

This legislation enjoys bipartisan and bicameral support.

Both Republican and Democratic colleagues are part of the 165 sponsors of the legislation in the House. The compromise in that committee was between the ranking member and the chair of that committee in the Senate.

So I think it behooves us to look at this fund, for every day past the 30th of September \$2.5 million will be lost to that fund, money that we cannot afford to lose.

Mr. Speaker, to wait for the ashes of the Land and Water Conservation Fund after the 30th and then to develop it without bipartisan input, without the Democrats playing any role at all in legislation that redefines the Fund and that includes purposes for which the Fund was never established and redirect its funds into areas which are far from the mission of the Fund when it was established 50 years ago, is effectively killing the Fund.

The cuts in our Federal land agencies and land management agencies that have endured in the last four or five budgets point to the fact that the Land and Water Conservation Fund has become an essential supplemental support to many of our public lands and the projects and outdoor activities and wildlife protections that the American people expect.

I suggest to the House that this reauthorization should be devoid of controversy and should be devoid of partisan bickering and political grandstanding. This is a routine item that requires action by the House.

Mr. Speaker, before the time runs out, fully funding and fully authorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund on a permanent basis is what the public is asking for and is what 165 Members of this House are asking for.

I believe that the Republican leadership of this House has to act and allow the House of Representatives, the elected Representatives of the people of this Nation, to work its will and take that vote.

My colleagues have mentioned the economic benefit and priorities of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Let me just add that a bipartisan poll found that 88 percent of the voters support continuing to set aside offshore oil and gas drilling fees that should go into the Land and Water Conservation Fund and 85 percent of Americans want the fund to be fully funded.

For every dollar that is spent on Land and Water Conservation Funds and that is invested, it results in a return of \$4 in economic value from the natural resources goods and services alone.

I think it is worth noting that \$900 million comes from those offshore oil and gas resources and \$17 billion that is collected from those fees and resources that are collected from offshore drilling and gas and oil development goes for other purposes elsewhere in the government.

So we are talking essentially about a very small sum of money that many of

us felt should have been raised a long time ago. We are jeopardizing this sum of money.

In jeopardizing this sum of money, we are further dismantling and further hurting the public's use of our public lands and, more importantly, the protections and cultural resource activities that occur as a result of the fund.

It is a simple matter. Bring it to a hearing. Bring it to a vote. I would urge the leadership of this House that it is way past time. To agonizingly wait for September 30 is not a function of government. It is cynical. It is wrong.

When you have a bill before you that enjoys the bipartisan support that H.R. 1814 enjoys, it is time to bring it to the floor and allow this Congress to vote and allow this bill to be reauthorized on a permanent level, on a permanent basis.

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

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCK). 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, actually, there are some people that it is more of a pleasure to work in this House with than others.

Congressman BUCK, you are one of those that it is a real honor and privilege to work with.

Mr. Speaker, I am back here on the floor to talk about one of the most important issues, maybe the most important issue, of this Congress, recent Congresses, maybe future Congresses, because it has to do with whether or not the Republican-marked majority in the Senate are going to just appear to oppose the Iranian agreement or if they are going to stop it.

The Corker-Cardin bill was done, I have no reason to doubt, with the best of intentions. I didn't vote for it. I could see what I was afraid was coming, and it is what has come. But those that voted for it had a legitimate basis for doing so.

Because the President of the United States, Barack Obama, had said this is basically an executive agreement, he doesn't need the Senate's vote. And that is true if it is not a treaty.

We had the Secretary of State say that he was—and he said it—negotiating a nonbinding agreement. Those were the kind of statements from which the Corker-Cardin bill was based.

And so that bill gave the House and the Senate each a vote on something that was considered to be a nonbinding executive agreement with Iran. However, after the U.N. Security Council voted on it, finally Congress got to see the so-called nonbinding agreement.

After the U.N. voted on it, then we keep getting messages about: Gee, you cannot stop this. Because to stop it

would put us in breach of the agreement. How can we be in breach of a nonbinding agreement?

Well, the truth came out once we had a chance to read the so-called Iranian deal, Iranian agreement. It is a treaty. There is no question it is a treaty.

I don't care whose law you go under. You cannot amend a treaty with anything that falls short of being a treaty itself.

It is just like here in the House. You can't amend legislation unless you amend it with other legislation, although we have bureaucracies like the EPA and others who have just decided to go off on their own and start legislating against the clear and expressed intent of Congress. But it is not lawful. They are acting unlawfully. They are acting outside the bounds of the Constitution.

The President has usurped power that is not his. He has done so in setting out an amnesty. He spoke it, as any good monarch would, and then the Secretary of Homeland Security put it into memos.

They effectively changed law from what it was on naturalization and immigration passed by Congress, signed by the President. They just changed it with the President speaking it and then Jeh Johnson, the Secretary of Homeland Security, doing memos.

Well, that is one thing. It does damage to this country. But when we are talking about an agreement which, under most everybody's description, will allow Iran to get nuclear weapons, there is disagreement whether that will be later or sooner.

But it seems to be almost unanimous that, yes, it is going to allow them to get nukes, but it will be later. Others of us know. They have cheated on every agreement they have entered since 1979, when they came into existence as mullahs running a country.

Yes, President Carter welcomed the Ayatollah Khomeini as a man of peace—a peace of destruction—but they have broken every international agreement in which they participated in since 1979.

They have never been made to account or held accountable for taking our embassy employees hostage for over a year.

For heaven's sake, it is bad enough the administration negotiated with a man that is being charged with desertion in return for giving radical Islamists, murderers, and terrorists back to continue to create havoc and kill Americans and others, but now we are going to give them the ability to have an agreement.

Well, they have broken every agreement they have entered for 36 years. But this one, we think we in the Obama administration are so special that this time they are really not going to breach this agreement, despite the fact that the Ayatollah himself and the other top leaders still say death to America, they still say they are plotting the destruction or overthrow of

Israel, they still say they are plotting the destruction of the United States.

And all the time they are doing that, we have people who didn't learn enough from the disastrous agreement with North Korea that gave the North Koreans nuclear weapons. Now they are trying the same strategy.

If we are nice enough and let them have the wherewithal to produce nuclear weapons, then maybe they really won't do that.

And if they do, it will be years down the road. But you don't even know in Congress what the side deals are between the IAEA and Iran.

So where it says that this will hold Iran at bay for 8 years in this provision or until the IAEA states the broader conclusion that Iran's nuclear material is being used for peaceful purposes, whichever is sooner, we don't even know what the deal between the IAEA and Iran is.

I heard recently the IAEA has been quoted as saying that, as far as they know, their nuclear material is being used for peaceful purposes, but they haven't been allowed into the material facilities for years.

As soon as this administration were to decide the agreement is finalized and ratified, the IAEA could turn right around and say: As far as we know, it is peaceful materials, but we haven't been allowed into the military facilities where they are doing the real nuclear weapons work. They are going to give us samples, and the samples they gave us showed they are using it for peaceful purposes.

So surely they wouldn't lie, even though they have lied about every international agreement they have entered since 1979.

□ 2015

For some reason, these people think they wouldn't lie now. I am telling you that this Iranian agreement has to be stopped, and the United States voters gave the United States Senate over to a majority of Republicans in the last elections. As our great President has said, elections have consequences.

Now, he acts like the elections, where we got a majority, Republicans got a majority in the House, that that was not meaningful, and he acts like the voters giving the majority to Republicans in the Senate, that didn't count, but it does count.

The only way it is going to count, it is going to have consequences, is if the Senate stands up—and I would encourage them, their leaders. Mr. Speaker, I don't think I am asking too much to ask that the Republican leadership have the same or close to the same amount of backbone that HARRY REID did when he suspended cloture on confirmations. I hope that is not too much to ask.

Just have HARRY REID—just almost as much as HARRY REID has stood up for things he believes in, we are asking the Senate to, the Republicans in the Senate, please stand up, almost as

much as HARRY REID did when he set aside cloture on confirmations.

Now, a number of us sent a letter to Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL, down the hall, imploring him to treat the Iranian agreement as the treaty it is because, if they just go along with the fiction that the Iranian agreement does fall under the Corker bill and, therefore, it takes two-thirds to disapprove in the Senate, two-thirds to disapprove in the House, well, here in the House, we have said the Corker bill doesn't apply at this time for sure. I would submit it doesn't apply at all.

All we have to do is rely on our founding document, the Constitution, ratified, made effective 1789, written 1787, and this article II, section 2, second paragraph, beginning of the paragraph says the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur."

The last thing the President wants is for us to follow the Constitution here because the Iranian agreement is a treaty. It modifies other treaties, like the nonproliferation treaty.

It also, as was specifically not contemplated in the Corker bill, it deals with allowing them to have weapons, purchase weapons, armaments, that was not supposed to be in the Iranian agreement.

It also addresses the sanctions allowing them to have over \$100 billion, to \$150 billion, so that they can use it for terrorist activity, so that more Americans and Israeli, Jews, Christians, can be terrorized and killed—and I shouldn't fail to mention moderate Muslims. They are at every bit as much risk—or more—as Christians and Jews because the first people they go after are Muslims that disagree with them.

It is clearly a treaty. All the Senate has to do is take the example that HARRY REID gave when he set aside cloture with 51 Democratic votes, so they could get through a whole bunch of judges confirmed.

It must have been in hopes that they could have judges get to the bench that might have been stopped otherwise, judges like Justice Ginsburg and Justice Kagan, who violated the law by not disqualifying themselves on the same-sex marriage ruling. They performed same-sex marriages.

The law requires them to, therefore, disqualify themselves because, by their actions and words, they made clear they thought it was constitutional. Their impartiality was beyond being reasonably questioned. They didn't have any impartiality.

I guess, when Leader REID, at the time, got 51 Democrats to remove cloture as a problem for their confirmations, he probably did get some more judges confirmed.

This is so much more serious—even then that, as serious as that is—because, if the Senate does not treat the Iranian agreement as the treaty it is,

then the President's already saying he is going to treat it as being approved—ratified is what that means.

When our U.S. administration treats the Iranian agreement as ratified, then when our dear friend in the Middle East, Israel, defends itself, then the United States, under Commander in Chief Barack Obama, will have to be at war with Israel for defending themselves against Iran continuing to move toward nuclear weapons.

Now, it is possible, I don't think it will happen, but it is possible that squeamish in Israel could win the day by saying—when we said "never again" all those years, we meant never again, except we are going to let Iran have nukes and let them nuke us once they have nuclear weapons.

Other than the millions of Jews that may be killed with nuclear weapons Iran has, other than that, we mean never again, but I don't think that is what a majority of Israelis are going to accept.

I have such complete respect for Prime Minister Netanyahu—I disagree with him on issues; that is what friends often do. I don't believe when Prime Minister Netanyahu has said never again, he meant never again after the Iranians nuke Israeli cities. They are going to have to do something.

If the Senate, with the Republican majority, does not stand up and have a ratification vote on this treaty, the Iranian treaty, and in that vote, fail to get the two-thirds to concur, as our Constitution requires, then President Obama is going to go forward as if it were ratified; and the consequences in the Middle East and to the United States will be absolutely devastating.

As bad as the leadership is in North Korea, they are not radical Islamists. The leaders in North Korea do not advocate or at least haven't been advocating suicide bombers. They haven't been advocating that, if you die blowing up lots of innocent people in Israel or the United States, you go to paradise. They don't advocate that in North Korea.

This is 10 times—many, many, many times worse than North Korea having nukes. This is something that would be written about in history books years from now. If the Republican majority in the Senate doesn't stand up, it will be written that, when Iran got nuclear weapons—because the Republicans that were given the majority in the Senate, they were given the majority in the House, but they refused to use their majority to vote on ratification of what was clearly a treaty.

As a result, the President was able to move forward as if it had been ratified. Iran got nuclear weapons, and millions of people died, and it changed the course of Western civilization forever.

If they have their way, we are headed for a dark age with nukes leading the way, and that will be on our heads. The blood from all those lost lives, all of the murders, all of the bombings, all of

those that occur with the tens of billions of dollars that the Obama administration gives to Iran, all of those will not just be on President Obama's head, they will be on all of our heads because America gave us the majority in the House and Senate, and we didn't have the nerve to stop this horrendous, disastrous treaty with Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I even made an offer. I asked if the House just pass my resolution, which laid out this path for stopping this Iranian treaty, but it ended with the Senate calling a vote on ratification as a treaty the Iranian agreement is, and they fail to get two-thirds, then it can't be enforced in any United States court or any court anywhere around the world because our Constitution requires ratification, the Senate took the vote, and they did not ratify it.

I said, if the Senate follows up the House and does that, I won't run again. I know that will make a lot of people happy, especially those that I am making very angry tonight with what I have got to say. I know that there is a debate on, so probably most Republicans that are politically plugged in are watching the debate.

I skipped some of the debate. I cannot avoid taking the opportunity, at least one more time, to beg our Republicans in the Senate to stop this disaster to Western civilization so this chapter never has to be written about the demise of Western civilization going back to when the Senate refused to use their power to stop a horrendous treaty that gave to the biggest supporter of terrorism all of the instrumentality, all of the money they needed to set Western civilization back 100 years.

Here I am, Mr. Speaker. I promised you I wasn't going to take 30 minutes, but I had to take the time to beg the Senate: Use your majority; 51 votes is all it takes.

Yes, I know, I know, the President normally sends things over that get on the executive calendar, and that is when you vote on things for the President. I get that.

The President sent over this agreement. Now, he didn't call it a treaty, but you should recognize it is a treaty. You have got one of two ways to bring it to the floor. One is you can say it is part of the executive calendar.

He sent it over to us, and under our own procedure, we set that for a vote, but it is a treaty, so we are treating it as a treaty, and it is made through the executive calendar. I get that. You can do that in the Senate. Mr. Speaker, they could.

Or the other way is just to say: Look, the Constitution does not require that the President send us a treaty and say, Here is a treaty, now ratify it, for us to take a vote on a treaty on whether or not to ratify it.

That is not in the Constitution. It is in the Senate rules.

What does it take to suspend the Senate rules? It is 51 votes, and the

Senate has that many votes that know how bad this deal is.

□ 2030

So either call it on the Executive Calendar because the President submitted, or suspend both the calendar rule and the cloture rule with 51 votes and then bring it to the floor of the Senate for a vote where you won't get the two-thirds needed to ratify it and we can all proclaim, "This Iranian treaty is dead." Then we don't risk defending Iran against our friend Israel in the beginning of a war that should never have to start.

The alternative to this horrendous treaty is not war. As Michael Oren once said, the day Iran believes the United States is a credible threat to attack its nuclear facilities is the day they stop enriching uranium. And he is exactly right. I hope he doesn't mind my saying that, but he was exactly right.

War is not inevitable. It doesn't need to be. We don't need it. But if this Iranian treaty is not stopped by the Senate, it is going to be a war that we don't see coming—at least our leaders don't—and millions die. It doesn't have to happen. I hope and pray it won't. I urge the Senate to do the right thing: Have a vote on ratification, stop the Iranian treaty, and then we can get a better deal.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2204

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 10 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 348, RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 758, LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2015 PROTECTION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-261) on the resolution (H. Res. 420) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 348) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes;

providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 758) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3134, DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3504, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-262) on the resolution (H. Res. 421) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3134) to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. WAGNER (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) for today and for the balance of the week on account of the passing of her mother, Ruth Ann Trousdale.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 720. An act to improve intergovernmental planning for and communication during security incidents at domestic airports, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 17, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

U.S. CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,
Washington, DC, September 16, 2015.
Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.
DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 202(d) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995