

As a young activist, I certainly was inspired by her words of wisdom. As a young activist, she inspired me to commit myself to serving others.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that trees are the Earth's endless efforts to nurture life. Mrs. Helen Burns Jackson was a beautiful tall tree among all of us who has returned to the heavenly glory of her God, our God Almighty.

Her spirit lives not only in her children, her grandchildren, and in her great-grandchildren, but her spirit also lives in the righteous fruits that may be found in those of us who were touched by the endless love, the great kindness, the great grace, and the tremendous wisdom of Ms. Helen Burns Jackson.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of the First Congressional District and on behalf of my loving wife, Carolyn, we pay tribute to this remarkable and special woman, this great tree, this inspiration to all of us, Ms. Helen Burns Jackson. She is indeed a mother of the movement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, a wonderful tribute from a man that knows courage. He has it, he has shown it, and he knows what it is to stand up for what he believes in.

A lot of great examples have served in this body, and that is what we need right now. We face as important an issue as we have had, certainly since I have been here, and possibly decades.

A deal with the devil is what it comes down to, a deal with what Ronald Reagan would say is evil. It makes the evil empire of the Soviet Union pale in comparison to the evil that Iran's leaders have perpetuated, and this administration has done a deal with them.

Chairman ED ROYCE has eloquently pointed out that Iran has violated every international agreement they have entered since 1979.

So wouldn't it fill the definition of insanity if another deal is entered by what used to be the lone superpower with the one and only country in existence right now in the world that has broken every agreement it has entered since 1979?

If someone were standing back as a historian and looking at what is going on right now and were totally objective, he or she would probably say: Well, it looks like the fools running the United States are going to get what they deserve. They have made a deal with sheer evil. These evil leaders have lied. They have broken every agreement they have ever entered, and these fools running the United States are going to get what they deserve. It is

going to happen again. People are going to die in greater numbers than ever before.

What grieves me more than anything is what seems to be the idea of some in the House and Senate that: Gee, since Iran is going to get nuclear weapons, surely they are going to cheat. They are going to get them. They are going to get them sooner rather than later. This deal is not going to allow anybody to stop them.

So what is important here is to provide political cover to Republicans. We can do that by acting like we are fighting real hard in the House, acting like we are fighting real hard in the Senate. Then we lose.

Then when Iran gets nukes and kills hundreds of thousands or millions of people, you say: See, we told you. We did what we could. But the trouble is that is not good enough because lives in this country and in the nation of Israel are all at stake here.

We have been told that: Gee, the 15 nations heading up the U.N. Security Council, they have agreed; so, it should be binding against the United States.

That argument was attempted to be made by the Secretary of State and the President himself, that: Gee, we have to go along because the U.N. has already voted.

Well, yeah, that would be true if there were not something called the United States Constitution under which our first President under the Constitution took office in 1789.

And since this has been in effect—our U.S. Constitution, Article II, Section 2, second paragraph, has been in effect, he, talking about the President, shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treatise, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. It is very clear.

And we also know it is very clear that you cannot have a treaty like the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The international agreement that was lauded by so many over such a long period of time—you cannot amend an international treaty like that unless it is with another treaty. You cannot amend that with an executive agreement. You cannot amend that with an agreement that is nonbinding.

Therefore, it is exceedingly clear that what the President and Secretary Kerry and Wendy Sherman that did such a good job helping with the North Korea deal so they got nuclear weapons—they say it is not a treaty. But absolutely it is a treaty.

So if we are going to uphold our oath of office, we have to acknowledge that this is a treaty and implore the Senate to announce that, even though the President has not submitted this treaty to them for ratification under Article II, since it is a treaty, they had the power to bring it up.

And, yes, there is a convenient Senate rule called cloture that HARRY REID actually suspended numerous times in the matter of some confirmations so they could get judges on the bench that

would uphold whatever interpretation of the Constitution this administration cared to bring before them.

But there is a time when the Republicans in the Senate must say: You know what. This is too important to let a gaggle of minority Senators from the minority party keep us from voting on the most important bill of our time. We are not going to let a rule that we make, that we put in place, that we can suspend, keep us from having a vote on the most important bill of our time, the treaty with Iran.

So the Senate can suspend, as HARRY REID did, the cloture rule with a vote of 51 Senators. Once they have the 51 that suspend cloture in this Iranian treaty, then bring the treaty to the floor for a ratification vote, it will not get two-thirds.

And then, once and for all time, it will be clear to everyone, except perhaps the President and Secretary Kerry—it will be very clear, as it is to constitutional law professors I have talked to—that we are not bound by the Iranian treaty with the only country in the world that has broken every international agreement they have had since 1979.

□ 2130

The resolution that I had filed with numerous great cosponsors, it points out that the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015—that is the Corker-Cardin bill—does not apply to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action regarding Iran—that is the Iran treaty—submitted to Congress on July 19, 2015, because the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is a treaty, and pursuant to article II of the United States Constitution, the Senate must give its advice and consent to ratification if the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is to be effective and binding upon the United States.

It also states—because it is a fact—on March 11, 2015, Secretary of State John Kerry, in describing the administration's nuclear negotiations with Iran, clearly stated that it was “not negotiating a legally binding plan” with Iran, and therefore, it does not have to be submitted to Congress.

If it were not legally binding, then, no, Secretary Kerry and the President do not have to submit it to Congress; but the President and the Secretary of State have already given this facade, this charade away because they have already said: Well, gee, if Congress doesn't go along with it, we will be in breach of the agreement because the U.N. has already voted on it.

A-ha. You said it wasn't legally binding what you were negotiating, and now, you are telling us that is not true.

I mean, it conjures up memories of other statements like: “If you like your insurance, you can keep it. If you like your doctor, you can keep it.” It conjures up sermons by this administration and this President how we had to take out Qadhafi out of Libya for stability of the area, that it would

make the place so much better in North Africa.

We saw what happened. Qadhafi would not have been removed without President Obama bombing on behalf of the rebels that were infused with al Qaeda that would end up ultimately attacking our consulate in Benghazi and killing four Americans.

We now see, as I did last week when I was in north Africa, this President, this State Department have created massive instability across north Africa. It has put tens of millions of people in fear. What do you think this crazy migration started from?

It started from the policies of this President in declaring that something that they love calling the Arab Spring but ended up becoming a cold, harsh killer of a winter was going to be helped along by the United States.

Some in north Africa reminded me of our President's statement that President Mubarak had to go. The President declared he has to go. He interfered with what was going on in Egypt. He interfered with an ally, not a great guy at all. He created massive instability that allowed the Muslim Brother Morsi to take over. Yes, he was elected. Yes, as confirmed again this past week, there were plenty of fraudulent votes. He alleged to have 12 million or so votes.

After a year as President of usurping the power under the Constitution, totally disregarding the Constitution, taking powers that weren't his, moving to become dictator, over 30 million Egyptians rose up, went to the street. These were moderate Muslims; these were secularists, Christians, Jews that came to the streets and said, with one accord, one heart, one voice: We don't want radical Islamists running Egypt.

Our Muslim friends in Afghanistan in the Northern Alliance said the same thing, We don't want radical Islamists running Afghanistan, but the Egyptian people did it on their own. It may have been the greatest peaceful—it was the greatest peaceful uprising in the history of man. There have never been that many people peacefully demonstrating.

What was not peaceful was the Muslim Brotherhood because they want the world caliphate. They thought they were on the way with the help of President Obama. They were taking Libya. They felt like they were taking Algeria, Tunisia, and come on around north Africa and the Middle East, they were on their way to that world caliphate they were promising they would have, the same world caliphate that the former adviser to the Secretary of Homeland Security here in the United States tweeted out after another American had his head cut off that the international caliphate was inevitable, Americans just needed to get used to the idea, a man that I had been warning was a Muslim Brother and was a top adviser in this administration and needed to be out.

Finally, after he made it clear to even the most dense in this administra-

tion that he was in favor of an international caliphate, finally, they had to let him finish his term and let him go by retiring.

Well, the President is still getting that kind of advice, and the truth is that it is a disaster. It has done so much damage to this country. Those who say this is a great deal are the same people that said we had to remove Qadhafi. It created massive instability. It created a situation where you have so many deaths as people try to flee from north Africa.

Where do you think they are coming from? What do you think laid the groundwork for this? It was this President's intervention in Libya, this President's meddling in Egypt.

We heard the President himself say on national television—international television because ISIS heard it, that ISIS is junior varsity, they are JV. I played on the JV, and I played on the varsity, and there is a vast difference. ISIS knew there was a difference. This President did not.

He said, if we could just arm the vetted moderate Syrian rebels, that everything would be fine in Syria. We have seen that he has created more chaos. He has created tens of thousands of more refugees because of his failed policies born out of massive ignorance—or somebody that is advising him is not ignorant, they know what they are doing—but it is setting the Middle East and north Africa, figuratively speaking, on fire and, in many cases, literally speaking.

We heard over and over of instances where the President's vetted moderate Syrian rebels that we spent millions and millions and millions of dollars training and arming, they kept having all that incredibly upgraded equipment taken over by ISIS. I have been over there. I met with the Kurdish commanders. They are begging for up-armored equipment so they can at least have some way to stay on the battlefield with ISIS that this President has armed through the so-called vetted Syrian moderate rebels.

Well, we heard tonight that Madeleine Albright thinks this is a good deal. Well, wow, I feel so much better that Secretary Albright that said, along with Wendy Sherman, that helped negotiate the deal with Iran, that, Gee, the key to keeping North Korea from having nuclear weapons is to give them nuclear power plants, give them the nuclear material they need because they are willing to promise, in writing, that they won't develop nuclear material or nuclear weapons if we will do all that for them. Well, that didn't work out so well.

People advising this President that were part of the advice—and we hear Madeleine Albright thinks that is a good deal? Then if there was any doubt in any Republican's mind—I don't think there is—but any doubt in any Republican's mind just how horrendous this deal is, that had to be completely dispelled tonight when we heard from

our friend on the Democratic side that Hank Paulson, the former Secretary of the Treasury, thinks this is the thing to do.

This is the guy that gave us TARP. This is the guy that said when we asked, Well, if you don't know how much mortgage-backed securities are worth, how do you know you need \$700 billion, and in our conference call with other Republicans, the answer to that question was, Well, we just needed a really big number.

That is the guy that we are told, tonight, is assuring us that this deal with Iran is the way to go.

On August 6, 2015, White House press secretary Josh Earnest, at a White House press briefing, stated: "We don't need Congress to approve this Iran nuclear deal."

On July 28, 2015, Secretary Kerry, at a hearing before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, stated the reason why the Iran nuclear agreement is not considered a treaty is because it has become physically impossible to pass a treaty through the United States Senate anymore. It has become impossible to schedule. It has become impossible to pass.

Two days after Secretary Kerry testified to that, that that was the reason he didn't bring this treaty as a treaty, well, the United States formally ratified the amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material when Henry S. Ensher, the Department of State's Ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Agency, delivered the United States' instruments of ratification to the IAEA. Whoops—it turns out Secretary Kerry's testimony was not true. I don't think he lied. I just think he was that ignorant.

On June 4, 2015, less than 2 months before Secretary Kerry testified it had become physically impossible for the Senate to ratify treaties, he stated the Department of State is "preparing the instruments of ratification of several important treaties" and that he wants "to personally thank the U.S. Congress for their efforts on the implementing legislation for the nuclear securities treaties."

Well, I don't think he was lying or ignorant. I just think he forgot that he had just thanked us for passing these treaties—or at least the Senate for ratifying these treaties. He forgot that he had just done that when he said it is physically impossible to ratify a treaty anymore.

May 7, 2015, the Senate held a vote on the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, commonly referred to as the Corker-Cardin bill, in which every Senator voted on that bill with the understanding that the Iran nuclear agreement was an executive agreement, not a treaty, and the United States' sanctions on Iran's ballistic missile program would remain in place.

The Corker-Cardin bill actually states:

It is the sense of Congress that United States sanctions on Iran for ballistic missiles will remain in place under an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States.

The Corker-Cardin bill was intended as a review of the application of statutory sanctions against only Iran's nuclear program. The Corker-Cardin bill prescribes a process for congressional review only of "agreements with Iran related to the nuclear program of Iran."

Under subsection (b) and (c) of section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as added by the Corker-Cardin bill, lawmakers may resolve to approve, disapprove, or take no action on nuclear agreements with Iran.

Under section 135(d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as added by the Corker-Cardin bill, it calls for "congressional oversight of Iranian compliance with nuclear agreements."

It is pretty easy to recall for those of us with a half-decent memory that actually, under the bill, the treaty being proposed by this administration, the Iran treaty actually doesn't allow Congress oversight.

□ 2145

Not only does it not allow Congress the oversight, it says the IAEA is going to have oversight, not Congress, and we don't even know the arrangement that has been negotiated or is being negotiated between the IAEA and Iran.

But we do know this. My friends across the aisle said in debate today—and I was amazed that this statement would be made—that if Iran cheats, we will know it. That was a quote from one of my friends across the aisle.

Well, if Iran cheats, we won't know it. We don't even know if the IAEA has a decent agreement. But we know this. Iran has made clear they will not allow the IAEA inspectors to go to their military sites. They made that clear in every communication they have had since this treaty came forward. And then we find out, actually, Iran has said: We are going to provide samples to you.

Oh, so, as my Democratic friend said, if Iran cheats, we will know it. What that means is when Iran cheats, they are going to bring samples from the area they won't let the IAEA inspect and say: Here are the samples that let you know we cheated, because our Democratic friends in Congress knew if we cheated, we would let you know we are cheating.

Seriously? Is that how naive this government has gotten?

We were told in debate by a Democratic friend that it would have been a mistake to demand the release of U.S. hostages. Oh, yeah, that would have been a mistake, that before we enter any negotiation, they have to show good faith by releasing the hostages so that we know that they are a country with whom we can deal? Of course that was the right thing to do.

And \$100 billion to \$150 billion going to Iran under this deal is more money

than we have given or used to help Israel with since Israel came into being again in the late 1940s. And yet we are going to give it not to our close ally Israel. We are going to give it to their worst enemy that has even said this past week that they were plotting to overthrow Israel. This week they have said that they are plotting to overthrow Israel, and they are coming for the United States.

I have heard people, I believe, Mr. Speaker, wrongly compare Neville Chamberlain to the current situation that the President and Secretary Kerry have proposed. I would submit that that is a grossly unfair comparison for Neville Chamberlain, because at the time Neville Chamberlain had that paper that he got Hitler to sign that caused him to say, "This is peace for our time"—a lot of papers messed it up and said "peace in our time"; he said "peace for our time"—at the time Chamberlain did that, Hitler had not violated every international agreement he had entered. He hadn't done that. Iran has.

At the time Neville Chamberlain said, "This is peace for our time," Hitler had not been saying, "Death to England"; "death to France"; "death to the countries in Europe." He had not been saying that. Iranian leaders have been, including the Ayatollah.

At the time Neville Chamberlain said this agreement means "peace for our time," Hitler had not publicly stated he was plotting the overthrow of any of the countries in the area. Iran has. They are plotting the overthrow of Israel and to take out the United States.

Our friend TOM COLE said in the Rules Committee this week that he was concerned that this agreement will cause an arms race, and he is exactly right. That was confirmed again this past week as I was over there talking to people that know in the Egyptian Government.

The Saudis are already working a deal to buy nukes. The Saudis know they have got to have them because Iran is going to have them under this Iranian treaty if we don't stop the treaty.

You stop the treaty by the Senate voting on it as a treaty and not getting to two-thirds. That means it is not binding against the United States. Other countries in the area—Jordan, Egypt, even Libya, Lebanon, and all these countries—know they are going to have to have nukes if they are going to survive the area.

It is going to create the proliferation of nuclear weapons like there has never been in the world. And as someone said, mutually assured destruction with Russia was a deterrent, but with Iran, it is an incentive.

This is such a dangerous time. But the Iranian treaty amends the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in several places. You can't amend a treaty unless you are amending it with another treaty.

This is a treaty the Senate needs to step up and say it is a treaty. And for heaven's sake, this is far more important a situation where we suspend the cloture rule so that we do not allow a small segment of radicals supporting Iran to keep us from voting on the most important bill of our time. And then vote, and when you don't get two-thirds it is not ratified.

What the House is doing this week is actually not a bad strategy for the House because, as a treaty, we don't get a vote. But if we stand idly by and let the President treat it as if it has been ratified, then Israel will have to defend itself. Under the Iranian treaty, we will have to defend Iran, not Israel, and the unthinkable will happen, and that is the United States and Iran will be on the same side against Israel. We have got to stop that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

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

S. 1603. An act to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers; to the Committee on Homeland Security; in addition, to the Committee on Armed Services for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1359. An act to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 11, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2654. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Organization; Mergers, Consolidations, and Charter Amendments of Banks or Associations (RIN: 3052-AC72) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.