

I would be remiss if I didn't note to our colleagues, you and I are both farmers, and one of the common threads in agriculture throughout this great country is, since colonial times, we have always produced more than we could consume in this country. We have always had to sell our surplus in the world markets. That is the only way that we could maintain a healthy production agriculture, to have reasonable job opportunities, a reasonable standard of living in our agricultural communities.

Export-Import touches on many of those issues, created in the 1930s as a tool to help all parts of the American economy have the credit and the ability to sell in the world markets.

As a matter of fact, the concept is so practical, it has been so well-defined, as you and I both know, 50-plus other countries have the same type of a system to help their manufacturers, their producers, their economic interests do business into the outside world.

Now, that said, we have been engaged for some time on the Financial Services Committee and in this body in a very, at times, heated debate about whether not just should Export-Import Bank be reformed to make it more efficient, make it more accountable, more responsible to the taxpayers, but whether it should even exist at all.

Now, some of our colleagues believe that, with a lack of action, the official expiration of the authorization, it is gone. We have heard our friends say here today that until all of the loans that are outstanding, all of the guarantees, all of the obligations that have been committed to are completed, the institution will continue to exist. It simply cannot provide new economic opportunities to do business around the world for our people.

And that brings us to this point, and I think it is the point that I want to stress. Can Export-Import Bank, in its present form, be reformed? Can it be made better? Can it be made more accountable?

Of course. There is not an institution in government anywhere that can't be made better, more efficient, more effective, more accountable to the taxpayers.

But the real tragedy of what is going on here is we have been presented, many of us, with the stark debate of end it all or, through circumstances beyond our control, have it reauthorized, most likely in its present form, without any of those reforms. That is why many of us are on the Fincher bill, because we believe Export-Import serves a purpose in helping create better jobs, more economic opportunities for many of our citizens, but that it needs to be done in a more responsible, accountable fashion.

I have been highly disappointed that we have not had a debate, a markup in committee on this very issue that would have ultimately led, I believe, to a debate and consideration on the floor of this United States House so that we

could potentially have sent a better product than we have now to the other body. We have not been allowed to do that.

So now we are faced with a stark contrast. How do we continue this very effective effort at moving our products into the world markets, creating those jobs here at home for our fellow citizens?

Either we have to wait for a bill to come from the other body, most likely not containing the level of reforms that we would have placed in such a reauthorization bill in the House, or, at some point, we will have a markup, either in committee or on the floor, of another piece of legislation where there will be an effort to attach it. That kind of an effort probably won't contain the level of Fincher reforms that we all want.

That is the tragedy, Congressman. We are going to reauthorize Export-Import. It is just, in what form will it be reauthorized?

We cannot allow 50-plus of our competitors around the world to have a tool, a resource, an ability for their businesses to push their products into the American economy that we don't match punch for punch economically. We cannot allow that to happen.

I hope we are going to work on behalf of our fellow workers, our fellow citizens, our fellow businesspeople in this country. But it is a tragedy, Congressman, that we are not going to have the kind of discussion and debate where we could create a dramatically improved, refined, or reformed Export-Import Bank.

We each represent our constituents. I care about mine just as you care about every one of yours, and making sure that we have the ability—the ability—for all those citizens to have good jobs, good-paying jobs, good, new economic opportunities, is just too important for us to back away—too important for us to back away.

If we don't get the reforms that our fellow citizens deserve, it won't be because you and I didn't try. We have tried for months. It will be because the choices thrust upon us by others are either all or nothing at all, present or nothing.

I want to keep selling those products that our hard-working fellow citizens make into the world market. I want to keep competing economically, blow for blow, with the rest of the world.

You know, some have said: Let's just do away with Export-Import. We will establish the principle, and the rest of the world will follow us.

Does anybody really believe that, that when we give up our ability to sell our products into other markets they will suddenly say: Oh, what a great principle. We will stop selling into your markets.

That is not the way it works, Dan, not the way it works.

I appreciate the gentleman's time, his effort on this critically important issue. Something will happen; it is just how soon and in what form.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I yield back the balance of my time.

IRAN'S NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZELDIN). 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, there is a great deal of tragedy going on in the world. I know that at times there are people around this Congress that have felt very much alone.

I know there have been times when Presidents have felt very much alone, like Abraham Lincoln, a year or so after his son had died. His wife was fussing at him. He was going to commemorate a battlefield. There have been people who have been very alone in this town. But, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that no one in the world feels more betrayed and dejected than the leader of our former friend, Israel.

Now, Israel is still the friend of many of ours. We still hold it in the highest regard because of its similarity in belief and human rights that we have here, even there in the midst of the Middle East.

The President has announced that he is going to the United Nations to get their approval before he would even ask for a vote in Congress. That struck a chord. That rang a bell.

March of 2011, a letter from the White House in which the President advises that, he says:

At my direction, U.S. military forces commenced operations to assist an international effort authorized by the United Nation's Security Council and undertaken with the support of European allies and Arab partners to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe and address the threat posed to international peace and security by the crisis in Libya.

The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, that our President created the catastrophe, created the crisis, the real crisis in Libya, as it exists today, far worse than anything that anybody conceived would or could exist in 2011 before the President went to the U.N. to seek authority instead of coming to Congress.

Since 2003, Qadhafi had given up all efforts at supporting terrorism. He had given up efforts, all efforts, at pursuing weapons that the United States did not give him authority to keep.

As some of our Muslim Arab leaders in the Middle East have told some of us privately, since 2003, Qadhafi was doing more to help you tamp out terrorism than most anybody in the world, and yet this President decided that a small problem in Libya was enough to justify him taking out Qadhafi.

Oh, I know, we were going to create a no-fly zone, but let's be serious. The President's bombing runs that he authorized ended up, even in the face of Qadhafi asking to be allowed to just leave, and leave the country peaceably, he asked for a response within 3 days, and this President authorized bombing, apparently, as an answer.

So make no mistake, the incredibly bad judgment in this White House created a debacle in northern Africa that has spilled into other nations around Libya, that has created all kinds of human atrocities, that has created a massive movement of people heading for boats from Libya, heading north to anywhere they can go.

This President did that without authorization of Congress. He caused that without authorization of Congress. But he did have the consent of the United Nations, as he now says he is going to seek before he gets approval for his Iranian deal in Congress.

March 21 of 2011, an article by Charlie Savage in *The New York Times*, points out: "Some Democratic lawmakers—including Representatives JERROLD NADLER of New York, BARBARA LEE of California and MICHAEL E. CAPUANO of Massachusetts—complained in the House Democratic Caucus conference call as the bombing began that Mr. Obama had exceeded his constitutional authority by authorizing the attack without Congressional permission."

I would have to say that my friend, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE, Mr. CAPUANO of Massachusetts, they were right. I haven't said that a whole lot about my friend, Mr. NADLER, but he was right.

The article goes on: "On Monday, Mr. Obama sent Congress a two-page letter saying that as commander in chief, he had constitutional authority to authorize the strikes, which were undertaken with French, British and other allies."

The article points out: "As a presidential candidate who promoted his background as an instructor of constitutional law, Mr. Obama appeared to adopt a more limited view of executive power when he answered a question about whether a president could order the bombing of Iranian nuclear sites without a use-of-force authorization from Congress."

□ 1915

Then it quotes Mr. Obama. It says:

"The President does not have power under the Constitution to unilaterally authorize a military attack in a situation that does not involve stopping an actual or imminent threat to the nation," Mr. Obama told *The Boston Globe* in December of 2007.

It mentions further down that, in the *Globe* survey, Vice President JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., then a Senator, argued that a President would have no authority under the Constitution to bomb Iranian nuclear sites without congressional authorization because even limited strikes can unintentionally prompt all-out war.

Well, they have violated what Mr. Obama and Mr. BIDEN said before they were in the White House and the Vice President's quarters. They created a disaster in northern Africa because they believed that their opinion was adequate and that the massive number of countries in the United Nations that hate Israel were better confidants than

Congress. Regardless of whether that is true or not, it is not constitutional.

In March of 2011, there was a national review article by Bill Burk which points out: "President Obama's war in Libya is unconstitutional without congressional authorization. But that is so only because the President has not yet given us a reason to fight that is constitutionally sound." And it goes on.

So the President helped create this massive disaster in northern Africa that has human tragedy occurring day after day, people fleeing in boats, some dying trying to get away from the Libya that he created because he decided it was time for Qadhafi to go.

Some of our Muslim leader friends in north Africa and the Middle East continue to ask: "Does your President not understand that he keeps helping the people that are at war with the United States? Does your President not understand that he is harming the people that are helping stop terrorism in the world?"

This deal that has now been cut with Iran, the largest supporter of terrorism in the world, is going to do for the Middle East and the world what President Obama's bombing did for Libya.

It has to be stopped. This deal has to be stopped. It does not meet any of the requirements that the President and all his minions said were going to come out of a deal with Iran.

And, oh, yes, there were celebrations here in Washington because they were able to convince Iran into taking back over \$100 billion. And, also, we were able to convince them to allow us to take them off the arms embargo so they could go ahead and start buying weapons from Russia, from China, wherever they wish.

Let's help the Russian economy. Let's help the Chinese economy. Let's give hundreds of billions of dollars to the largest supporter of terrorism in the world and allow them to pursue arms with that money.

Isn't there enough terrorism in the world today without this administration being accomplices to death and destruction the world over through the assistance, through this so-called deal that it has cut with Iran?

An article from certainly not a great press friend of the United States, but AFP—the *Agence France-Presse* has an article from Tehran which says, "Hard-Liners in Tehran, brought up on chants of 'death to America,' have repeatedly voiced opposition to the quest for a deal with a power derided as the 'great Satan' ever since the Islamic revolution of 1979.

The article goes on further: "Rather than representing submission to the West, the agreement is likely to consolidate Khamenei's rule, according to Davoud Hermidas Bavand, a veteran political analyst at Tehran University."

And make no mistake, this is Tehran that is in Iran, from a veteran political analyst that serves at the pleasure—o keeps his life at the pleasure of Khomeini.

The article says, "And whatever the evident contradictions of a pact with 'the great Satan,' the core of Iran's nuclear program has been preserved."

Thank you, President Barack Hussein Obama.

Yes, I know there are people celebrating in Washington. Yes, we got a great deal. We got them to take \$100 billion off our hands. We got them to agree to start being able for they themselves to buy arms.

We got them off the terrorist watch list so they can move more freely as they want to create terrorism. It is a great day. Oh, it is time to celebrate.

This article, in what may be one of the most understated comments about the deal, says, "It probably amounts to a marginal win over Israel, Saudi Arabia, and even Turkey." And that is from Mr. Bavand, describing the nuclear deal as a step forward for a war-wracked Middle East.

An article from Max Boot in *commentarymagazine.com* points out that, for a more succinct account, go right to the statement issued by Tehran's official Islamic news agency. And this comes from that.

"World powers have recognized Iran's peaceful nuclear program and are to respect the nuclear rights of Iranian nation within international conventions."

The second says—and this is from Iran—"The Islamic Republic of Iran is to be recognized as a nuclear technology power authorized to have peaceful nuclear programs, such as complete nuclear fuel cycle and enrichment to be identified by the United Nations."

"All unfair sanctions imposed by the UN Security Council, including economic and financial sanctions on Iran, are to be lifted, as per the agreement and through issuance of a new resolution by the United Nations Security Council," most all of which hate Israel.

"All nuclear installations and sites are to continue their work, contrary to the early demands of the other party"—that would be the United States—"None of them will be dismantled."

That is Iran's interpretation of the deal being celebrated down the street here, down Pennsylvania Avenue. They are celebrating because they say none of their nuclear facilities have to be dismantled.

It goes on: "The policy on preventing enrichment uranium is now failed, and Iran will go ahead with its enrichment program."

Further from Iran, they declare that "Iran's nuclear infrastructure will remain intact; no centrifuges will be dismantled; and research and development on key and advanced centrifuges . . ." "will continue."

And that is rather amazing. We heard the President say that they were going to have to dismantle like two-thirds of their centrifuges.

But it appears, from what we can find out about the deal so far, that, actually, they may dismantle some of the

centrifuges, but only because we are going to help them install and work with the most advanced centrifuges in the world, more advanced than anything Iran would have now. So far as we know, this is a huge boom to their nuclear efforts.

This article says, "The agreement specifies that it would take no fewer than 24 days to compel an inspection." It is talking about the nuclear sites. "That's plenty of time for the Iranians to 'sanitize' any suspect site so as to remove any evidence of nuclear activity; and it's far removed from the kind of '24/7 access' that President Obama said just today that inspectors would have."

"The Iranians had insisted that the agreement stick only to the nuclear issue—that's why, for example, the Iranians did not agree, as part of this deal, to release the American hostages they are holding or to end their support for terrorism or their commitment to Israel's destruction. But it turns out the agreement isn't just limited to nuclear issues. It includes a commitment to lift the conventional arms embargo on Iran in no more than 5 years and the embargo on missile sales to Iran in no more than 8 years and possibly sooner, if Iran is said to be in compliance with the nuclear accord."

And, gee, won't that be interesting. They may be able to have people that hate Israel give them the go-ahead much earlier than 8 years.

This article points out, "What this means is that Iran will soon have more than \$100 billion extra to spend not only on exporting the Iranian revolution and dominating neighboring states, but that it will also, before long, be free to purchase as many weapons—even ballistic missiles—as it likes on the world market. No wonder Vladimir Putin appears to be happy: This deal is likely to become a windfall for Russian arms makers, although you can be sure that Iran will also spread its largesse to manufacturers in France and, if possible, the U.K. so as to give those countries an extra stake in not re-imposing sanctions."

And that is good news for Ukraine, good news for Georgia, because this means that this deal, if it goes through—and the President is already saying, "We are going to lift these sanctions. We are going to get them the \$100 billion plus." Some say it is going to be \$150 billion.

Can you imagine what Russia can do with money that Iran pays it? Why, they could probably take over all of Ukraine with that kind of money.

And then the Russians, as they take over more and more of Ukraine, can be putting big posters on their tanks saying "Thank you, President Obama. Without your deal with Iran, we would never have had the money to take over Ukraine."

And what about Egypt? This is devastating news that this deal is coming to fruition for Egypt. When over 30 mil-

lion Egyptians come to the street—it would be like over 100 million Americans going to the streets and demanding the ouster of the Muslim Brother president that was seizing all power and demanding that he be gotten rid of. The military did as the people of Egypt ordered. What an incredible peaceful uprising.

□ 1930

That was impeachment as peaceably as it could be done since the Americans assisting Egypt did not even help them put in an impeachment provision in their constitution.

Mr. Speaker, it is bad news obviously for Saudi Arabia. It is bad news for Jordan. It is bad news for all countries in the Middle East. It is bad news for Syria. It is bad news for Turkey.

Oh, there will be some in Turkey and some in Syria that will be just shouting with joy, particularly President Assad. He may need to send President Obama a thank you note for the money that comes flowing in to help him in Syria perhaps; but there is going to be money spread all around to weapons makers and to people who peddle war and destruction because of what this President has done and agreed to without any promise—not even a promise—of giving up terrorism—not even a promise, not even a verbal promise, for Heaven's sake, that Iran will not try to destroy Israel.

We have this article from AFP also back in March 2 of 2015, this year. The article says: "Obama told Reuters if 'Iran is willing to agree to double-digit years of keeping their program where it is,'" there will be a deal.

Well, that is not what President Obama agreed to. This article goes on—and, again, this is March—"Netanyahu on Monday told a pro-Israel conference that a deal with Iran would 'threaten the survival of Israel.'

"Obama said that sentiment is wrongheaded, noting Netanyahu's previous opposition to an interim Iran deal as evidence Israel should back the talks.

"Netanyahu made all sorts of claims. This was going to be a terrible deal. This was going to result in Iran getting \$50 billion worth of relief. Iran would not abide by the agreement. None of that has come true."

Well, Mr. Speaker, it turns out the President was the one who was wrong, and Prime Minister Netanyahu is the one that was exactly right that it was a bad deal, that this was a terrible deal. He was right.

Now, I have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that Prime Minister Netanyahu was extremely wrong about one aspect of the Iranian deal between it and President Obama; I have to admit.

I think the world of Prime Minister Netanyahu; he is a great man, and he has the potential of being one of Israel's truly great leaders, but he was wrong when he said that this deal was going to result in Iran getting \$50 billion worth of relief.

He was way wrong because they are going to get maybe \$150 billion of relief, but certainly over \$100 billion of relief. We have to chalk it up as the one area that President Obama was right about Netanyahu being wrong.

Netanyahu understated the amount of cash this administration was willing to fork over to the terrorist state of Iran. It wasn't \$50 billion; it was over \$100 billion, possibly \$150 billion. There it is on the record; Netanyahu was wrong. He said \$50 billion is what Iran would get, and it was over \$100 billion.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at this deal and what has been said in the past about it. Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman—Mr. Speaker, you will remember that she is the one who was key in the negotiations with North Korea where we gave them nuclear power plants and material and all we got in return was a promise that, if we just gave them everything they needed, all the technology to make nuclear bombs, they would use it for nuclear power plants. Of course, we know they broke their word.

When you are dealing with a scorpion and it stings you, you shouldn't ask later: Why did you do that? You know why. The answer in the old fable is: It is because I am a scorpion; it is what I do. That is what the leader of North Korea is, and it is what he did.

If you look at the leaders of Iran, there is a similar fable about the snake. Someone warms the snake up, and it ends up biting him. Why did you do that? It is because I am a snake. Perhaps in the near future, President Obama and Secretary Kerry will be heard to ask: Why did you break all these terms?

The answer should be: It is because we are snakes; that is what we do.

Mr. Speaker, Wendy Sherman said, on February 4 of 2014, nearly a year and a half ago, about the Iranian deal:

We raised possible military dimensions. In fact, in the Joint Plan of Action, we have required that Iran come clean on its past actions as part of any comprehensive agreement.

Well, that didn't happen. Wendy Sherman was as wrong about that as she was about North Korea not using the nuclear capacity we gave them to make nuclear weapons.

Of course, December 7, 2013, President Obama himself said: "It is my strong belief that we can envision an end state that gives us an assurance that even if they have some modest enrichment capability, it is so constrained and the inspections so intrusive that they, as a practical matter, do not have breakout capacity."

Now, that is a great statement there because he is not saying that we will get Iran to that point. If you look carefully, he says that we will have "an end state that gives us an assurance."

Well, Iran is willing to give us assurance, but they are not even willing to give us an assurance of what President Obama hoped for, for goodness' sake.

Secretary Kerry said, on November 24, 2013: "There is no right to enrich.

We do not recognize a right to enrich. It is clear.” in the NPT, “in the non-proliferation treaty, it’s very, very clear that there is no right to enrich.”

Well, now, we know that Secretary Kerry was very, very wrong about it being very, very clear there was no right to enrich; not only is there a right to enrich, we are going to help Iran enrich. Thank you, President Obama.

Sanctions relief, here is a quote from John Kerry from March 3. Secretary of State Kerry said: “Iran is not open for business until Iran is closed for nuclear bombs.”

Well, we know that is not going to be the case. They are open for business, and they are still enriching.

Again, Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman said: “This includes a lot of dismantling of their infrastructure.”

Well, it turns out that is not the case, either.

Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman, February 4 of 2014, said: “It is true that in these first six months we’ve not shut down all of their production of any ballistic missile.”

Well, it turns out they are not going to at all—how about that.

March 5, 2015, Secretary Kerry: “It will reduce the pressure for a regional nuclear arms race, and it will increase the strength of the international non-proliferation regime. It will also vastly improve the prospects for peace both here and elsewhere.”

Secretary Kerry was wrong, wrong, wrong.

Now, they want the U.N. to pass the deal. Well, gosh, I am sure they will get plenty of votes from people that want the money that the U.S. is going to make sure Iran has to buy nuclear weapons.

Prime Minister Netanyahu says that the Iran deal is a grave mistake, and he is as right now as he was before. This deal has to be stopped for the sake of mankind.

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

applicable budget allocations and aggregates pursuant to section 3(e)(1)(B) of H. Res. 5 and section 4509 of S. Con. Res. 11, the Fiscal Year 2016 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

For fiscal year 2015, the applicable budget allocations and aggregates set forth in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2014, as adjusted in the 113th Congress, are revised. For fiscal years 2016 through 2025, the applicable budget allocations and aggregates provided by S. Con. Res. 11 are revised. These revisions are designated for H.R. 3038, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, Part II. Corresponding tables are attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of budgetary enforcement. These revised allocations and aggregates are to be considered as the aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 11, as adjusted. Pursuant to section 3402 of such concurrent resolution, this revision to the allocations and aggregates shall apply only while H.R. 3038 is under consideration or upon its enactment.

Sincerely,

TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2015 AND 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2015.

MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the

TABLE 1—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES

[Budget aggregates—on-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year		
	2015	2016	2016–2025
Current Aggregates:			
Budget Authority	3,033,319	3,040,298	1
Outlays	3,027,686	3,092,366	1
Revenues	2,535,978	2,676,733	32,237,371
Adjustment for the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, Part II:			
Budget Authority	8,068	0	1
Outlays	8,068	0	1
Revenues	19	171	4,889
Revised Aggregates:			
Budget Authority	3,041,387	3,040,298	1
Outlays	3,035,754	3,092,366	1
Revenues	2,535,997	2,676,904	32,242,260

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2017–2025 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2—REVISION TO THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

[Authorizing committee 302(a) allocations—on-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	2015		2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Current Allocation	71,391	17,102	57,975	16,407	520,762	184,208
Adjustment for the Highway & Transportation Funding Act of 2015	8,068	8,068	0	0	0	0
Revised Allocation	79,459	25,170	57,975	16,407	520,762	184,208

TABLE 3—REVISION TO THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

[Authorizing committee 302(a) allocations—on-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	2015		2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Current Allocation	1,913	1,887	1,808	1,793	3,591	3,736
Adjustment for the Highway & Transportation Funding Act of 2015	0	0	0	0	–3,160	–3,160
Revised Allocation	1,913	1,887	1,808	1,793	431	576

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker’s table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 756. An act to require a report on accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o’clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 16, 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:

2165. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final