

Obama. Any objective observer would tell you that it is not fair. Not only is 5 to 1 not fair, but it is also the fact that hearings are simply not being held.

Maybe it is time for a new strategy. Maybe it is time for the Republican leader to live up to his constitutional duty, do his job, and start moving all of these backlogged nominations and directing the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings. The American people need these judges, and they need them now, working to ensure that everyone gets the justice he or she deserves. To allow these qualified nominees to linger longer is simply unjust and unfair. The American people expect more from the Republican leadership and Congress and deserve better. We are going to do everything within our power to bring to the American people's attention that the Republican leadership is not doing a very good job on this and other matters before the Senate.

Mr. President, what is the schedule of the Senate today?

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the majority controlling the first hour and the Democrats controlling the second hour.

The majority whip.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, ahead of tomorrow's hearing in the Foreign Relations Committee with Secretaries Kerry, Moniz, and Lew on the President's announced nuclear deal with Iran, I wanted to take a few minutes to address just how far the administration has moved its own goalposts in terms of this purported deal.

Over the last few years the administration has made extensive public statements about what would and would not be acceptable in a final deal with Iran, and today it is clear that the final deal falls short not necessarily of other people's expectations but of their own standards and their own stated expectations.

As Senators consider this proposed deal and whether it should be approved or disapproved, I think it is important to have a good understanding of where the President and his team did not meet their own expectations.

From the early stages of the negotiation, the Obama administration made clear that a key part of any "good deal" would be dismantling Iran's nuclear infrastructure.

Before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Secretary Kerry said back in December of 2013 that "the whole point" of the sanctions regime was to "help Iran dismantle its nuclear program." However, President Obama, in previewing the deal in April of this year, essentially admitted that it would fall short of this standard by saying that "Iran is not going to simply dismantle its program because we demand it to do so." But weren't our negotiators actually demanding that Iran dismantle its nuclear program? That had been our stated policy as the U.S. Government. Wasn't that—in Secretary Kerry's own words—"the whole point"?

As Prime Minister Netanyahu of Israel pointed out, instead of dismantling the nuclear infrastructure of Iran, the No. 1 state sponsor of international terrorism and threat to the safety and stability of the Middle East, this deal legitimizes and paves the way for their nuclear program and its enrichment capability. In fact, by the time this deal expires, the rogue regime in Tehran will have an industrialized nuclear program.

For the duration of the agreement, Iran will be able to conduct research and development on several types of advanced centrifuges. In year 8, Iran can resume testing its most advanced centrifuges, and in year 9 it can start manufacturing more of them. That is hardly dismantlement. That is the opposite of dismantlement.

I also want to address another important point that has been made concerning inspections because, as we know, Iran will cheat. So inspections take on an especially important role in enforcing any agreement that is made. In particular, I want to address this issue of anytime, anywhere inspections.

In April, President Obama announced that a good deal had been struck between world powers and Iran and noted that the deal would "prevent it from obtaining a nuclear weapon." This is, of course, now known as the "framework deal"—a precursor to what was announced last week.

A few weeks after this announcement, Secretary Ernest Moniz, the Energy Secretary, who was at the table with Secretary Kerry in negotiating this deal, said: "We expect to have anywhere, anytime access." He said that on April 20, 2015. This is a particularly clear statement from someone intimately familiar with the negotiation process, and, of course, it was well received because this is, at a minimum, what needs to be done in order to keep Iran from cheating. But by the weekend, the administration was singing a different tune.

This is what Secretary Kerry said when he began to backtrack from what was said by Secretary Moniz on April 20. He said that "anywhere, anytime" inspections was "a term that honestly I never heard in the four years that we were negotiating. It was not on the

table." I don't know whether Secretary Moniz and Secretary Kerry actually talked to each other or not. They spent an awful lot of time together in Vienna and supposedly would be on the same page. But for Secretary Kerry to say this really incredible statement, that he never heard of this idea, and that this was not on the table is simply incredible.

So, of course, my question is: Were anywhere, anytime inspections ever on the table? And if not, why did the administration tell us they were—including the Secretary of Energy. And if they were not on the table, why is this deal actually a good deal? Why can we have any sense of conviction or belief that Iran won't cheat, especially given this Rube Goldberg sort of contraption involving notice and this bureaucratic process that will basically lead up to a 24-day delay between when inspections are requested and before inspections can actually be done? We know from our experience with Saddam Hussein in Iraq that it is easy to move things around and avoid the inspectors of the IAEA.

This deal today provides that inspectors will have "managed access"—whatever that means—to suspect sites, but, as I said, it allows up to 24 days for Iran to stall inspectors before it actually grants them access, if they ever do. This is another way of saying that Iran will be able to cheat with near impunity.

The administration has also led us astray on a third item, and that is Iran's ballistic missile capability. This is the vehicle by which Iran could launch a nuclear weapon to hit people in the region or even further.

In February of last year, the chief U.S. negotiator, Wendy Sherman, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that while Iran had "not shut down all of their production of any ballistic missile," the issue was "indeed, going to be part of something that has to be addressed as part of the comprehensive agreement."

Ballistic missiles, as we know, can be used to deliver a nuclear weapon, and now under the current deal, the arms embargo in Iran will be completely lifted in just 8 years' time, including on ballistic missiles. I don't think the administration simply changed their minds and decided that this wasn't an important issue. I think they simply caved on yet another important item to our national security and that of our allies.

Earlier this month, for example, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Martin Dempsey, testified that "under no circumstances should [the United States] relieve pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capabilities and arms trafficking." So with this purported deal, the administration has apparently caved once again on something that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who is the No. 1 military adviser to the President of the United States, said should be off the

table. Under this negotiation, apparently, it is on the table and part of the deal that we will have an opportunity to vote on in September.

I have one more example. The President has repeatedly said from the beginning that no deal is better than a bad deal. I agree with that. Yet right now he and the rest of the administration are telling Members of Congress and the American people that there is no other option on the table, and it is either this deal or war.

There is a third choice. There are tougher sanctions that will bring Iran to the table for a better deal and a good deal. It is simply unacceptable for the President to be misrepresenting what the options are to Congress and the American people by saying “it is either this deal or war.” As bad as this deal is, obviously no one wants war.

We do know that Iran is an existential threat to our No. 1 ally in the Middle East, the nation of Israel. Iran has been engaged in proxy wars against the United States and its allies since at least the early 1980s—since the early days of the current regime.

Well, the President is supposed to be Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and the No. 1 person in the U.S. Government when it comes to national security. He took office with the promise to restore America’s relationships with our allies around the world, and clearly his promise has not come true. Instead, what the President has delivered during his time in office has been that our allies increasingly do not trust us and our adversaries no longer fear us, as evidenced by the coercion and intimidation engaged in by Mr. Putin in Eastern Europe.

I ask unanimous consent for 2 more minutes.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Even President Jimmy Carter in a recent interview admitted that ‘the United States’ influence and prestige and respect in the world is probably lower now than it was 6 or 7 years ago.’

This isn’t some Republican criticizing a Democratic President; this is Jimmy Carter, former President of the United States and a member of the Democratic Party, who is saying the U.S. influence, prestige, and respect in the world is probably lower now than it was 6 or 7 years ago.

This is a difficult statement to take in, and President Carter has been wrong about an awful lot of national security issues, but I am afraid he is right on that one.

So now Congress has an important role to play, and I can’t think of a single more important national security issue we will have an opportunity to act on than Iran’s aspirations for a nuclear weapon. This is a true game-changer in terms of stability and peace in the Middle East and our own safety and security. I know that I and the rest of our colleagues will take full advantage of the opportunity of having 60

days to review this agreement, to put it under a microscope, and we will have no trouble voting it down if we conclude, as many of us are now starting to do, that it jeopardizes America’s security and paves the way for a nuclear-armed Iran.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to commend the majority whip on his outstanding speech addressing the Iran nuclear deal.

I rise in a number of capacities. One is as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which will undertake a review of this act, and ultimately a vote, as well as the entire Senate. I rise as one who voted for the New START treaty and went through those negotiations in this administration. I rise as a grandfather of nine children with a commitment that the rest of my life is about seeing to it that they live in a world that is as safe, as free, and as productive as the United States is for us today.

I will go through all the due diligence provided for in the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. I wish to at this point commend Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN on the outstanding work they did to ensure the American people would have oversight and the Congress would have a vote on this deal, but I want to be sure we have a vote on this deal that is meaningful and not superficial.

The President decided, for reasons that are his own, to not call this a treaty and to originally try to avoid any congressional input at all. I don’t know what those reasons were, but they were his and his alone. Yet this is the same President who agreed to a treaty with Russia to limit nuclear weapons and bring a vote to the Senate floor. An agreement, I might add, which has inspection provisions which are robust, has Russian inspectors in America, American inspectors in Russia, and has the type of trust and belief that we can have in any nuclear deal.

I am worried that the deal we are talking about making with the Iranians has neither. I am extremely concerned that the President will say, in answer to people who condemn the treaty: Well, if you don’t like it, what would you do differently or is it this treaty or this agreement or war. We need to live up to our responsibility. It is not a choice of this agreement or war; it is a choice of doing this agreement or doing the right thing for the American people.

There are three concerns I want to mention. The first is that as a businessperson, I learned a long time ago that the best deals I ever made were the ones I walked away from before I closed them. The worst deals I ever made were the ones when my arm was

behind my back and somebody said: Oh just get it out of the way and do it. Every one of those were bad. Every one of the ones I walked away from and then was asked back to the table were good. They were good for a very simple reason. If you can’t play hard to get in a negotiation, you are going to be easy to get.

Teddy Roosevelt once said: “Walk softly and carry a big stick,” and he was right. This administration walked loudly and carried no stick at all. In fact, at the last of the negotiations, all of a sudden there appeared new relief of the U.N. Arms Embargo by the Iranian regime at the end of 5 years. This was a nuclear weapons treaty; this was not some agreement about conventional weapons. We don’t want to lift the sanctions against the Iranians for proliferating conventional weapons in the Middle East, but yet this agreement contained that. I think that was a concession we made to them to keep them at the table.

We reversed roles. The largest superpower in the world lost its clout and the Ayatollah Ali Khamenei and the Iranian Government gained theirs just because they were willing to walk away from the table.

And then there is the trigger of 8 to 8½ years where, as that time passes, the Iranians will begin to resume fissile nuclear material development. They will do some of their planning for strategic missiles, some of the restrictions of the agreement that will take place in the beginning will go away. Working toward an end where, at the end of 2 years, any agreement that would limit nuclear weapons breakout by the Iranian regime.

This started out as a deal to keep the Iranians from getting a nuclear weapon, stop nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, and not allow the Middle East to become a nuclear arms camp. Unfortunately, I am afraid this will not happen if this agreement is adopted in the form I understand it to be.

So when the President says: What would you do, would you fight a war? I would say: No, I would go back to the table. I would say: The sanctions got you to the table to begin with; let’s keep the sanctions to keep you at the table and let’s review whether we should have let the conventional arms embargo go away. Let’s see if we should allow the reworking of fissile nuclear material at the end of year 6. Let’s see if at the year end, the Fordow facility embedded in a mountain should be reactivated to produce nuclear-grade plutonium.

All of those triggers along the way in the agreement are just steps toward allowing Iran to become what we said we didn’t want Iran to be. We didn’t want Iran to be a nuclear arms power in the Middle East to go through nuclear proliferation. I am afraid this is just a staged platform from which that is exactly what will happen.

I will listen to every word by the administration. I will go to every briefing. I will do my due diligence as a

Senator of the United States and as a representative of the people of Georgia.

When I cast that vote, it is going to be in the best interest of my children and grandchildren and yours. It is going to be making the best deal we can make for the American people, doing everything we can to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons and doing everything we can to get those who say “death to America” before every speech understand that America is the greatest democracy on the face of this Earth.

We will walk softly, but we will carry a big stick, and we will insist on negotiations that are good not just for the other side but for the American people as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, on Monday, the United Nations Security Council voted to accept the agreement that was negotiated over Iran's nuclear program.

I think it is very telling that President Obama decided to take his plan to the United Nations before bringing it to the Congress. I think the President is hoping to force Congress—to bully Congress—to go along with his plan without actually giving it serious debate. Well, we are going to have a serious debate. I believe President Obama and his negotiators failed to get the strong deal they promised, and it remains to be seen whether this deal is good enough.

United Nations Ambassador Samantha Power called me after the deal had been agreed to by the President and by Iran and she told me the greatest weakness of the deal was its complexity. So I have to ask: Why is the President in such a rush? The American people have every right in the world to have their voices heard on this important issue.

I was at home in Wyoming over the weekend and I got an earful about why this deal is so bad and about the risk it poses to our own U.S. national security. Congress also has the right and the responsibility to provide oversight on this plan, and there has been bipartisan skepticism and concern on this floor about this specific deal.

So we need to take a very close look at the agreement over the next 2 months. We are going to listen to our constituents, and we will have hearings to make sure all the facts are clear, starting tomorrow in the Foreign Relations Committee.

While the Senate does its part in evaluating the deal, I think we have to keep in mind two key questions. First, do we believe this is a good deal that will protect the American people, protect our allies far into the future and not just for a few years and, second, what evidence is there that the Iranian regime plans to change its illegitimate and dangerous behavior in any way?

This agreement accepts Iran as a nuclear threshold state on the premise

that we can build a better relationship with the country's leaders. How realistic is that? Iran is still holding American hostages. Iran continues to support Bashar Assad in Syria. Iran continues to support Palestinian terrorist groups. Even President Obama admits this behavior is likely to continue under the deal he negotiated. Can we afford to allow this Iranian regime to have the nuclear program it will get at the end of this deal? President Obama wants to put off the answer to this question until after he has left office. Congress needs the answer now.

People on both sides of the aisle have raised many appropriate concerns about this deal. One issue is that before the agreement was announced, Iran had more than 19,000 centrifuges to enrich uranium. After the deal is fully implemented, Iran will still have more than 19,000 centrifuges. Not a single one will be dismantled under this agreement. Some of them may go into storage, some of them may be turned off, but eventually that could be brought back again and turned back on. More than 5,000 of them will continue to spin and to enrich uranium.

Iran can continue to conduct research and development on more advanced centrifuges. It says right in the deal that “Iran will continue testing” advanced centrifuges—and it can actually manufacture them for specific purposes. Once the restrictions end, Iran can produce as many of these advanced centrifuges as it wants. They will have already done the work and they will know how to build them and how to use them. President Obama had the leverage—he had the leverage—to push for more on this point. Why didn't he use it?

This bill doesn't dismantle a single centrifuge; it does dismantle the sanctions against Iran. That is another very real concern a lot of people have.

While it will not happen overnight, Iran is likely going to gain access to what will eventually amount to more than \$100 billion. This massive injection of resources is ultimately a direct deposit into Iran's terrorism accounts. Why was there nothing in this agreement to stop Iran from using this money in ways that could harm America and our allies?

And there is the extremely important issue of whether this agreement allows us to inspect Iran's nuclear facilities anywhere and anytime. President Obama said that is how we would verify that Iran was living up to its promises. It turns out that the reality is very different from what the White House promised. Now the President says that inspectors will have access “where necessary, when necessary.” That is a big difference. Who gets to decide what is necessary?

Under the actual agreement, the International Atomic Energy Agency can request—can request—access to a location in Iran if it is worried. That is not anywhere, any time; that is anywhere, anytime Iran chooses.

Iran can refuse to give access to the site, and it gets 2 weeks to negotiate what inspectors can do. If the two sides can't work it out within 14 days, then the issue gets turned over to a commission of eight countries that are part of the agreement. Then the Commissioners have another 17 days to resolve the issue by a majority vote. After that, Iran gets another 3 days to comply. It is as much as 24 days in total. So we went from anywhere, anytime, 24/7, to 24 days.

A former Deputy Administrator at the National Nuclear Security Administration recently wrote an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal about this very subject. He said 24 days is “ample time for Iran to hide or destroy evidence.” Twenty-four days, which is what the President agreed to, is ample time for Iran to hide or destroy evidence.

President Obama says we will be able to tell if Iran is violating the agreement. That is an important difference of opinion, and Congress is going to have to resolve that over the next 2 months.

It is very clear President Obama and Secretary of State Kerry were desperate to get a deal with Iran, even if it was a very bad deal. Both the President and the Secretary of State are lameducks, and they are looking to build their legacy. Iran knew that, and Iran took advantage of that fact. At the last minute, to make sure they could actually get a deal signed, the President and the Secretary of State agreed to let Russia sell Iran ballistic missile technology. This technology can be used to attack our allies and even to threaten the United States. Why was this even a part of this agreement over Iran's nuclear program? The week before the deal was announced, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff told the Senate Armed Services Committee: “Under no circumstances should we relieve pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capabilities and arms trafficking.” So why did it end up as part of the deal? Why did the President, yet again, ignore the advice of his military commanders on this vital national security issue?

At the end of the day, this deal does not take away Iran's pathway to a nuclear weapon. It merely gets Iran to promise that for the next few years it will walk down the path very slowly. President Obama may think this deal is good enough to help his legacy. There are still a lot of questions about whether it is good enough to keep the American people safe and the rest of the world as well.

Our goal all along should have been an agreement that was accountable, enforceable, and verifiable. At this point, I have serious doubts about whether this deal is good enough.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, back home this weekend in Indiana I took

the time very carefully to read through all 159 pages of the agreement made with Iran, as well as a lot of supporting material written by the foreign policy experts who had an opportunity also to look at this. I read it carefully because words mean a lot. As concerned as I was when we started this process, I became much more concerned after reading through the fine print that is now called the agreement with Iran.

Yesterday we returned to Washington to start the session this week. I had the opportunity as a member of the Select Intelligence Committee to look over the classified annexes of this. There is still one outstanding, which we will be looking at as soon as we receive it. The more I read, the more concerned I am that we have struck not a good deal, not a passable deal that we have to accept, but a bad deal—a bad deal that is clearly worse than no deal.

Four Presidents—three previous Presidents and this current President—have declared over the years of their service that a nuclear-armed Iran is unacceptable. Each person, each President used that very word “unacceptable.” But this deal intends simply to slow down Iran’s march to nuclear weapons capability. Even the White House has conceded now that it will not permanently stop Iran’s nuclear ambitions. This, in and of itself, should raise major questions and concerns about this agreement.

But perhaps more concerning is what the negotiations conceded in order to reach an agreement with a regime—a regime that calls America its enemy, brazenly violates U.N. resolutions, sponsors terrorism, threatens Israel’s existence, is led by individuals who proclaim “death to America,” and is responsible for more than 1,000 military deaths since September 11, 2001. This is the regime we are dealing with.

Six of the major powers in the world, led by the United States—or at least we thought they would be led by the United States—having all the leverage of their status in world affairs, were negotiating with a country that violates all that I have just listed, that cannot be trusted, that simply is in a weak position given the sanctions, thankfully, that the Congress has imposed and other Presidents have imposed and is put in a situation where it should have the weak hand. It turns out they had the strong hand against the weakness and the lack of will and resolve of the six nations—France, United Kingdom, Germany, the United States, China, and Russia. That group was on one side of the table with the leverage that group would have against Iran, which has not gained the trust of anyone except its loyal followers—a nation that is staggering because of the sanctions that have been imposed—and which ends up being the strong hand working against the weak. The will and resolve to stand tough to achieve an agreement that was in the benefit of not just the United States but the world for a more secure Middle

East and prevention of nuclear weapon possession by Iran has been negotiated away.

Clearly, in the coming weeks we will be talking about various aspects of this agreement. The time is limited today, so I will just go into a couple of issues.

The period covered by the deal is way too short. There was the promise that Iran would not have the capability to develop nuclear weapons, and it is specifically now on a pathway to acquiring them.

President Obama has admitted that in these future circumstances, Iran’s breakout time to nuclear weapons will be essentially zero. That is what he said some time ago. But, of course, now the President, the Secretary of State, and the White House are making public statements saying: Well, that is really not what we meant. And they said a number of things to reassure the American people: Trust us; everything is going to be OK.

What particularly grabbed my attention was the inspection regime. Clearly, on any kind of agreement of this type, there has to be as tight a regime of inspections as possible. We know Iran has cheated in the past. We know they are going to try to cheat in the future. They are going to try to interpret every nuance and every word in this agreement as something different than what we will describe. Therefore, verification of their ability to live by the word of the agreement, as bad as it is, has to be verified completely. When you look at the sections necessary to accomplish that, it raises real concerns. I will spend more time on this floor later, given the constraints here, to talk about this inspections regime.

But let me address an issue that has just come to light. I was sitting and plowing through this agreement. When I came to section 78, it started listing the timeframe for how we would proceed if we found that there was information to suspect Iran was cheating on the agreement. You have heard 24 days is the maximum, which, by the way, is longer than just about any agreement we have entered into in an arms agreement. For many of these, it has been 9 hours. Everybody knows that we have given up anywhere, anyplace. We now have to have Iran’s approval before we move forward with a convoluted, byzantine process in terms of getting to a point where a resolution is made. We now know, reading through sections 78 to 82, I believe, that it doesn’t add up to 24 days. It adds up to 54 days. We are talking nearly 2 months or more.

I was interested to open up the Wall Street Journal this morning: “Iran Inspections in 24 Days? Not Even Close.”

As I was sitting there, it was being pounded into our heads by the Secretary of State saying: 24 days, that is all it is—24 days. We are on top of this. We can get it resolved. Don’t worry; they can’t move their stuff somewhere else or cover their tracks or remove evidence of what we suspect is a violation of the agreement. Over and over

and over the Secretary of State and the President of the United States said 24 days. First of all, 24 days is not a good deal, as I just mentioned. It ought to be 24 hours or less—anytime, anywhere. What did we do to anytime, anywhere? We stretched it out to 54 days. Despite what the administration has said about this, I cannot believe that the clear reading—read sections 78 to 82, I believe it is, and add it up. It is 54 days of time if all time is used to come to an agreement.

What can you do in 54 days when you have been accused of cheating? You remove the evidence. That is exactly what they will do. This is a huge revelation here that is now in print. The administration keeps insisting that this is not the case: Don’t worry, folks; we have it covered on inspections. That simply is false.

So let’s say we find out they are cheating. When our negotiators abandoned their position on gradual sanctions relief, they opted instead for this so-called snapback provision that would punish Iran for noncompliance, for cheating. Read the agreement. There is a convoluted, byzantine scheme for such a return to sanctions that would be exceedingly time consuming and is not politically realistic. It is an illusion—and more on this later.

The arms embargo is lifted, and on and on it goes.

I listed just a couple of very deeply concerning issues here that need to be discussed. Unfortunately, we have been put in a box by this administration. They ran straight to the United Nations to get approval for this without America’s elected representatives and the American people having an opportunity to have the deal presented to them and for them to make the decision. So five of the six nations involved here—even if the United States comes to the point where we defeat this effort, if it is possible to do so—now have the full green light to go forward. Germany rushed over with contracts in hand with their Commerce Minister and heads of major corporations are signing off deals like you wouldn’t believe. Those aren’t going to be snapped back.

We now have an opportunity to review this pending deal, and I would urge every Member of the Senate to take the time to sit down and read this agreement through carefully. Look at what the experts—the foreign policy experts—have said about it. Look at where the flaws are, and let’s sit down and discuss it. Let’s look at those top secret classified annexes—every Member here has the opportunity to do that if they so choose—and bring forward to the American people—that which we are allowed to bring forward that is not classified—the flaws of what has turned out to be an agreement that simply is not in the interest of the future of the American people.

My time has expired. Let me just wrap up by saying that the President

has defended this deal by challenging critics who put forward alternatives. How about this? How about exercising American leadership and making it clear that crippling sanctions will be maintained and strengthened if Iran nuclear activity continues? Congress should reject this bad deal. We then can enact more vigorous sanctions to persuade the Iranian leaders to reconsider their position or persuade the Iranian people to reconsider their leaders.

Mr. President, I apologize for going over my time. I yield the floor to my colleague from North Carolina, and I see my colleague from Maine is waiting to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I have come to talk about what I think we have reached here—a tipping point in terms of President Obama's legacy.

Recently, Jimmy Carter emphatically charged that President Obama has weakened us and brought us less respect everywhere in the world. When President Carter makes a statement such as that, I don't think President Obama should be spiking the football in the Rose Garden.

Why do you think President Carter made those statements? Maybe he has looked at the legacy over the last 6 years, as many of the American people have. Ukraine is on fire. China is threatening its neighbors. Al Qaeda is stronger than ever. ISIS is massacring Christians and Muslims with genocidal savagery the likes of which we haven't seen since the Second World War. The Jewish people are facing the greatest threat since the Holocaust.

The President got this deal with the ayatollahs, no matter how dangerous and no matter how destabilizing the final accord is. He has claimed a victory, and the media vanguards are right behind him, and he is going to late-night comedy cable shows to build his case.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is no laughing matter. You are going to hear a lot of speeches over the next few weeks—in the 60 days we have to review this deal. There are going to be a lot of technical terms, a lot of things that quite honestly some Members of Congress don't fully understand. But I hope that over the next 60 days we will be able to communicate to the American people in a way that they understand why this is a very dangerous deal.

Here are some questions I hope you will look into and form your own opinion.

One question: Is there truly a dismantlement of Iran's nuclear program? I have looked at the summary of the agreement. I have not read the full text yet. I will be doing that this week. But it is very clear this is not a matter of whether Iran can have a nuclear weapon; it is a matter of when they can have a nuclear weapon. That is not dismantlement; that is scheduling.

There is another one. I think my colleague from Indiana just spoke about

it. It has to do with inspections. We use terms like "snapback" and everything else, but let's put this in very simple terms. Imagine that the police in your community suspected there was a criminal enterprise in some house. Imagine that instead of being able to get a warrant and then quickly go and knock on the door and identify that criminal activity, the police would send a letter to the criminal saying: In the next 4 or 5 weeks, 3 or 4 weeks, we are going to do a surprise inspection on your house. What is the likelihood that criminal presence or that criminal activity is going to be there? That is the nature of the inspections regime with the nation that still continues to chant "Death to America." They are not a good player. They are not a good actor. Giving them time to prepare for a so-called snap inspection makes no sense to me, but that is what is in this deal, and it is written out in plain English.

Another question is this: Why hasn't the President done something as basic as have the Iranian people—or the Iranian leadership, I should say; this is not about the people, it is about the leadership—show good faith by releasing American prisoners in Iran?

As far as the ballistic missile program, ask the President, ask the people who negotiated this agreement: Will Iran have a ballistic missile program? The answer is yes. They actually have backorders for missiles that could reach Europe. Over time, they will develop a program that will reach the United States. This agreement has no treatment for this.

Ask them if they will dismantle the Iran terror network. The Iran terror network operates throughout the world. The Iran terror network is funded literally through the Government of Iran. Over \$300 million has been identified by Canadian intelligence agencies as having been funneled to terrorist organizations such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and a number of others. Are they going to dismantle it? No. As a matter of fact, I believe that with the sanctions being removed, it is going to provide them more money to fund those networks.

Why would the President release \$140 billion in sanctions? Why would we do that? Why would we provide money to a nation that says they need money but they can spend money on terror and a number of other things—not education, not fixing roads, not better health care for Iranians, but spreading terror throughout the world? Why on Earth would we give them more money to do that?

The President has given birth to the Middle East nuclear arms race as well. Ask yourself this question: Do you think it is likely that Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Egypt, and other Gulf States are going to stand idly by when a hostile regime is going to have a nuclear capability over some period of time? Of course not. They are going to do what they need to do to feel like they are protecting their citizens. It will give

rise to an arms race. We will be taking about this if this deal goes through I think in my tenure as a Senator over the next 5 years.

President Obama has willfully ignored 40 years of hostility from Tehran. The President may not recognize that we are at war, but the Iranians certainly do. They say in public statements that they are going to continue their fight against America. They are a chief sponsor of global terror. They have never stepped back from their desire to obliterate the United States and our great friend and ally Israel.

This is the Obama doctrine. The President sees America as the problem. He views Israel as an obstacle to peace and Iran as another oppressed constituency with legitimate grievances against the West. In fact, so much so, when millions of Iranians took to the streets to protest the mullahs—the leaders of Iran—the President was silent. The old American alliances are collapsing in confusion and fear, and the only answer from the administration seems to be a clear path toward Iran possessing a nuclear weapon.

In his 1987 State of the Union Address, President Ronald Reagan warned:

Our approach is not to seek agreement for agreement's sake but to settle only for agreements that truly enhance our national security and that of our allies. We will never put our security at risk or that of our allies just to reach an agreement. . . . No agreement is better than a bad agreement.

So there you have it. Our allies—Israel, Saudi Arabia, the Gulf States, Jordan, Egypt—are worried. Tehran is on the march and moving closer to a nuclear weapon. Charles Krauthammer noted, "The one great hope for Middle East peace, the strategic anchor for 40 years [the United States] is giving the green light to terror." Ladies and gentlemen, I don't think that is a legacy anyone should be proud of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Maine.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1828 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

WOMEN VETERANS AND FAMILIES HEALTH SERVICES ACT OF 2015

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am on the floor today to discuss the path forward on my bill, the Women Veterans and Families Health Services Act of 2015. This is legislation which would end VA's decades-old ban on fertility services, and it would take critical steps toward ensuring that we are doing everything we can to support veterans who have sacrificed so much for our country and have suffered injuries on the battlefield that prevent them from having children on their own.