

issues setting himself apart from his colleagues as a leader on the Budget and Ways and Means Committees.

His service to our country did not end after his time in the House. He was instrumental in the passage of NAFTA as a special adviser to President Clinton and worked with President George W. Bush on the Social Security Commission and Advisory Committee.

As we honor his career and service, it is easy to see that Bill truly worked to represent all he served by crossing the aisle, time and again, to produce solutions for Minnesotans and all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in sending prayers to Bill's wife, Ruthy; his daughters Debby, Pam, and Mitty; and the entire Frenzel family.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Bill Frenzel, U.S. Representative of the 3rd District of Minnesota from the 92nd through the 101st Congress, who sadly passed away on Monday, November 17th at the age of 86. Bill retired from Congress right as I was elected to office to serve Minnesota, but I was lucky enough to have gotten to know him during my tenure in the Minnesota Senate and later serving as the Representative from the 7th District on Minnesota. He left a great legacy and was an honorable public servant.

Born in St. Paul in 1928, Bill attended Dartmouth College where he received both his Bachelor's and Master's degrees. Following graduation, Bill served as a lieutenant in the United States Naval Reserve during the Korean War from 1951 to 1954. Prior to his election to the U.S. Congress, Bill served for 8 years in the Minnesota House of Representatives, amongst other boards and executive committees. Bill had a successful career representing Minnesotans during his tenure in Congress. Rising to Ranking Member on the House Budget Committee, and a long tenure on the House Ways and Means Committee, he became known around Washington as an expert in budget and fiscal policy. He served as a Congressional Representative to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) for 15 years. After serving 10 terms, Bill decided to retire, telling the *Star Tribune*, "You ought to go out when you're hitting .300, rather than deteriorating."

Following his retirement from Congress, Bill did not slow down. He served as Chairman of the Ripon Society until 2004, and has been a guest scholar at the Brookings Institution since his retirement, serving as a director of the Brookings Governmental Affairs Institute. In 1993, President Bill Clinton appointed Bill as a special adviser to help work with the Republican party to pass the North American Free Trade Agreement. Subsequently, President George W. Bush appointed Bill to the Social Security Commission, and to the Advisory Committee on Trade Policy and Negotiations. Up until his death, Bill continued to chair numerous boards and commissions, furthering his legacy as a devoted public servant and policy maker.

Not only a brilliant mind, Bill had a knack for lighting up a room around him. He had an engrained sense of integrity that he embodied throughout his life and career. Known around Washington for his "doodles," Bill was able to maintain a sense of lightness and humor, while navigating difficult policy negotiations. Bill Frenzel leaves behind a monumental leg-

acy in Washington and Minnesota, but his crowning achievement was that of his family: his wife Ruthy and his three daughters, Debby, Pam and Mitty, and two grandchildren. My prayers go out to them during this time of grief and loss.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Bill's life and legacy, as he was truly a giant in Washington and the U.S. Congress. It is in that sense that I invite my colleagues to join me in remembering his service, and that we may all serve to honor his work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members that the rules do not permit references to those in the gallery.

IRAN AND DEVELOPMENTS FOLLOWING THE JOINT PLAN OF ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight because I know that in a short period of time it appears that the President of the United States will issue an executive order related to immigration that could very well be outside the constitutional limits of his authority.

And I believe that is going to create a great reaction in this country, Mr. Speaker. As important as it may be, it is also going to coincide with the date of November 24, when the interim agreement that this President signed with the nation of Iran will essentially expire. Then it will either be renewed or some type of agreement will be reached—or the effort will be abandoned.

I am deeply concerned that the importance of this event could be obscured by the media frenzy that potentially will follow this President's executive order on immigration.

So I come to the floor tonight to speak to that issue, Mr. Speaker, because the pursuit of nuclear weapons by the nation of Iran is an issue of the most profound significance to the national security of this country and to the peace and security of the entire world.

It seems very important to me that we do not let that issue be obscured by others, as important as they may be.

Mr. Speaker, those of us in this body are all too familiar with the endless parade of terror groups that have seemingly come onto the world stage in recent years.

But if we are startled by the rapid rise of ISIS and its subsequent march across the Middle East, during which it has beheaded, raped, crucified, and sold into sex slavery scores of men, women, and children alike; if we are concerned about the crushing video of the innocent woman whose hands and feet were tied to two cars that subsequently drove in opposite directions and ripped her in half, or the Christians who were beheaded and whose decapitated heads were used as soccer balls;

If we are outraged at the activities of Boko Haram and its brutal displays of violence against any group that doesn't stand alongside its inhuman ideology, including its raids and its bombings across Nigeria, its systematic abduction of young schoolgirls, as young as 12, who are said to be raped every day in their months of captivity;

If we are shocked at the activities of al Shabaab, whose attacks have killed hundreds upon hundreds of civilians, including teenage girls lined up before firing squads as well as the numerous suicide bombings and other such horrific methods;

If we recoil at the thought of groups such as the Taliban, whose atrocious violations of basic human rights, roadside bombings, and suicide attacks marked so much of the United States' early struggle in Afghanistan;

If we recall, as so many of us do, precisely where we were when we learned of al Qaeda's attack on September 11 that claimed thousands of innocent American lives, just one of those senseless attacks by that group;

Mr. Speaker, if we are stunned and outraged at this rise of militant Islam in the world, then, sir, how will we feel if we allow President Barack Obama to stand idly by and watch the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, this deranged Islamist regime in Iran, lay hold upon nuclear weapons?

Mr. Speaker, shortly before the midterm elections earlier this month, President Obama penned a so-called letter of collaboration to Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei.

This is the same Ayatollah Ali Khamenei who just a couple of days ago released his detailed, nine-step plan on how to wipe Israel off of the map.

Mr. Obama's incredibly naive attempt at collaboration is with a man whose sermons have included such edifying lines as "The Zionist cancer is gnawing into the lives of Islamic nations."

This is just one of the recent very telling glimpses at just how out of touch with reality this President truly is as Iran continues its sprint toward a nuclear weapons capability.

The Obama State Department was recently confronted by the somehow shocking revelation that Iran was now defying the interim agreement by feeding uranium into the IR5, the most technologically advanced centrifuge currently available in the world.

Inexplicably, Mr. Speaker, the administration responded with the sort of naivete that has become so characteristic of Obama foreign policy, stating: "We raised that issue with Iran as soon as the International Atomic Energy Agency reported it. The Iranians have confirmed that they will not continue that activity as cited in the IAEA report, so it's been resolved."

To rephrase that, upon learning that the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism had defied an agreement on

which the safety of the free world ostensibly rests and that indeed Iran was still conducting activities that could help it obtain nuclear weapons with which to carry out its threats to destroy the United States, the Obama Administration, so sophisticated is their “understanding” of what is presumably a tragically misunderstood Iranian regime, was assured by a pinky promise that the Iranians won’t do it again.

Mr. Speaker, such naivete would be heartwarming on an elementary school playground, but on the world stage, when this President seems poised to personally usher in an age of nuclear terrorism, it becomes a very grave thing indeed.

Mr. Speaker, this administration’s attempted punitive measures have been so halfhearted and demonstrably ineffective that they have at times actually benefited the world’s largest state sponsor of terrorism.

For instance, last week, the organization United Against Nuclear Iran released its updated analysis of the joint plan of action. That is the plan agreed upon by this administration and the Iranian regime. The Iranian government reported a 4.6 percent increase in their gross domestic product for the first quarter of the current Iranian calendar year compared to that same period last year.

According to the Central Bank of Iran, this is the first time the Iranian economy has experienced positive growth in more than 2 years.

□ 1830

Meanwhile, Iran’s inflation is down 24 percent since July 2013, from an estimated 45 percent to 21.1 percent at the end of September. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the entire Iranian Stock Exchange has seen a 57 percent increase since roughly this time last year.

Mr. Speaker, how bitterly ironic that this President has done more to benefit the Tehran Stock Exchange than he has done to benefit the New York Stock Exchange.

These statistics directly controvert assertions made by administration officials that, despite the sanctions relief provided under the joint plan of action, Iran would still find itself even deeper in the economic hole. That is what they told us, Mr. Speaker.

Let us not forget that Iran’s economic bounce, which is occurring in the midst of what are supposedly sanctions designed to punish its economy, follows an agreement, the meaning of which neither party can even agree upon.

The Iranian regime has publicly stated its belief that the agreement—which specifically references an “inalienable right” to use nuclear energy—guarantees Iran’s right to continue enriching uranium. That is contrary to all of the U.N. Council resolutions saying that they had to dismantle such capability. The White House, meanwhile, has stated that it doesn’t understand the agreement to mean that.

From Iran’s perspective, Mr. Speaker, they have signed on to an agreement that gives them a guaranteed right to ongoing uranium enrichment, giving them a breakout capability that—for a nuclear weapons capability not within years but rather within months, and then, as a reward for signing that agreement, which gives them nearly everything they have ever wanted, the Obama administration has also agreed to lift sanctions, providing a further boon to the Iranian economy.

Mr. Speaker, what part of this approach is supposed to convince the jihadist Iranian leadership that they should reconsider their current course? Is it our concession to their nuclear rights? Is it our help in facilitating an economic windfall for them?

Just last week, a Wall Street Journal op-ed revealed that an upcoming London forum will bring together Iranian firms with a range of international counterparts—ranging from law offices, telecom operations, business consultancies, and even art auction houses—to explore how capital might be moved into Iran as the country transitions into a “post-sanctions” environment.

This is hardly the face of an Iran that fears the effect Mr. Obama’s sanctions will have on what looks to be a very lucrative future.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could see some method to this madness if, for example, the President had managed to secure other concessions from the Iranian Government, a commitment perhaps to address its atrocious human rights record; instead, the election of Hassan Rouhani—again, a man heralded by many on the left as a harbinger of a more reasonable era in Iran—what has transpired has been described by some as an “execution binge,” with nearly two executions occurring every day, often performed as a public spectacle as a punishment for such times as refusing to convert to Islam.

In fact, since Rouhani’s election last year, over 900 such executions have taken place. Meanwhile, Mr. Rouhani’s promise to ease Internet restrictions remains unfulfilled. An American pastor and a citizen of the United States of America remains in prison in Iran, where he has been tortured for his Christian faith.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how one may try to give this President the benefit of the doubt, there is simply no way to make the Obama approach make any reasonable sense.

If the goal has been to keep Iran from being able to obtain a nuclear weapon, then Mr. Obama has failed. If the goal has been to punish the Iranian economy for the regime’s radical pursuit of nuclear weapons, then Mr. Obama has failed.

If the goal has been to have an impact on Iran’s human rights record, then Mr. Obama has failed. If the goal was to reduce the chances of the world’s children stepping into the shad-

ow of nuclear terrorism, then Mr. Obama has failed.

This President’s only conceivable victory lies in his hope that, like a would-be modern Richard Nixon opening the doors to China, history will somehow consider Mr. Obama a hero for blazing new trails into Iran and for his mindless refusal to take the Iranian regime at its word, no matter how many times they have expressed that their real goal is the destruction of America and Israel.

Mr. Speaker, very simply, the Obama foreign policy is a gutless political correctness on the global stage. It is the cynical pursuit of legacy without regard for the cause of human freedom. It is the belief that tepid appeals to some hollow concept of tolerance are all that are necessary to tame the most savage of beasts.

The entire Obama legacy, Mr. Speaker, rests on the desperate hope that history will hand out an award for blind trust in the promises of jihadists.

Mr. Speaker, former Ambassador to the United Nations John Bolton once said:

Diplomacy is not an end in itself if it does not advance U.S. interests.

This President’s take on that principle seems to be:

U.S. interests be damned, so long as everyone considers me diplomatic.

It is for all of the above reasons that I am pleased to join my colleague in the Senate, Senator TED CRUZ, in introducing H.R. 5709, the Sanction Iran, Safeguard America Act of 2014.

The bill would eliminate many of Mr. Obama’s waiver authorities over sanctions and would oppose severe sanctions on Iran once again. Included in the legislation are sanctions on Iranian crude oil, oil transportation, financial institutions, petroleum—including sanctions on the purchase, acquisition, sale, transport, and marketing of petroleum products—and the Iranian automotive sector, among others.

The bill also includes a prohibition on funding for any additional negotiations with Iran until a joint resolution of approval by Congress is passed, certifying that all Iranian-held American prisoners of conscience are released; the IAEA has determined Iran has dismantled its nuclear program, ceased enrichment activities, and released all stockpiles of enriched uranium; the Central Bank of Iran is no longer considered a primary money laundering concern under the PATRIOT Act; and Iran has renounced their state sponsorship of terrorism designation by admitting to participation in terrorist acts.

Mr. Speaker, I would adjure this body that we must legislatively fill, insofar as it is possible, this vacuum of leadership left by a President who is asleep at the wheel while radical terrorists move toward placing their fingers on the nuclear trigger under his paralyzed stare.

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

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we got word earlier this afternoon that President Obama intends to issue an oral decree followed by a written decree—as any good monarch would—indicating that he has decided to change the law regarding immigration.

An article here from The Washington Post has a quote from Secretary Jeh Johnson, the Secretary of Homeland Security, which he says:

“Legislative action is always preferable,” Johnson said, “but we have waited for Congress to act, and the Congress has not acted. The President has waited.”

That is what leaders in places like Venezuela—many places historically where that statement has been made, we have waited for parliament or the legislature or Congress to change the law. They didn't do as we dictated to Congress they had to do, and therefore, we have decided to change the law.

This President is creating a constitutional crisis, and it happens when a President is allowed to continue pushing the envelope and pushing the envelope and exceeding the envelope, and you have an incorrigible opinion written—as the majority for the Supreme Court did on ObamaCare—that is the height of hypocrisy.

How the Supreme Court majority could say, on page 14 and 15, that the mandated penalty in ObamaCare was not a tax—the Supreme Court said if it were a tax, of course, under the anti-injunction statute many decades old, we would not have jurisdiction—plaintiffs wouldn't have standing.

But since clearly the penalty is just that—it is a penalty—then it is not a tax because, if it were a tax, we wouldn't have jurisdiction, plaintiffs wouldn't have standing, and we would all be out of luck, and we wouldn't be able to issue an opinion, but since it is not a tax, it is a penalty, then we will go forward and be able to issue an opinion.

Then you get over about 40 pages, and the opinion says, since it is a tax after all—even though 40 pages or so ago it wasn't—now, we found that it is, therefore, it is constitutional.

So we have had all three branches help create a constitutional crisis. The President on one hand, by continuing to overstep the boundaries of the Constitution as he usurps more and more power; the Supreme Court by issuing decisions that are nonsensical; and Congress, if we continue not to use the powers of the purse to stop the lawlessness by this administration.

The Supreme Court has had opportunities to stop it—they have stopped it on many occasions—set a record for numbers of Supreme Court opinions ruling against an administration unanimously, so the President does have that part of his legacy going, but

apparently, the legacy continues to be stretched to the bounds of absurdity.

The Washington Post said—this was from today:

President Obama will announce Thursday that he will use his executive authority to expand temporary protections to millions of undocumented immigrants, according to several individuals who have been briefed on the decision. Obama will travel to Las Vegas on the heels of that announcement to rally support for his initiative on Friday.

It shouldn't be a surprise. While the President slept and four heroes—including one ambassador—in Benghazi were killed, he got up and headed for Las Vegas.

□ 1845

Now, he is going to announce this constitutional crisis he is creating by deciding to legislate and then take off for Las Vegas again, gambling with the jobs of Americans as he goes.

Getting back to the article again, it says:

Congress will receive official details on the move Thursday, according to a senior Democratic Party official.

Even before final confirmation of the President's plans, outside advocates began readying events to promote the administration's immigration policy.

“We hear there will be a primetime Thursday evening announcement, to preview, and full unveiling in Vegas on Friday,” immigration advocate Dawn Le wrote in an email to other activists, which was later inadvertently sent to a group of reporters Wednesday morning. “Can folks begin to work and plan watch parties for Thursday and/or Friday? Unclear whether Thursday night content will be what is ‘celebratory,’ but Friday will be where we need a lot of energy guaranteed.”

That is, of course, while the President is in Las Vegas, gambling away American jobs.

The article goes on:

Obama launched his push for immigration reform in January 2013 in Las Vegas, outlining a plan that would allow many of the Nation's 11 million undocumented immigrants to earn citizenship.

Now, it is important to note the article goes on to say:

Johnson said the administration has concluded it has “wide latitude” to take action. “It can't be that we are not allowed to lift a finger to fix our broken immigration system,” he said. “And we will.”

That is what creates the constitutional crisis, Mr. Speaker. Jefferson once recommended that we shouldn't bring up a bill for a vote until it has had a year on file for people to review. That would eliminate all these legislating-by-crises situations, but we have seen crises generated.

We know the former Chief of Staff for the President of the United States once quipped that you never want to let a good emergency go to waste; obviously, there is a feeling that this would be the time to usurp congressional authority.

Now, the sad thing is the crisis is not as bad right now as it has been in the past. Any time the President talked about amnesty or legal status, Border Patrolmen—some on the record, some

in articles—have pointed out any time the President—or anybody in Washington, but especially the President—talks about amnesty or legal status, the numbers of people coming in illegally, the number of people dying trying to get in, increases.

The number of people wishing to get lost in the masses from Central America and Mexico coming in from countries where radical Islamic activities abound are coming in, in greater numbers.

Interestingly, the White House has shown it has the ability to foment a crisis unilaterally, and then by fomenting the crisis unilaterally, justify the crisis they created to usurp congressional authority granted to Congress and no one else in the Constitution.

There is an article from my dear friend, Senator TED CRUZ. “The Constitution designs a system of checks and balances for our Nation, and executive amnesty for illegal immigrants unilaterally decreed by the White House would seriously undermine the rule of law.”

“Our Founders repeatedly warned about the dangers of unlimited power within the executive branch. Congress should heed those words as the President threatens to grant amnesty to millions of people who have come to our country illegally.”

“To be clear, the dispute over executive amnesty is not between President Obama and Republicans in Congress; it is a dispute between President Obama and the American people. The Democrats suffered historic losses in the midterm elections largely over the prospects of the President's executive amnesty. President Obama was correct: his policies were on the ballot across the Nation in 2014. The elections were a referendum on amnesty, and the voters soundly rejected it. There was no ambiguity.”

“Undeterred, President Obama appears to be going forward. It is lawless. It is unconstitutional. He is defiant and angry at the American people. If he acts by executive diktat, President Obama will not be acting as a President, he will be acting as a monarch.”

“Thankfully, the Framers of our Constitution, wary of the dangers of monarchy, gave the Congress tools to rein in abuses of power. They believed if the President wants to change the law, he cannot act alone; he must work with Congress.”

“He may not get everything he wants, but the Constitution requires compromise between the branches.”

“A monarch, however, does not compromise. As Alexander Hamilton explains in Federalist 69, a monarch decrees, dictates, and rules through fiat power, which”—as TED CRUZ points out—“is what President Obama is attempting. When the President embraces the tactics of a monarch, it becomes incumbent on Congress to wield the constitutional power it has to stop it.”

He goes on to make good points.