, a decorated marine; Robert Levinson; and Jason Rezaian, a Washington Post reporter. That should have been a term before we even sat down at the table, that no American citizen will be held hostage by an outlaw, third-rate regime like Iran—before we started negotiating with them. They and their families deserve no less.

There should be no sanctions relief until the President can certify that Iran has agreed to anytime, anywhere inspections. This is an ongoing point of major dispute between President Obama and Iran's leaders, but if we can't go to their military facilities, if we can't inspect any facility instantly, without notification, we will be engaged in the same kind of cat-and-mouse regime that has caused inspection regimes to fail time and time again.

Finally, Iran should recognize Israel's right to exist. It is not too much to simply say that Israel has a right to exist as a Jewish and a democratic country. This is a country that just a few months ago was tweeting—tweeting—nine different reasons why Israel should be annihilated from the world.

These are very simple terms, most of which President Obama himself outlined before these negotiations began or which are clear and binding international obligations on Iran. They are good amendments that would strengthen this bill—a bill that touches on the most important issues that most of us will address during our time in the Senate.

When we considered the Keystone Pipeline bill—an important bill but a

bill that dealt with a single pipeline—we considered almost 250 amendments, and we voted on 40. Surely, we should have the same kind of robust consideration, debate, and voting on this bill. I strongly support the majority leader's call earlier this morning for exactly that kind of robust process. Most of these amendments touch directly on the heart of this legislation. I look forward to casting up-or-down votes on a 51-vote threshold on all of these amendments and many more that my colleagues may offer.

I regret that I may miss some of this debate. I may have to ask some of my colleagues to submit amendments for me. My first child is due today. By the time this bill gets to the floor next week for debate and voting, I expect my first child will have arrived. But I will not allow my son to live under the threat of a nuclear Iran—the threat of nuclear attack and ultimate nuclear war—any more than I will allow the sons and daughters of all Americans to live under that threat.

So I look forward to this debate. I look forward to stopping Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise today to continue our efforts to honor the Nation's and North Dakota's Vietnam veterans and specifically those brave servicemembers who were killed in action during the Vietnam war.

Mr. President, 198 soldiers from North Dakota died while serving in Vietnam. Today, I am honored to speak about some of these brave men and the stories their families have shared with us.

I need to credit David Erbstoesser of Bismarck, a Vietnam veteran, for his service and for his years of reaching out to the family members of these fallen North Dakota patriots. Over the past 20 years, David contacted each family to obtain a photo of every servicemember and a photo of their gravestone. I am grateful to David for meeting with my staff to share his collection of obituaries, news articles, and photos he has collected.

The Bismarck High students and their teachers are also researching North Dakota's servicemembers who didn't come home from Vietnam. Today, I am happy to include research from BHS's 11th grade students about two such men: Gary Myers and David Bujalski.

RAPHAEL "JOHN" FROST

The first of our soldiers is John Frost. John was from Hunter. He was born on March 16, 1948. He served in the Army's 196th Infantry Brigade. John was 20 years old when he was killed on December 20, 1968.

John was the oldest of three children and helped his dad on the family farm. During high school, John participated in the school newspaper, choir, the Letterman's Club, a school play, and was a class officer. He was also an all-around athlete who earned letters in track, baseball, football, and basketball. His mother Lois still remembers how proud she was the day he scored 33 points in one basketball game in a winning effort.

After high school, John enrolled at Valley City State College. He was a quiet, fun-loving boy who dreamed of returning to his hometown to work as a teacher and basketball coach.

John's mother and brother Kevin remember John's kindness, especially toward his Grandma Alice while she was staying with the family recuperating from breaking her hip. While his parents were out of town, John stayed home caring for his grandmother, even making potato pancakes for her.

JON GREENLEY

Jon Greenley was from Fargo. He was born on January 30, 1942. He served in the Air Force's 774th Tactical Aerial Flight Squadron. Jon died on January 7, 1966. He was 23 years old.

Jon was one of three sons. His brother Doug remembers that Jon respected authority. Jon sent Doug a letter stating that the only time he questioned their parents' judgment was when he was buying a lawnmower and they suggested he buy a type he didn't like.

From a young age, Jon had an interest in planes and in the military. He joined the North Dakota Air National Guard. When his parents wouldn't take him to see the Air Museum in Ohio, he hitchhiked there.

Jon attended North Dakota State University and became president of the international relations group there. He was named Outstanding ROTC of the Air Force and was the first alternate to the Air Force Academy. The Fargo AMVETS post, founded in 1980, was named after Jon.

His body has never been recovered.

DAN HERDEBU

Dan Herdebu was from Baldwin. He was born on July 21, 1948. He served in the Army's 1st Aviation Brigade. He was 19 years old when he died on March 10, 1968.

Dan and his two brothers attended their two-room school through the eighth grade and attended Bismarck High School.

Dan planned to put his aviation experience to good use by flying helicopters for law enforcement or medical facilities someday.

Dan's older brother Eugene was in basic training when Dan was killed in a helicopter crash in Vietnam. After Dan's death, Eugene also served in Vietnam in the Army.

ALAN HINZPETER

Alan Hinzpeter was from Minot. He was born on May 12, 1949. He served in the Army's 101st Airborne Division. Alan died on September 6, 1971. He was 22 years old. Alan was one of four children. His brother Gordie also served in Vietnam, and their father served in World War II in the Navy.

Alan's friends and family called him Pete and remember him as a hard worker who was smart and generous with his money. He was a jokester who liked everyone and whom everyone liked. His oldest sister Jean tells about the time he wanted to watch the World Series, so he smoked a cigarette at school so he would be suspended. Jean says that Alan was 5 feet 4 inches but had a big personality. Many people attended his funeral and still to this day remember him fondly.

GERALD ALLEN "AL" IVERSON

Al Iverson was from Oakes. He was born on May 26, 1947. He served in the Army's 9th Infantry Division. He was 20 years old when he died on November 1, 1967.

Al was the second youngest of 14 kids—7 boys and 7 girls. Al's siblings say he was a fun-loving brother with red hair and freckles. He loved baseball and fishing. He also enjoyed spending time with his older siblings' kids, the oldest in his family, and he wanted to get married someday and have six kids of his own.

Al had 3 months left before he was scheduled to return home. He was the first Dickey County soldier to die in Vietnam.

NORBERT FROEHLICH

Norbert Froehlich was from Belfield. He was born on March 4, 1947. He served in the Army's 503rd Airborne Infantry Regiment. Norbert died on January 30, 1968. He was 19 years old.

He was the ninth of 10 kids and grew up on his family farm. Three of his brothers also served our country in the military.

His friends, both in the Army and from high school, remembered Norbert as a friend who stuck by them through thick and thin. His brother Don says that Norbert was wounded in Vietnam and was supposed to be on R&R in Australia but chose to stay in Vietnam to