

AMENDMENT NO. 1197

(Purpose: Amendment of a perfecting nature)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1197 at the desk to the text proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1140.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. COTTON] proposes an amendment numbered 1197 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1140.

Mr. COTTON. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1198 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1197

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I also call up for Senator RUBIO a second-degree amendment, amendment No. 1198 to amendment No. 1197.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. COTTON], for Mr. RUBIO, proposes an amendment numbered 1198 to amendment No. 1197.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a certification that Iran's leaders have publically accepted Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state)

On page 3, line 20, of the amendment, strike "purpose." and insert the following: "purpose; and

"(iii) the President determines Iran's leaders have publically accepted Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, again, these amendments would do two very simple things: First, they would require a vote on whether Iran should get sanctions relief before it discloses past military dimensions of its nuclear program, before it closes its underground fortified bunker at Fordow, and before it submits to a fully verifiable, anytime, anywhere, no-notice inspections regime. Second, they would require Iran to acknowledge Israel's right to exist as a Jewish democratic state before they get nuclear weapons because they continue to say that Israel would be wiped off the map, and if they get nuclear weapons, they will have the means to do so.

It is my intent to insist upon a recorded vote on these amendments at a simple-majority threshold. The Senate needs to vote. If you disagree with these policies, vote no. If you agree with these policies and you think this will upset a delicate compromise, then vote no and explain that. But we need to vote, and we should start voting.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me point out a couple things. There are

now 67 amendments, all of which have been filed by Republicans, none by Democrats.

This bill passed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee 19 to 0. Senator CORKER and I have been working with Republicans who have filed amendments to try to accommodate them, and we have been making progress. We have been trying to schedule additional votes. I thank Senator CORKER and those who are cooperating with us in a way that we can try to move this bill forward.

We are prepared to have votes, but I think some of the tactics that are now being deployed are going to make it much more difficult for us to be able to proceed in an orderly way. It is every Member's right to take whatever actions they want to take, but I want to tell you that for those of us who want to get this bill to the finish line, it gets a little frustrating.

We will continue to focus on a way forward on this legislation. But I want to make it clear that we have been prepared to find an orderly way to proceed with votes and to deal with the issues Members have been concerned about, but at times it becomes difficult with the procedures that are being used.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank the ranking member and the ranking member's staff. I thank the minority leader's office for working with us on what was going to be a series of votes, tough votes. I have a sense that the context of this has just changed, and I regret that.

I have been working with numbers of Senators on some really controversial votes that we were willing to make, as we already have. As a matter of fact, the only two votes we have had thus far were considered poison pill votes. My friend from Maryland was willing to have more poison pill votes—if you want to call them that—tough votes, but I sense the context of this may have just changed.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, let's talk about poison pill amendments. I would say these aren't poison pills; these are vitamin pills. They are designed to strengthen this legislation and to strengthen the U.S. negotiating position.

Who could object that Israel has a right to exist as a Jewish state and that Iran should not be allowed a nuclear weapon if they won't recognize that right? The President himself said

they should close their underground fortified military bunker before they get sanctions relief. We are simply asking for a vote on what the President himself has said.

If the Senator from Maryland wants to talk about procedural tactics, let's be perfectly clear what has happened here. The very first amendment brought to the floor on this bill was designed to stop any other amendments from being offered.

For those of you watching, you should know that the only thing that amendment says is that any final agreement must be submitted in Farsi as well as English. That is a non-controversial proposal which I am sure we could adopt by voice vote and move on in an orderly fashion to any other amendments. Yet, they continue to object to unanimous consent to bring up any other amendments, designed to stop the Senate from having to cast these votes.

The amendments we have offered are no more of a procedural tactic than what the Senator from Maryland himself is doing—an amendment that could have been offered in committee, an amendment that could have been voted on easily on Tuesday when it was offered but is being used to block consideration of any other amendment.

These are not tough votes. These should be easy votes. Again, if you want to vote no, vote no. If you want to vote no and say it is designed to protect a compromise, do that. But we should be voting.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I know the Senator from Arkansas knows I have no issue with taking tough votes, and I would take them all day long.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—VETO

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, under the previous order, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the veto message.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

(The text of the President's veto message is printed on page S2094 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 13, 2015.)

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the joint resolution.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of the amendment that I plan to submit. It is amendment No. 1173. It is my intention to work with the managers of the Iran bill to get this amendment filed and voted on soon. What I wanted to do is to talk about this amendment for a little bit.

I want to begin by complimenting Senator CORKER, Senator CARDIN, and others who have worked hard on the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015. It is a good start to a critically important issue for all of us and for the American people. The amendment that I am proposing and that I am offering today will make that bill stronger, will give leverage to our negotiators, and will make our country more secure. That is our No. 1 priority. That is what this amendment will help us do.

The simple question this amendment proposes is this. Should the United States—our government, we, this body—allow sanctions to be lifted on a country that our own State Department has designated a state sponsor of terrorism? It is a simple, straightforward question.

In my view, the answer is also simple. The answer is no. Sanctions should not be lifted on a state sponsor of terrorism, especially one with a track record like Iran.

My amendment requires the President of the United States to declare that Iran is no longer a sponsor of state terrorism before lifting sanctions and allowing billions of dollars to flood into that country's economy. It is that simple. We should not allow, facilitate or encourage billions of dollars to go to a country that sponsors terrorism, because I fear that we have been inured to the issue of state sponsor of terrorism. I would like to focus on what that means a little bit.

Let's first start with the states that are on the list: Yemen, Syria, Sudan, Iran. These countries are all on the list because governments in each state facilitate international terrorism. We are not talking about rogue elements within a country that are killing people within their own borders. We are talking about governments themselves, the bodies in charge of a country, the bodies making and enforcing a country's laws, supporting acts of inter-

national terrorism, including against our own citizens.

Why is Iran on the list? Since its founding in 1979, the leaders of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the government have been sponsoring terrorism. In fact, our State Department has called Iran the world's most active sponsor of terrorism. Since 1979, Iran has been responsible for taking American hostages, for bombing our and our allies' embassies, and for horrible acts of murder across the globe.

Here is the key point. It has not stopped. According to the State Department, Iran continues to support terrorism—Palestinian terrorist groups—and is actively fostering instability throughout the Middle East right now, today. Last month, March 2015, a U.S. Federal judge found Iran complicit in the 2000 bombing of the USS *Cole*, the deadliest attack on a U.S. Navy vessel since 1987.

Let's talk about Iran's involvement in Iraq. I am a Marine Corps Reserve officer. In 2005, I was recalled to Active Duty for a year and a half, serving as a staff officer to the commanding general of the U.S. Central Command, John Abizaid. During that time, I deployed to many parts of the CENTCOM area of responsibility. One of the biggest concerns—perhaps the biggest concern—that we saw in Iraq during that time was the increasing threat to our troops of improvised explosive devices, especially what was referred to as explosively formed projectiles, EFPs, the most deadly and sophisticated IEDs on the battlefield.

Almost every time I was in Iraq with General Abizaid, he and his staff were briefed on the details of this threat, showing captured weapons systems, the twisted, charred remains of military vehicles that had been hit by EFPs. Those EFPs killed more American troops per attack than any other roadside bombs. They blasted through tanks, humvees or anything they hit. They were deadly. They killed and maimed thousands of our troops.

I still remember the courage and trepidation I saw in the eyes of our brave military members who had to face this threat on a daily basis, even some members of this body. To this day, I deeply distrust the leadership of the regime that was responsible for these EFPs.

Make no mistake, that country was Iran. That much was confirmed by our intelligence agencies and the State Department. But Iran has never taken responsibility for these deaths, and it has not said that it will stop this kind of terrorism.

Let me provide an example. In 2007, CENTCOM and intelligence officials provided very detailed briefings on the fact that these EFPs were coming from Iran. At the same time, Iran's U.N. Ambassador wrote an op-ed in the New York Times and said that such charges and evidence were being fabricated by the United States. That was the U.N. Ambassador from Iran, Ambassador

Zarif. In that op-ed he was telling a lie to the American people.

Why is that important? He is now the Foreign Minister of Iran. He is now in charge of negotiating this nuclear deal. He is certainly not a trustworthy man.

If sanctions are lifted, billions of dollars are going to flow from companies and banks from around the world to the economy and government of Iran. They are going to invest in businesses. They are going to invest in the oil and gas sector. They are going to invest in banks.

What will the Iranian leadership likely do with that money? Do we trust them to invest in schools and infrastructure and health clinics so they can provide their citizens better lives?

Let's use history as our guide. Everything about that country's leadership and everything about that country's history tells us that that money—billions—is likely to be used to pump up their terror machine around the world and target American citizens.

I know what we have heard from the administration: Do not worry. If there is a violation of this agreement, these sanctions will snap back into place. They will snap back—no problem, piece of cake.

After serving on Active Duty for that time I mentioned, I served as a U.S. Assistant Secretary of State. I helped lead the effort in the Bush Administration to isolate economically Iran, to go to our allies and say you have to divest out of the Iranian oil and gas sector, the Iranian financial sector.

There was no snap here. This was a slog. It took years to get companies to divest. Yet now this administration is talking that we will snap back. No problem, we will divest in a couple of days. It is a fantasy. The Administration knows it. They should stop using the term "snapback" because it is not accurate. It is not accurate.

What is the alternative? The alternative is simple. Before lifting sanctions on Iran, Iran needs to take the steps to get off the list of countries that sponsor terrorism around the world. These are not insurmountable steps. These would include having a clear record for 6 months. That is it, 6 months—not decades, not years—6 months of not sponsoring state terrorism.

It would also require Iran to renounce terrorism. Simple, don't engage in terrorism. Do not try to kill our citizens or the citizens of our allies. Do not send your forces around the world to blow things up or take hostages. Then we will consider lifting the sanctions. You do not have to be our ally. You do not have to like us. We do not have to like you. You do not have to change even the structure of your government. You just should not target our citizens for murder the way you are doing now as one of the biggest—the biggest—state sponsors of terrorism in the world.

It has been said that such a requirement and an amendment such as this

would be a poison pill, meaning that if this amendment is added to the Corker-Menendez bill, it will somehow signify the death of the bill. I have thought long and hard about that. Do I want to be a Member of this body who introduces a poison pill? Am I being unreasonable with this amendment?

What I came to is this. It is our job—the most important job we have in this body—to do everything we can to keep our citizens safe and to enact good policy. Sometimes that means taking difficult positions, and sometimes it means taking very reasonable positions, even though the political process might make it seem as if this were a complicated and difficult issue. This is not complicated. This is not difficult. This amendment is a simple amendment. It is not difficult.

I wish to conclude with the question I began with. Is it good policy for the United States of America to allow or even encourage countries and corporations to do business with a state sponsor of terrorism, particularly one that has a history of targeting and killing our citizens? Is that good policy?

I believe the vast majority of the American people—Democrat, Republican, any State in the Union—would say no, that is not good policy. I believe that if the question were posed directly to the American people, they would not consider this some kind of poison pill. They might even consider this some kind of vitamin pill, one that will make us stronger. It is a supplement to strengthen our negotiators' position.

Right now there is confusion. It is in the press. The Iranians are saying we have a deal that lifts sanctions immediately. The President has said no, that is not necessarily clear. We have to be creative on how this is going to happen.

This amendment will give the President and Secretary Kerry the leverage to solve this critical issue, one that the President and the Secretary of State should use and welcome to strengthen our position in the negotiations and not view it as some kind of poison pill.

Again, it is a simple amendment. Before sanctions are lifted, the President and the State Department need to make sure Iran is off the list of states that sponsor terrorism. Iran could take the simple steps to make that possible and the world would be a much safer place.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

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. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

FDA TOBACCO DEEMING REGULATIONS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, a number of my colleagues came to the floor yesterday to speak about the FDA's failure to release the tobacco deeming rule and the delays that have occurred with respect to that rule.

As difficult as the American people may find it to understand why there are these delays in issuing a rule that protects our citizens against tobacco use—most particularly our children—we should all understand that these rules have real-life consequences.

Tobacco, in fact, is the leading cause of preventable death. In this Nation, tobacco use kills more than half a million people every year. Most smokers and tobacco users begin as children, many under the age of 10. Each day, more than 3,200 people younger than 18 years old smoke their first cigarette, and the consequences are inevitable. Thousands of them will die early in life.

Cigarettes are the only product in the world that, when used as the manufacturer intends it, kills the customer. If smoking continues at the current rate among U.S. youth, 5.6 million of them are expected to die prematurely from smoking-related illness.

Tobacco use is a path to addiction and disease, and it is a public health epidemic. Yet laws that protect the public, laws that forbid marketing to children, laws that are designed to uphold the public trust have been unimplemented.

My fight against Big Tobacco began in the 1990s, when I was attorney general of the State of Connecticut. I helped to lead a lawsuit against tobacco companies for marketing to children. We succeeded in restricting tobacco companies from selling to and targeting children in their ads through sporting events, magazines, and point of sale methods. We helped reimburse the States for the enormous amount of taxpayer dollars spent on tobacco-related diseases, and those payments continue today. They are supposed to be used for prevention and cessation activities, but unfortunately and tragically, much of that money is now used to fill gaps in State budgets.

I have continued my fight against the tobacco companies in the Senate, alongside dedicated colleagues such as Senator MERKLEY and Senator DURBIN, who spoke yesterday, in urging the FDA to seek relief, to strive to do its job with the tobacco deeming rule in order to protect children and families from tobacco.

The Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act of 2009 gave the FDA significant power and responsibility to achieve this goal. Now it is the FDA's responsibility to implement that law to prevent young people from becoming nicotine addicts, damaging their health, risking their lives, and costing the taxpayers hundreds of millions—in fact, billions—of dollars.

Six years have passed since that law was passed. The FDA has yet to implement it, and the reason is that it has yet to issue those regulations. It wasn't until last year, April 2014—5 years after the measure passed—that the FDA took the first step, issuing draft regulations known as the deeming rule that would formalize this authority. The rule would allow the FDA to control the regulation and sale—in particular, the sale to minors—of e-cigarettes, as well as dangerous combustible products, such as hookah, pipe tobacco, and cigars.

This past Saturday, April 25, was the 1-year anniversary of the release of the proposed rule. Over the past year, youth use of unregulated tobacco products, such as e-cigarettes and the hookah, has skyrocketed. E-cigarette use has tripled among 11- to 18-year-olds, while hookah use has almost doubled.

There is clear data, absolutely irrefutable evidence that the rate of use of these products has increased even as some of the use of tobacco products has diminished, and this chart illustrates that evidence. It indicates that use of the regulated products has diminished, while use of unregulated products has increased. So laws work. Rules have an effect. People can be saved from addiction and disease. And these products—cigars, pipes, hookahs, e-cigarettes—lead to tobacco use in cigarettes and addiction to nicotine. They create the same kind of public health menace that tobacco products do.

We know that nicotine addiction is surging through e-cigarette use, which is a disastrous tribute to the ingenuity of Big Tobacco. In fact, many of the big tobacco companies have bought the e-cigarette companies because they know they can use the e-cigarettes as a gateway nicotine-delivery device, addicting children so that they will then shift to cigarette tobacco.

I am joining my colleagues in urging that the FDA act as quickly as possible to implement these rules, to finalize the regulations, to get them out of the regulatory apparatus, the morass in which they are now trapped, and make sure that our children and our citizens are protected against the marketing and other abuses that are involved in the current sale of these nicotine-delivery devices marketed to children.

I am also proud to be introducing today a new measure, the Tobacco Tax and Enforcement Reform Act, which is supported by Senators DURBIN, REED, and BOXER. I am very grateful to them for their leadership not only on this measure but over many years in fighting this battle against nicotine addiction and tobacco use.

Congress has a continuing responsibility to combat cigarette smoking directly. Right now, there are a number of areas where loopholes and gaps exist in the enforcement structure. We need to do more to fight illegal tobacco trafficking. We need to eliminate the tax disparities between different tobacco products. These gaps in our laws and

law enforcement failures create opportunities and incentives for violations of those laws, at great cost to the State with regard to illegal trafficking.

Similar to the changes outlined in the President's budget proposal, this bill would also increase the Federal tax rate on tobacco products. In fact, these reforms would help the Federal Government and States collect nearly \$100 billion at a time when our States are strapped fiscally and our Federal Government needs that revenue as well. These revenues would not only reduce tobacco consumption, they would also aid the fiscal well-being of our State and local governments.

Most importantly from the standpoint of law enforcement, it would force criminals who engage in illegal trafficking to comply with the law. It would combat those criminals who profit from the illegal sale of these products and trafficking across State lines, who are selling illicitly and gaining huge numbers of dollars from that legal noncompliance.

Economic research confirms that raising the price of tobacco reduces use among young people, who are particularly sensitive to pricing. They are sensitive to price increases because they have less disposable income and know they have fewer dollars to spend. They are more price-sensitive. In fact, every 10 percent increase in the real price of cigarettes will reduce the prevalence of adult smoking by 5 percent and youth smoking by 7 percent. Adults are price-sensitive, too. Increasing the cost of cigarettes makes people more likely to want to quit and to pursue tobacco cessation, to break the nicotine habit and seek help through quit lines, the nicotine patch, and other pharmaceutical measures.

The current tobacco tax code has many loopholes that enable even the least creative manufacturers to exploit them and incentivizes many manufacturers to manipulate products so they can be classified in a lower tax category. These tax incentives and loopholes not only sharply reduce Federal revenues, but they increase the overall use of tobacco and tobacco-related harms. Eliminating these tax disparities, along with the price, is one of the goals of the measure I am introducing today. By taxing all products at the same level as cigarettes, we can make progress against nicotine addiction and the illnesses and diseases associated with tobacco use.

The increase in tax rate on cigarettes by 94 percent per pack and setting the rates for other tobacco products to an equivalent amount would help people who are now addicted and would also help America because at the end of the day the real cost of cigarettes is not only to people who are addicted and who endure the suffering and the pain of cancer, lung disease, and heart problems, it is to their families and to all taxpayers. All of us—literally, all of us—pay for the diseases that result from tobacco use through our insur-

ance policies and through Medicare and Medicaid. We are the ones who bear the financial burden.

Due to these current tax inequities, the GAO has projected \$615 million to \$1.1 billion in losses to Federal tax revenue right now, and tobacco-related health problems cost the country almost \$170 billion a year in direct medical costs. We can save money and save lives through this measure. I hope my colleagues will support it.

Every day that goes by without FDA regulation harms children. It hurts people who become addicted. It hurts all of America. Every day that tax disparities exist, every day that illegal trafficking continues is a day when America pays in the casualties, human suffering, loss of productivity, and loss of revenue.

I hope my colleagues will support these efforts.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Thank you, Madam President.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

I rise today to discuss the negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program. Many of my colleagues have spoken at length about some of their concerns, which I share. Today, however, I would like to discuss my concern about the administration's increasing reliance on the idea that sanctions can be snapped back into place in the event that Iran violates an agreement.

In its press release on the framework agreed upon earlier this month, the White House stated:

If at any time Iran fails to fulfill its commitments, these sanctions will snap back into place.

On April 11, 2015, President Obama stated:

We are preserving the capacity to snap back sanctions in the event they are breaking any deal. . . . And if . . . we don't have the capacity to snap back sanctions when we see a potential violation, then we're probably not going to get a deal.

A week later, at a press conference with the Italian Prime Minister, President Obama played down the question of whether Iran would receive immediate sanctions relief and insisted snap-back provisions were more important. He said:

Our main concern here is making sure that if Iran doesn't abide by its agreement, that we don't have to jump through a whole bunch of hoops in order to reinstate sanctions. That is our main concern.

I agree with President Obama's goal. Who wouldn't want harsh measures reinstated the moment Iran fails to comply with this agreement? The problem is that reality is far more complicated than the simple phrase "snapback" suggests.

In a Washington Post column last week, former CIA Director Michael Hayden, former Deputy Director General of the IAEA Olli Heinonen, and Middle East expert Dr. Ray Takeyh

laid out the long and circuitous path that any action to reinstate sanctions on Iran would have to take. Their conclusion? That it could take an entire year or even longer to simply confirm that Iran has actually violated its obligations and navigate the bureaucratic process necessary to restore the sanctions on Iran.

A recent article in the Wall Street Journal by Henry Kissinger and George Shultz made a similar point. In it, they write:

Restoring the most effective sanctions would require coordinated international action. In countries that had reluctantly joined in previous rounds, the demands of public and commercial opinion will militate against automatic or even prompt "snapback."

Some may argue that past history is irrelevant and that the negotiations will produce a new process, allowing for a quick restoration of the sanctions regime. Such a process would still be far from automatic since significant time would be required to confirm Iran's violation, but recent comments by Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Sergey Ryabkov made clear that this idea is not in the cards. Speaking last week on the idea of snapping back sanctions, he stated: "This process should not in any way be automatic." He went on to say that decisions on this matter should be taken in accordance with the procedures of the U.N. Security Council through voting in the Council and through the adoption of the appropriate resolutions. We must also bear in mind that sanctions take time to have effect.

The United States has had sanctions on Iran since 1979. One could argue that the heavy sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table—they began back in 2010. But even in that case it took years to create enough economic pressure for Iran to even sit down with negotiators. The idea that we will be able to swiftly reimpose sanctions and that those sanctions are going to swiftly cripple the Iranian economy and that they are going to force Iran to change its behavior—I believe that is simply implausible.

The point is the practical reality of this issue is much more complicated than the talking points suggest. To me, this underscores the importance of getting a good deal with Iran. It demonstrates why a bad deal is so much worse than no deal at all. It took many years to build the global sanctions regime that brought Iran to the negotiating table. The fact is that it can be dismantled much faster than it can be rebuilt.

We cannot afford to overlook key provisions or pretend that the precise terms of this agreement are of lesser importance. Of all the tools we can use to influence Iran, sanctions relief is the most important. It should only be provided as part of a deal that is clearly in American interests. The security of our country, our families, and the possibility of a nuclear Middle East hangs in the balance.

There will be no simple snapback if this agreement does not hold. We need to be honest with the American people and not rely on unrealistic notions to justify any deal with them.

I yield the floor.

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. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I come to the floor to speak for a few minutes on the bill we are debating to provide some congressional oversight over a potential—though not yet signed—deal with Iran.

I wish to start simply with what we all agree on. We all agree we need to do whatever we can to ensure that Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon. I have no doubt that 100 Members of the Senate would agree with that proposition. That is our guiding principle, and it should be our North Star. We may disagree on the best way to achieve a nuclear weapons-free Iran, but we can all agree on our goal.

So how do we get there is the question we are debating. I happen to be a member of the camp who believes our best hope of achieving this goal is through diplomacy, through a negotiated settlement that dramatically rolls back Iran's nuclear program in a transparent and verifiable way. While our negotiations still have a long way to go to get to that agreement, we are closer now than we have been in decades.

I, and many of my colleagues, strongly believe we should give our negotiators the space to do their jobs and to see if a deal is ultimately possible.

That is really what this bill does. It postpones a congressional vote on these negotiations, appropriately, until the negotiations are finished. That makes sense, right? There is no use on voting on a deal when we don't have a deal. And then it sets up time constraints for Congress's review of that potential deal, basically, about 30 days. That is a reasonable period of time for us to debate the agreement, and, if there is one, there is some certainty over our process to those who are at the negotiating table.

The President's critics seem to fall into two often overlapping camps. One strain of argument holds that this framework agreement we have right now is just too weak and that our side should walk away from the table, reimpose sanctions, and hold out for a better deal.

The second strain of argument—evidenced, frankly, by many of the amendments that have been filed to the underlying bill—holds that our negotiations shouldn't be just about Iran's nuclear program, that we should

also be negotiating over all of the other bad things Iran does and supports.

Now, I don't think it is worth getting into a defense of a framework today since we are months away from a final deal. But to my mind, if the final deal does look demonstrably like the framework, we would be fools to reject it. Does it allow Iran to do nuclear research? Yes, it does. Does it allow them to keep some centrifuges? Yes. But anybody who thought we were going to sign a deal that would effectively be an unconditional surrender was living in a fantasyland. The framework accomplishes our goal of protecting Israel, the region, and the United States from a quick nuclear breakout. The plutonium pathway at Arak is ended. Their enriched stores basically go down to zero. Fordow and Natanz stay open, but they can no longer do substantial enrichment, and they are going to have international scientists and inspectors crawling all over their capacity. Inspections, on the entire nuclear supply chain, will be at a scale that is totally, completely unprecedented in the history of the nuclear age.

It is a good framework. But even if you don't believe this, I just think it belies common sense to think that walking away from the table now would get you a better deal. Yes, we could reinstitute sanctions, the United States could. Perhaps some of our partners would go along, but they would be weaker than before because lots of countries that think this is a good framework wouldn't go along with this. Just look at what Russia and China have announced in the past few weeks. They basically have telegraphed that they are looking to do business with the Iranians, notwithstanding what happens at the negotiating table. We know what happens when we apply weak sanctions against Iran, alongside a policy of isolating. They get stronger.

How do we know this? Because in 2002 we had a chance to cap Iran's centrifuges at a few hundred. Instead, after years of relatively weak sanctions and international isolation, Iran built 20,000 centrifuges and put in place a secret nuclear facility.

Now, our most recent round of tough international sanctions—in part because of the policies of this Congress—worked to get to the table, to the negotiating table, but only because there was a credible offer of a negotiated solution. We know exactly what happens, what sanctions and isolation get us, because we tried it for years. It gets us 20,000 centrifuges, no international inspections, and an increasingly hard-line and inward-looking regime.

This last point and result is important because the people of Iran actually don't think like their Supreme Leader. His grasp on power isn't absolute, in large part because Iranians are much more moderate, much more internationalist, and much more pro-American than their leader, generally.

Khamenei knows this, and that is why, when Iranian voters elected a moderate, Western-oriented President, the Supreme Leader allowed his team the space to negotiate this framework.

Now, no one can be certain, but it is certainly plausible to believe that moderate forces inside Iran are winning and that our policy toward Iran should consider whether our actions help the moderates or help the hard-liners. We don't want another hard-line administration, but we are going to get one if we walk away from these negotiations now, when thousands of Iranians are cheering the opening of relations with the West. If we walk away, moderate voters are going to feel abandoned. Hard-liners will be proven right. The two groups will be merged. Politics inside Iran will shift inward and extreme again. For all of my Republican colleagues who were so forceful in their criticism of the administration, saying President Obama didn't do enough to support the Green Revolution, you would do far more damage to this cause by ending reformers' hopes of rapprochement with the West right now.

Now, for the second argument—that we should settle all of our grievances with Iran in one fell swoop right now, that this agreement is somehow illegitimate unless Iran renounces Hamas and Hezbollah, unless they get right with Israel, unless they end their other nonnuclear weapons programs, unless they release political prisoners, and so on and so on.

First, there is not a single person here who agrees with Iran's support for terrorism or its inflammatory rhetoric toward Israel. No one is pleased with the Iranian regime's record on human rights or its funding of Hezbollah.

But let's agree that an Iran that pursues these policies and has a nuclear weapon is a far worse outcome, one that should be avoided at all costs. The truth is that adding these issues into the nuclear agreement would mean no deal is possible.

In America, we are strong enough to be able to walk and chew gum at the same time. We can negotiate with an enemy or adversary on one issue and reserve the right to fight another day or simultaneously on other issues. For evidence of this, I would ask my Republican friends to simply look to their great, romanticized hero, President Ronald Reagan. When he was negotiating a nuclear weapons deal with the Soviet Union, he did not simultaneously try to address the USSR's support for proxies in Central America or the Middle East or their provocative naval activities in the Pacific Ocean, he knew that by taking one issue off the table it would make America and the world safer, even if it didn't address all of our grievances at once. He knew if he did put everything on the table all at once, then there would be no progress.

Just as a little kid can't eat a hot dog all in one bite no matter how hard he tries, we all have to make progress

one bite at a time. That is often how life and, in fact, negotiations tend to work.

So I hope my colleagues will oppose these well-meaning amendments that are being offered. They have laudable goals, but in the real world they are simply unrealistic within the confines of these negotiations, and they will have the effect of killing the deal entirely.

On a broader scale, I hope when this debate is done, we can also ask ourselves some bigger questions. Diplomacy is power. It is not weakness. Talking to your enemies has been part of our national security toolbox for as long as we have existed as a nation.

This country is tired. It is weary of war for good reason. Ten years of conflict in Iraq didn't make us any safer, and a lot of people—heroes—died in the process.

But when we spend all of this time—the majority of this Congress—engaged in detailed oversight over the President's diplomatic endeavors and absolutely no time engaged in detailed oversight over a war in Iraq and Syria that is still, months and months later, unauthorized and extraconstitutional, then we send a bad message to America and to the rest of the world. We seem to have a developing double standard when it comes to oversight. We are all over the President when he talks to our adversaries, but we stand down when he fights them—lots of oversight over peace, very little over war.

That is not where the American people are. They want their President to take extraordinary steps to avoid war. They don't want us to get dragged back into a ground war in the Middle East.

I am supporting this bill today because I will be first in line to reassert Congress's power to set foreign policy right alongside the President, but I don't support Congress sending a message that diplomacy is somehow more worthy of rigorous oversight than military action.

I don't think this is where the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is coming from, but there are certainly some Members of his caucus who view power solely through a military lens. That is dangerous because, as we saw in Iraq, large-scale military operations kill a lot of terrorists, they kill a lot of bad guys, but they often create two for every one they kill.

In the end, it is nonkinetic intervention that solves extremism, building inclusive governments, lifting people out of destitution and poverty, countering radical propaganda, and showing an America that backs up all of its talk about American civil liberties with action.

I am so thankful to Chairman CORKER for taking the time to work on this bill with Senator CARDIN, Senator MENENDEZ, and others to make it something we can truly rally around today. That takes guts to show patience, to give ground, and to talk to people whom you don't agree with.

It is actually diplomacy that wins the day here more often than not. It is our guiding value as a body, as an institution. It is what makes this place work when it works, and we are best when we recognize that the value of diplomacy and the results we get from it do not expire at the edges of this Chamber.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we are finally seeing the Senate do what we were elected to do, and that is the people's work. I am glad to see there have been some reports in the press saying the 114th Congress and the new majority are actually following through and keeping our promises by passing important legislation that helps make the American people's lives just a little bit better.

One of the actions we have taken is the House and the Senate have now met in a conference committee to agree on a budget. This is, unfortunately, an unusual event in recent history. It was 2009 when the last budget was passed by the U.S. Congress. That is a little embarrassing. It is actually very embarrassing. It is a scandal, really. But now we are finally getting back on track. I am glad to report, as the Presiding Officer knows, that this is a budget that balances in roughly 9 years. I wish it were sooner, but that is what it is. There are no tax increases. It also meets our obligation to keep the country safe and the American people secure by plussing up some of the defense accounts, which I believe is important. All of our colleagues on our side of the aisle believe this should be our No. 1 priority. There are some things that only the Federal Government can do, and national security is at the very top of that list.

So we will have a vote—perhaps as early as next Tuesday—on the budget conference report.

UNITED STATES-JAPAN ALLIANCE AND TRADE

Mr. President, yesterday, we had a joint meeting of Congress, and we heard from the leader of one of America's greatest allies, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe of Japan. I had a chance to meet the Prime Minister briefly before his comments, and I told him: Mr. Prime Minister, I actually graduated from high school in Japan. My dad was in the U.S. Air Force and was stationed at Tachikawa Air Force Base, and that is where I attended my senior year in high school.

It was an honor for all of us to listen to the Prime Minister. As were many of my colleagues, I was very encouraged to hear about his unwavering sup-

port for the U.S.-Japan alliance. This is one of the most important alliances the United States has in the world.

The Prime Minister spent a good amount of time talking about our shared values. He noted our mutual and unflinching commitment to democracy and freedom and our common goal of peace and prosperity.

One of the issues I was particularly glad to hear the Prime Minister speak about was the shared values of freedom and democracy and why the Trans-Pacific Partnership is so important not just to the United States, not just to Japan, but to all, I believe, 12 different countries that are negotiating this important trade agreement.

I couldn't agree more about the importance of trade. Texas is the No. 1 exporting State in the Nation, and that is one of the reasons we are doing relatively well compared to the rest of the country economically. I know the Presiding Officer comes from an oil-producing and gas-producing State that is booming as well. But one of the reasons my State is doing so well is because we figured out that the more people we can sell goods and services to that we grow or we raise or we make, the more jobs we have at home, the better our economy is, and the better our people are.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership fits right into that formulation because the United States occupies roughly 5 percent of the planet and we represent about 20 percent of the purchasing power of the planet. So that should tell us that 80 percent of the purchasing power lies outside and beyond our shores, and why in the world wouldn't we want to trade with those other countries and sell goods and services to consumers in Japan and all around the world, including the region of Asia on which the Pacific partnership is particularly focused?

The Prime Minister eloquently articulated that the Trans-Pacific Partnership promotes the spread of our values by reducing economic barriers. It has been observed by smarter people than I that countries that actually trade together are much less likely to go to war against each other. That just seems to be the way it works. And the more people we can improve our economic ties to around the world—it improves not only prosperity, it also improves the peace.

Prime Minister Abe understands how important this agreement is not only for the 12 nations that make up the TPP but for the entire global economy. This is at least in part because the 12 Asia-Pacific countries involved in the partnership make up 40 percent of the world economy. Thankfully, the Prime Minister assured us that he will continue to work with the United States to ensure the success of these negotiations.

In a short time—perhaps maybe next week or the week after—we will have

an opportunity to take up trade promotion authority. This is congressionally conferred authority to the executive branch to engage in negotiations and sets the parameters for those negotiations—very clear congressional direction for the President's negotiators, including Ambassador Froman, in negotiating this Trans-Pacific Partnership. Once the negotiations are concluded, then it will have to lie in public for up to 60 days, I believe the timeframe is, so the American people can read it, to be completely transparent, and I think that is a very important part of the process.

I would be remiss, as I suggested earlier, if I did not point out the important role of trade not only to the United States but also to my State of Texas. About \$1.5 trillion of GDP is attributable to the State of Texas. If we were an independent nation—which we once were for 9 years; from independence to the time we were annexed to the United States in 1845—if we were still an independent nation, we would represent the 12th largest economy in the world. It would put us ahead of even robust economies such as those in Mexico and South Korea. It is primarily because of the role of exports.

Energy is an incredibly important part of our economy, but it is not all of our economy. If we could do what the Presiding Officer and others have advocated, which is to accelerate the export of liquefied natural gas and perhaps reconsider the ban on exporting crude under some appropriate circumstances, I think we could do even better.

According to a report released earlier this month by the Department of Commerce and the U.S. Trade Representative, Texas was far and away the leader of goods exported in 2014, with \$289 billion of goods exported—\$289 billion. So, not to brag—well, Texans have been known to brag a little bit—but just to state the facts—let me put it that way. The State of California—the State with the second most goods exported by value—exported a sizable \$174 billion worth. Now, that is a lot, \$174 billion for California, but it is still \$115 billion less than the No. 1 State of Texas. The same report revealed that Texas also boasts some 41,000 companies—many small- and medium-sized businesses—that export goods globally.

For years, this impressive amount of trade has helped our economy continue to grow, while providing jobs for Texans across the State. In fact, more than 1 million jobs in Texas are supported by global exports. So why wouldn't we want to do more and create more jobs and more prosperity and more opportunity?

I agree with Prime Minister Abe that the Trans-Pacific Partnership deal is vitally important to the United States, particularly at a time, as we learned—I guess it was yesterday, maybe the day before—that the gross domestic product of the United States had grown by an anemic .2 percent in the last quarter, essentially saying our econ-

omy has flatlined. That is dangerous, and it is also painful for the families of people who are out of work or who are looking for work or those who have simply dropped out of the workforce. We need to do better by growing our economy and creating those jobs so people can find work and provide for their families.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership would help Texas businesses. It would also help our farmers and ranchers, both big and small. Obviously, the agricultural exports and particularly the beef and poultry and pork exports to a country such as Japan would be very important.

As the President said the other day, if we don't enter into this Trans-Pacific Partnership deal where we will be setting the rules, along with these 12 countries—if we don't do this, what will happen is that China will, in essence, be setting the rules for Asia. That is a circumstance we should not sit by and let happen.

Increasing trade in the region will also provide a way forward for 21st-century industries that have made a home in Texas, including electronics and machinery. We are not as well known for electronics manufacturing and machinery as we are for the energy business or farming and ranching and agriculture. But, importantly, as Prime Minister Abe mentioned yesterday, the TPP goes far beyond just economic benefits; it also provides the United States an opportunity for greater influence in the region and in the process promotes not only prosperity, as I said earlier, but also stability and security.

Just last week, the Dallas Morning News made this point well by saying that TPP is “not just about exports and imports; it's also about enhancing America's role among Pacific nations and standing strong against an assertive China.” President Obama made that point as well, and I happen to think in this case he is absolutely right.

Texas and our entire country stands to gain a lot from this pending trade deal. I am happy to see the President is promoting this among some members of his own party, who are a little bit divided on this issue. I think it is fair to say that on this side of the aisle we are a little more unified on this issue. This is not, though, an objective we are going to be able to get done unless the President steps up and delivers votes from that side of the aisle from members of his own political party, and I hope he will roll up his sleeves and he will dive right in and engage and produce those votes. We can't produce those votes on that side of the aisle; only the President, the leader of his party, can do that.

So I am happy to see that this Chamber, this U.S. Senate, has continued in a spirit of bipartisanship by passing trade promotion authority out of the Senate Finance Committee, and I hope we will take it up here as a body very soon.

In conclusion, this legislation will open up American goods and services to American markets, which is good for our economy, good for jobs, and good for better wages for hard-working Americans, including Texas families.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act that is before the Senate today. I thank Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN for their incredible work bringing people together on the Foreign Relations Committee.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill as written. We must move forward to pass this legislation as quickly as possible to ensure that Congress has a role in reviewing any proposed nuclear agreement with Iran.

This is a critically important bill at a critically important time. Preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon is one of the most important objectives of our national security policy, and I strongly supported the sanctions every step of the way that brought Iran to the negotiating table.

I have also supported the diplomatic efforts to address the threat posed by Iran's nuclear program. The framework that was reached in Switzerland earlier this month is a positive step forward, but I think we all know that this process is far from complete.

There are so many unanswered questions on the military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program, on how its uranium stockpile would be handled, under what circumstances any sanctions relief would be provided, and the timing of that relief.

It is clear that there are still differences between Iran and the rest of the international community on these issues. I believe it is important that negotiations continue to pursue a final agreement by June 30 that comprehensively addresses the threat posed by Iran's nuclear program. Again, one of the most important objectives of the U.S. national security policy is to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

The bipartisan legislation before us today will set up a process for Congress to review any final nuclear agreement with Iran. It ensures that Congress, which through its actions brought Iran to the table, will have access to all the final details of the agreement. It preserves our right to have a final say in the potential lifting of the sanctions that we led on. That is how we were involved in compelling Iran to negotiate in terms of these sanctions.

Senators CORKER and CARDIN worked so hard to strike a careful balance between the Executive's prerogative to pursue the negotiations and Congress's role in reviewing any nuclear agreement. Their negotiations were a success, as I said. The bill passed the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously, 19 to 0, 2 weeks ago. That is a committee with a number of Senators with a broad range of views on every issue, including foreign relations and including these negotiations.

The President, who had long threatened to veto any such bill, has agreed to sign it. This is a significant victory for the Senate and also for congressional oversight of foreign policy, something many of us have been pushing for.

Any nuclear agreement with Iran will have significant long-term implications for the United States, for Israel, and for our allies in the region. So it is critical that Congress have the opportunity to review it.

This bill ensures that we have that opportunity. That is why it is so important that we act now to pass this legislation without delay and without amendments that undercut the bipartisan agreement on this bill.

Right now, I understand there are negotiations over a number of amendments that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to offer. I think we know that a number of these amendments appear to be written in a way that would undermine the bipartisan support for the bill or would somehow make this bill much more difficult in terms of having a process.

All this bill is, from my mind, is a process to review. Instead of having a haphazard process, this actually gives Congress something for which we have been asking for a long time. It has given us that ability to review this agreement and have a vote on it. I don't know how many times I have heard my colleagues from the other side of the aisle talk about it—and my colleagues on this side of the aisle. We finally have a bipartisan way to do it. So I think we need to be very careful when moving forward and look at some of these amendments.

I certainly share my colleagues' deep mistrust and skepticism of the Iranian regime. I am appalled by the continuing human rights abuses, the unjustified detention of American citizens—everyone, from the Washington Post reporter to a former marine to a Christian pastor. I abhor the vicious threats we are hearing against Israel and against Israeli leaders, the track record supporting anti-Semitism and the Holocaust denial. I am deeply concerned about the destabilizing actions in the region, including Iran's efforts to obtain more advanced missiles, and the support for militant forces and terrorists.

I think we all know the issues that are going on here. It is incredibly important that we work to address these issues, but there must be a recognition

of the fact that what we are talking about here is a nuclear agreement. I think every Senator is going to want to look at that agreement and say: Does this make things safer or not? What effect does this have on Israel? Is it safer to have Iran have nuclear capabilities when they have shown the propensity to do all of these other things that I have just mentioned? I think many of us come down on the side that we want to see this agreement but we are pleased these negotiations are going on. We are particularly thankful that Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN were able to come to an agreement on a process and to get that agreement through a highly diverse committee in terms of their political views and to get that agreement through on a 19-to-0 vote.

Also, I might add that we don't want to revive the threat of a Presidential veto here. I know many of these amendments sound appealing to many of us but not if they are going to be used as a way to bring down this process, the review agreement, and that is essentially what would happen.

We do not want to be damaging our own ability to ensure that sanctions relief will only come from a strong agreement that prevents Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. I would think that outcome would certainly be fine with the Iranians, if that is what happens. As our Republican colleague from South Carolina, LINDSEY GRAHAM, pointed out recently, "Anybody who offers an amendment that will break this agreement apart . . . the beneficiary will be the Iranians."

So let's not give the Iranians a victory. Let's pass this bill on a strong bipartisan vote, and let's do it now so it is clear that Congress stands united and we want the ability to review this agreement. Our foreign policy is more effective when we speak with one voice. It may be simplistic to say that politics should stop at the water's edge, but when it comes to Iran, the fact is, we have been unified. The past three votes in favor of major sanctions legislation in 2010, 2011, and 2012 have been unanimous—99 to 0, 100 to 0, and 94 to 0 respectively. And now the Iranians are at the table negotiating a nuclear agreement. That is because we stood together across party lines.

We have stood together and been strong and unified as a country. The time has come to show we are serious again—serious about ensuring that a final agreement is strong and enforceable and, most importantly, blocks Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. We may not agree on everything, but we must certainly agree on something that so many of us have been talking about—a role for the Congress, a role for the Senate in having a say over this agreement. That is all this bill is about. Passing this bill will show our commitment to our country's security and the security of our allies and our partners. It transcends partisan politics, and that is something that, when

it comes to foreign relations and when it comes to dealing with a country such as Iran, must stop at the water's edge.

I thank our colleagues, Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN, for working so hard to negotiate this agreement—simply a process of review—so that we can finally have a say, and I ask my colleagues to support this.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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. CARPER. 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. CARPER. Mr. President, sometimes when I travel, people ask me what I do, and I tell them I am a retired Navy captain. And then they say: Well, what do you do now? And I tell them I am a recovering Governor. Then they say: Well, now that you are recovering, what do you do? I tell them I am a servant.

Once, one guy said to me on an airplane: What do you mean you are a servant?

I said: I serve the people of Delaware. He said: Are you like a butler?

And I said: No, not really, but I do serve.

But I still think like a retired recovering Governor. I am proud to be able to serve here. I loved being in the Navy. But at heart, I still think and act a good deal like a retired Governor. Those others who serve here in this body who have served as the chief executive of their State sometimes feel the same way about how they approach their job. I love doing that. I feel really lucky to have that choice. I feel very lucky to be here to serve Delaware, the First State, in this capacity.

One of the key takeaways from my time as the chief executive of my State was that when we had to negotiate deals, whether with our neighboring States or with the Federal Government or actually with folks who were thinking of starting a business in Delaware or growing a business in Delaware, we had to do so with one unified voice in order to be effective.

Now, we were trying to bring AstraZeneca, one of the largest pharmaceutical companies in the world, and convince them to put their North American headquarters in Delaware. We didn't have the whole legislature to negotiate that deal. My cabinet and I were involved in that negotiation, and we got a signoff from the legislature, at least indirectly. We just couldn't have competing messages coming from all the various elected officials, State senators, State representatives, and so forth. The reason is that this would have undermined in some cases very sensitive negotiations and hindered our ability to work through some already tough issues. While I would consult

with Delaware's other State and local officials, as appropriate—and I valued their insight and their opinions, even when I didn't necessarily agree with all of them any more than they agreed with me—at the end of the day, as chief executive of our State, I had to be the final decisionmaker in a lot of cases in negotiating or advocating on behalf of Delaware.

Now, as a U.S. Senator, I take really a very similar approach to negotiating on many issues, including matters of foreign policy. I support the idea that when the United States conducts diplomacy with foreign governments, the United States should speak to that government with a unified voice.

Our system is set up so that we do not have 535 Members of Congress serving as negotiators and diplomats—and for good reason. That is the case with trade deals—the kind of deal we are trying to negotiate today with 11 other countries that come from this hemisphere all the way over to Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, Japan, and Vietnam. But if we fail to speak with a unified voice in most of those negotiations, including the one I just mentioned, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, then forging international agreements with other countries is going to be really tough and in some cases just about impossible.

When it comes to the negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program—the negotiations that involve not just Iran, not just us, but the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and Germany as well—I have been a strong proponent of giving the President and his negotiating team the flexibility they need to achieve the best deal for our Nation.

I know many of our colleagues have strong views on the need for Congress to play a direct role in the negotiations and to make sure their voices are heard in this process. I understand that position, and I respect that position as well.

There are also some in the Senate who believe that the best deal with Iran is, frankly, no deal at all, and they are trying to maximize their ability to kill the nuclear deal with Iran before it is ever finalized.

Another key lesson I learned as Governor—and I am constantly reminded of it in the Senate—is that forging compromise is no easy task. Bridging the divide of competing interests is never easy, especially on issues as important as negotiations over nuclear weapons and Iran. But that is what my colleagues—our colleagues—in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently did.

Specifically, Senators CORKER of Tennessee and CARDIN of Maryland, one a Republican and one a Democrat, worked to forge a compromise that identifies an appropriate role for Congress in these nuclear talks. This compromise will enable the President to maintain his prerogative as our Nation's Chief Executive and Commander

in Chief to negotiate on behalf of the United States, while also ensuring that Congress is able to weigh in on the final product of those negotiations should they come to fruition. In my mind, that is a reasonable compromise that we should all support regardless of our opinion on the prospect of the President reaching an acceptable deal with Iran.

Let me explain why. First of all, Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN's compromise satisfies one of my key goals of not undermining our negotiating team before any final deal can be reached with the Iranians.

Second, for those who insist that Congress be given a chance to weigh in on a final nuclear deal with Iran, this bill that we are debating today and will probably debate a little more next week will empower Members of Congress to cast a vote for or against any final deal before it is implemented.

Finally, for those Members who think that no deal is the best deal, this bill gives those Members the opportunity to make their case to our respective colleagues at an appropriate time.

Now, Senators CORKER and CARDIN should be commended for their tireless work to strike a compromise that should satisfy many of our colleagues—not all, but many. I know they worked with the White House to craft a bill that does not cut the legs out from underneath our negotiators as they work to finalize a deal with Iran, and I want to thank them for preserving the administration's ability to negotiate and the Congress's ability to weigh in on the final deal.

As we cast our votes on amendments and final passage of this bill, I would encourage us to consider the delicate nature of the compromise that Senators CORKER and CARDIN have struck.

Too often in Washington we focus on what divides us rather than what unites us. That is unfortunate and sometimes counterproductive for our country—not just on this issue but on a host of important policy matters. Compromise should not be a rare occurrence in our Nation's Capital. Rather, it should be one of our guiding principles.

We should seize this opportunity, colleagues, to advance a compromise that meets the needs of many of our colleagues, the President, and our Nation. I urge our colleagues to join me in supporting Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN's legislation.

Some of my colleagues have heard me say before, whenever I meet people who have been married for a long time, I love to ask those who have been married 50, 60, 70 years: What is the secret for being married 50, 60 or 70 years? I get a lot of different answers, as you might imagine. Some of them are very funny, and some are quite poignant.

Some of my favorites include a couple married over 50 years. I asked them not long ago: What is the secret to being married 50 years?

The wife said of her husband: He could be right or he could be happy, but he cannot be both.

More recently, with a couple who has been married over 60 years, I asked the husband and wife: What is the secret to being married over 60 years? And each of them gave a different answer. The wife said patience, and her husband of 60 years said a good sense of humor. That is pretty good advice as well.

I have asked this question hundreds of times over the years, but the best advice I have ever heard in asking that question is years ago from the answers of a couple who had been married 65 years or so.

I said: What is the secret of being married 65 years?

They both said almost at the same time: The two C's.

The two C's. I had never heard that one before.

I said: What are the two C's?

One of them said: Communicate.

That is good.

The other one said: Compromise.

Those are two pretty good C's.

Since then, I have invoked their words any number of times, including on this floor and here in Washington, DC, and in my own State of Delaware.

Over the years, I have added a third C to it. The third C is collaborate—collaborate. If you think about it, those two C's or those three C's—communicate, compromise, and collaborate—are not just the secret for a vibrant and long marriage between two people; they are also the secret to a vibrant democracy.

As one of the Members of this body, I wish to again express my thanks to Senators CORKER and CARDIN for communicating, for compromising, and for collaborating in a way that could bring about a better future for my kids, your kids, our grandchildren, and hopefully for the people of Iran and a lot of other nations that have a real interest in this issue—as we say in Delaware, a dog in this fight.

As I close, I thank you for this opportunity to speak today. I hope when we vote next week we will reward the efforts of those Senators with the two C's—CARDIN and CORKER—and further embrace the three C's—communicating, compromising, and collaborating—embrace their efforts with an “aye” vote.

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

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

FDA TOBACCO DEEMING REGULATIONS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, technology can be transformative. The black rotary phones have given way to iPhones. Sunlight and wind have become electricity. Camera tripods have

begotten selfie sticks. There are certain things, however, that do not need to be reimagined, repurposed or redesigned. There are items that serve no societal benefit whatsoever.

Example No. 1, the cigarette. Yet new cigarettes have exploded into the marketplace, known as everything from e-cigs to advanced nicotine delivery systems, to vaporizers. Similar to many emerging technologies, these products are designed to appeal to young people, and are more accessible to young people, and are explicitly marketed to young people, and because of this, we are being forced to write another dark chapter in the history books.

After more than four decades of research, there are several incontrovertible facts. Nicotine is addictive. It affects brain development, and in combination with tobacco, it is responsible for claiming millions of lives. These facts are true and were true decades ago, at the same time that Big Tobacco willfully, consistently, publicly, and falsely denied them.

Today, e-cigarette sales in the United States alone top \$1 billion. The use of e-cigarettes among middle and high school students tripled from 2013 to 2014, accounting for upward of 13 percent of high school students. New data reports that nearly 2.5 million American young people currently use e-cigarettes.

This data is not at all surprising when we consider the way these nicotine delivery products are targeted at young people and how these products are available in a myriad of flavors from cotton candy to vanilla cupcakes, to Coca-Cola. Strawberry-flavored vape liquid can contain just as much nicotine, and sometimes more, as a traditional cigarette.

We know from years of research that flavors attract young people, and the younger a person is when they start tobacco use, the more difficult it will be for them to quit. That is why Congress explicitly banned the use of cigarettes with flavors like cherry and bubble gum because of their appeal to young people.

Over the past decade, we have made great strides educating children and teens about the dangers of smoking. We cannot allow e-cigarettes to snuff out the progress we have made preventing nicotine addiction and its deadly consequences.

E-cigarette use is growing as fast as the students who are using them, and we need to put in place the rules to ensure that we stop it. First, we need to ban the marketing of e-cigarettes to young people in the United States. Second, we need to ban the use of flavorings. The use of fruit- and candy-based flavors is clearly meant to attract children. Cherry Crush e-cigarettes pose the same addiction risk as the minty Kools of the 1970s. Third, we should ban online sales of e-cigarettes. The FDA should prevent online sales of these devices to keep the product out

of the hands of children. Finally, last week marked 1 year since the FDA proposed long-overdue regulations to govern e-cigarettes. This is the first step to making sure children and teens can be protected from the harms of these devices. But 1 year later, these rules still have not been finalized. Until they are, new cigarettes will continue to target young people with appealing marketing, advertising, and product flavoring. Every day the FDA fails to act is another day young Americans can fall prey to harmful products pushed by the tobacco industry.

Last year, at a commerce committee hearing, I asked several e-cigarette company leaders to commit to ceasing the sale of these types of flavored products, and a few of them agreed, but the vast majority have not and will not stop this marketing campaign.

Today's electronic cigarettes are no better than the Joe Camels of the past because e-cigarettes, children, and teens do not mix. Young people are getting addicted to nicotine and putting their health and their futures at grave risk. It is time for the FDA to step in and stop the sale of these candy-flavored poisons, especially to the children of the United States.

My father started smoking two packs of Camels when he was 13 years of age. It was the cool thing to do. My father died from lung cancer. The tobacco industry denied that there was any linkage between tobacco and smoking and cancer and death. My father died from it. He started smoking at age 13 because it was the cool thing to do. Once you are addicted at the age of 13, 14 or 15 and smoking two packs of Joe Camels a day, it is hard to stop.

Here is something else we know: If a young person doesn't start to smoke until they are 19, they are highly unlikely to start at all because they have reached beyond the point where it is attractive to them from a peer pressure perspective. So what do these companies have to do? These companies have to find a way to market to young people by giving them flavored e-cigarettes and making it appealing to them because they have to get them when they are 13, 14, 15, and 16 years old. That is the marketing plan.

It has always been the marketing plan since my father started smoking when he was 13. He would say to me: Eddie, you have no idea how hard it is to stop. You have no idea how much I need to smoke and how much I need the nicotine. You could see it. He started when he was a kid, and that is the way it begins because people don't start smoking when they are 20 years of age. We all know that. Everyone listening to me knows that, and that is why this marketing campaign is so invidious. That is why what they are doing plays right into what we have known for a century is the business plan of the tobacco industry.

I urge the FDA to act. I urge the Members of this body to rise up to ensure that we do not have another gen-

eration that suffers the same fate as the previous generations have, in fact, had to live with, which is this addiction that was given to them at a very young age.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the opportunity to speak this afternoon, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I echo the voices of my friends and colleagues, the Senators from Oregon, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Rhode Island in calling on the FDA to act with all possible speed to issue final rules on regulating e-cigarettes. I want to thank especially my friend from Oregon, Senator MERKLEY, and my friend from California, Senator BOXER, who have been real leaders on this issue.

The Federal Government has an imperative to protect the public from dangerous products with commonsense restrictions. E-cigarettes are no exception. Their use among middle schoolers and high schoolers has skyrocketed—tripled among high schoolers according to a recent National Youth Tobacco Survey—and their risks are numerous.

E-cigarettes contain liquid nicotine, an addictive chemical which can impede brain development when consumed at a young age.

And these liquid nicotine containers are often sold without child protection caps in many parts of the country—and there have been far too many tragedies already of young children accidentally ingesting liquid nicotine. In Fort Plain, in upstate New York, a toddler of 18 months lost his life in such an accident—a terrible tragedy for two young parents. It is what propelled my home State to pass a requirement that all these liquid nicotine bottles be sold with child protection caps.

But, as my colleagues pointed out, the companies that sell these e-cigarettes are largely unregulated at the Federal level. In terms of Federal policy, e-cigarette companies are not even barred from selling to minors under the age of 18. So they market to children—on TV and on billboards and with child-friendly labels and flavors. According to a 2014 study, e-cigarette marketing exposure to children from 12 to 17 years old increased by 256 percent between 2011 and 2013. The FDA needs to be the adult in the room and put an end to these cynical marketing ploys. The FDA, including the new commissioner, seem ready and eager to use the Tobacco Deeming Rule to regulate e-cigarettes under the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act. We strongly support their posture, but we need them to strengthen and finalize these rules. It is time for the FDA to put our children first and promulgate these rules.

Just yesterday, 31 prominent national organizations including, Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, Trust for America's Health, the American Lung Association and the American Academy of Pediatrics, sent a letter to the President asking the FDA to finalize

these regulations. Cigarette use has drastically declined in the last decade and we have made great strides in educating children about their harmful effects. E-cigarettes, with their misleading and trendy marketing, are threatening to set back that progress. Now it is time to snuff out the tactics that try to put kids on the path to smoking.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO DR. GORDON J. CHRISTENSEN

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is an honor today to pay tribute to a renowned educator and a highly regarded prosthodontist, Dr. Gordon J. Christensen. Dr. Christensen has had a meaningful impact on dentistry across the Nation, and he continues to influence the field today through his wide-reaching publications.

Appropriately, the board of directors of the CR Foundation will be honoring Dr. Christensen for his contributions to the field at its upcoming 40th Anniversary Celebration on May 8, 2015.

Born on November 10, 1936, Gordon Christensen completed pre dental studies at Utah State University in 1956 and received a DDS degree at the University of Southern California in 1960. He completed a master's degree in restorative dentistry at the University of Washington in 1963 and earned a PhD in higher education and psychology at the University of Denver in 1972. Dr. Christensen has also received honorary doctorate degrees from Utah State University and Utah Valley University.

In 1976, Dr. Christensen and his wife, Dr. Rella Christensen—a well-respected dental consultant—started Clinical Research Associates, now known as the CR Foundation. He is presently serving as CR's chief executive officer and is a member of the board of directors. Dr. Christensen and his wife volunteer full-time for CR to conduct research in all areas of dentistry.

The Christensens publish the findings of their research in the Gordon J. Christensen Clinicians Report, a publication of the CR Foundation. The Clinicians Report is translated in 7 lan-

guages and distributed to more than 100,000 dentists across 92 countries. The Christensens have developed an expansive readership, and their groundbreaking research has positively impacted the dental health of hundreds of thousands of patients worldwide. Dental professionals who subscribe to Clinicians Report are unreserved in their praise of Dr. Christensen. I would like to share some of the appreciation Dr. Christensen recently received from three dental professionals. Richard K. Dimsdale, DDS, wrote: "Dentistry would never have made the advances it has over many years without the help, guidance, & research you have contributed!" Ted Cross, DDS, wrote: "The Gordon J. Christensen Clinicians Report has not only saved me tens of thousands of dollars of purchasing mistakes, but has also immeasurably improved the care my staff and I offer our patients." And Bob Dolan, DDS, wrote: "I recently retired after 54 years of practice. I believe I have been in contact with Gordon for 20 or 30 or more years and have really appreciated the great-unbiased information. Thank you Gordon (and your dear wife) for all you have done for me and for dentistry these many years."

Dr. Christensen also founded and directs Practical Clinical Courses, PCC, in Utah, an international continuing education organization providing courses and videos for dental professionals. In connection with PCC, he has presented over 45,000 hours of continuing education throughout the world.

As a frequent contributor to professional journals, Dr. Christensen holds editorial positions with 10 dental publications. He is also the recipient of many fellowships, masterships, and diplomas from various dental specialties and organizations worldwide.

Early in his career, Dr. Christensen helped initiate the University of Kentucky and the University of Colorado Dental Schools. He also taught dentistry courses at the University of Washington.

For the Christensens, dentistry seems to run in the family. Both of Dr. Christensen's sons work in the field: William is a prosthodontist and Michael is a general dentist. The Christensens' lovely daughter, Carlene, is making her own contributions as a teacher.

After more than 55 years in private practice, Dr. Christensen remains active in treating patients. He continues to influence dentistry across the world through his continuing education lectures and the Clinicians Report. He is truly one of dentistry's great leaders, and it is with great respect, gratitude, admiration, and affection that I pay tribute to Dr. Gordon J. Christensen.

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEVADA APPEAL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of the Nevada Appeal newspaper.

May 16, 2015, marks 150 years since E.F. McElwain, J. Barrett, Marshall Robinson, and editor Henry Rust Mighels published the first issue of the Carson Daily Appeal in Nevada's State capital, Carson City. Nevada had recently joined the Union, and the Daily Appeal soon began reporting on the important issues facing the newly established State.

For 150 years, the paper has demonstrated its resilience and withstood a number of name changes and owners. One notable owner was Henry Mighels' widow, Nellie Verrill Mighels, who inherited the publication following Henry's death in 1879. Covering local politics and a popular boxing match, Nellie earned her place among the Appeal's journalists. Though her ownership of the paper was short-lived, she propelled the paper forward during her tenure.

Today, the Appeal remains the longest continually running newspaper in Nevada and is among the oldest businesses in Carson City. Decades of committed staff and dedicated local readers have kept this important publication and piece of Nevada history alive. I applaud the Nevada Appeal on its 150 years of quality journalism and wish the paper much continued success for years to come.

REMEMBERING REX CARR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to pay my respects to a man who championed the underdogs of Metro East, IL. Rex Carr passed away on Monday at the age of 88. For over one-half century, people who were out of luck or injured could call on Rex Carr to be their champion. He did it with a style and grace that made him a legend in the community.

Rex grew up in my hometown of East St. Louis. He was the second youngest of five boys. His mother was a teacher and father was a firefighter with the Illinois Central Railroad. His family could not afford much and often had to move when they could not pay the rent. When Rex graduated from East St. Louis High School, he joined the Navy and served in the Pacific Theater during World War II.

Rex would go on to attend college and law school at the University of Illinois. During summers, he worked filling freight cars with ice and hitched a ride back and forth between home and the University of Illinois.

In 1949, Rex finished law school and started practicing in East St. Louis. He was so poor that his first office was in the chambers of a friendly judge, where he could only work when the judge was busy in court. He earned \$500 his first year of practice. But he would keep an office in East St. Louis for the rest of his life.

In Harper Lee's *To Kill a Mockingbird*, Atticus Finch defined courage, "When you know you're licked before you begin but you begin anyway and you see it through no matter what."