

Foreign policy leaders in Congress agree that this deal does not block every Iranian pathway to a nuclear weapon and that better alternatives exist.

"If Iran's true intent is to get a nuclear weapon, under this agreement, it must simply exercise patience...To me, after ten years, if Iran is the same nation as it is today, we will be worse off with this agreement than without it."

– Sen. Charles Schumer (D-NY), August 6, 2015



"I believe that [the administration has] crossed a new threshold in U.S. foreign policy where now it is the policy of the United States to enable a state sponsor of terror to obtain an industrialized nuclear development program that has, as we know, only one real need."

– Sen. Bob Corker (R-TN), July 23, 2015

"For all those who have said they have not heard—from anyone who opposes the agreement—a better solution, they're wrong. I believe there is a pathway to a better deal."

– Sen. Robert Menendez (D-NJ), August 18, 2015



"Though the deal was originally being negotiated to keep Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, in its final form the agreement would allow just that when it sunsets in 10-15 years."

– Rep. Kevin McCarthy (R-CA), July 22, 2015

"And if we are going to call on history, we must recognize that this agreement—by allowing Iran an advanced uranium enrichment capacity—dramatically departs from decades of bipartisan, non-proliferation policy."

– Rep. Ed Royce (R-CA), August 5, 2015



"Finally, I have a fundamental concern that 15 years from now, Iran's leaders will be free to produce weapons-grade, highly enriched uranium without any limitation. This amounts to Iran as a legitimized nuclear threshold state after the year 2030 with advanced centrifuges and the ability to produce without restriction a stockpile of enriched uranium."

– Rep. Eliot L. Engel (D-NY), August 7, 2015