

Cook	Johnson (OH)	Roby
Correa	Johnson (SD)	Roe, David P.
Costa	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Craig	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Crawford	Joyce (PA)	Rooney (FL)
Crenshaw	Kelly (MS)	Rose (NY)
Crist	Kelly (PA)	Rose, John W.
Crow	Kilmer	Rouda
Cunningham	Kim	Rouzer
Curtis	Kind	Roy
Davids (KS)	King (NY)	Ruiz
Davis, Rodney	Kirkpatrick	Rutherford
DesJarlais	Krishnamoorthi	Scalise
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff (TN)	Schrader
Duffy	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Duncan	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Dunn	Lamborn	Shimkus
Emmer	Latta	Slotkin
Estes	Lawson (FL)	Smith (MO)
Ferguson	Lesko	Smith (NE)
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Smucker
Flores	Lucas	Spanberger
Foxx (NC)	Marchant	Spano
Fudge	Marshall	Steube
Fulcher	Massie	Stewart
Gaetz	Mast	Suozi
Gallagher	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Gianforte	McAdams	Thompson (PA)
Gibbs	McCauley	Timmons
Golden	McHenry	Tipton
Gonzalez (OH)	McKinley	Torres Small
Gooden	Meadows	(NM)
Gosar	Meng	Turner
Gottheimer	Meuser	Upton
Graves (GA)	Miller	Van Drew
Graves (LA)	Mitchell	Walberg
Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Walden
Green (TN)	Mooney (WV)	Walker
Griffith	Mucarsel-Powell	Walorski
Guest	Mullin	Waltz
Guthrie	Norman	Waters
Hagedorn	Nunes	Watson Coleman
Harder (CA)	O'Halleran	Weber (TX)
Harris	Olson	Weber (FL)
Hartzler	Palmer	Westerman
Hern, Kevin	Pence	Wild
Herrera Beutler	Peters	Williams
Hice (GA)	Peterson	Wilson (SC)
Hill (AR)	Porter	Wittman
Himes	Posey	Womack
Holding	Ratchiffe	Woodall
Hudson	Reschenthaler	Wright
Huizenga	Rice (NY)	Young
Hunter	Rice (SC)	Zeldin
Johnson (LA)	Riggleman	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tonko

NOT VOTING—16

Allred	Keating	Ryan
Biggs	Kinzinger	Scanlon
Blumenauer	Palazzo	Wagner
Dingell	Pingree	Wenstrup
Gohmert	Price (NC)	
Hurd (TX)	Quigley	

□ 1403

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, my vote did not record. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 80.

REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.J. Res. 37.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 122 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 37.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1407

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress, with Ms. PLASKETT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the joint resolution is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is an important moment for the House, Madam Chair. For years, under administrations of both parties, the Congress has handed away our authority and abrogated our responsibility when it comes to foreign policy, particularly the questions of how and where our military is engaged around the world.

Article I of the Constitution gives Congress the responsibility to declare war, yet we have given Presidents of both parties a virtual blank check to send our brave servicemembers into harm's way while we have stood on the sidelines.

With the measure we are considering today, we take some of that power back, and we do so to restore a sense of American values and American leadership to the worst humanitarian catastrophe in the world.

For the last few years, we have all seen horrific images of the civilian casualties in the Yemen war: starving children, millions displaced, outbreaks of deadly disease.

Madam Chair, 85,000 children have starved to death. Fourteen million are on the brink of famine. More than a million suffer from cholera. And the ongoing military operations are bringing us no closer to a resolution. The only way out of this mess is for parties to sit down and work toward a political solution.

The United States can and should play a role pushing for that solution, pushing parties to make a commitment to negotiations. This measure, introduced by Mr. KHANNA, will help us do exactly that.

Let me explain why this is so important and why I support passing this resolution right now.

In the last few years, the Saudi-led coalition has carried out 18,000 airstrikes. A full one-third of those strikes hit nonmilitary targets. This is absolutely reckless.

I am not naive, Madam Chair. I know we have critical strategic interests in that region. The Houthis are a problem. They get support from Iran. They launch missiles into Saudi territory and international waterways, threatening Saudi civilians. They are starving the Yemeni people, diverting assistance, and holding civilians hostage to their political demands. But we cannot just give the coalition a blank check when so many innocent lives are being lost. And if the administration won't demand any sort of accountability from the Saudis and Emiratis, it is time for Congress to act.

I want to acknowledge my friend from Texas, the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. MCCAUL. I believe that he also wants to see Congress reclaim our prerogatives on foreign policy, though I understand we have an honest difference of opinion on the approach we are dealing with today.

I am glad that we moved this measure through regular order, that we had a hearing with experts and a markup, and that the gentleman from Texas and I could make our cases before the Rules Committee. It allowed me to hear the arguments from all perspectives on this issue.

I think, during this debate, we will hear my friends on the other side call this resolution misguided. I think because this resolution has to do with our security agreements with the Saudis and Emiratis, we will hear them question what impact this may have on other security agreements.

It is a fair question, to be honest. That is why this measure is tailored so specifically to deal with just this situation. This is not a broad, blanket policy that is going to tie the hands of the executive branch. There is no dangerous precedent being set here, just an attempt to stop a war that is costing far too many innocent lives.

I think we will hear my friends question whether this measure would even do anything because this measure withdraws American forces engaged in hostilities, and the Pentagon says "hostilities" only applies to situations where American troops are firing weapons at an enemy. I have two reactions to that.

First of all, this measure would specifically define "hostilities" to include aerial refueling of warplanes carrying out airstrikes against Houthi militants. Now, I understand the Defense

Department has stopped refueling as a matter of policy, but policies can be reversed, so this resolution would cut off refueling as a matter of law.

My second point is broader and gets at the heart of today's debate. This body is not subject to the definitions conjured up by the Defense Department. We don't ask permission to exercise our Article I authority. Of course, the Pentagon will try to define things in a way that consolidates the power of the executive branch, but Congress, with authority over war powers, need not accept that definition.

The Congress has lost its grip on foreign policy, in my opinion, by granting too much deference to the executive branch, by failing to examine the decisions, determinations, and definitions that are used to justify sending Americans into harm's way. Our job is to keep that branch in check, not to shrug our shoulders when they tell us to mind our own business.

Lastly, I think we will hear my colleagues on the other side ask: Isn't this just all politics? No, Madam Chair. Politics is what the former majority did to this resolution twice during the last Congress. Politics is stifling debate on national security issues because we are uncomfortable with the message it might send or we don't want to take a tough vote.

□ 1415

Politics is walking away from our constitutional responsibilities, as Congress has done for far too long; and frankly, we have done it for far too long, Congresses in both parties with a majority and Presidents in both parties.

Our Article I responsibilities are things that we cannot just simply turn the other way. We are a coequal branch of government, and we have not had a declaration of war, for instance, since 1941. We are content to just tell whatever administration is in, go ahead, you handle it. We don't have any responsibility. I hope that that stops this afternoon.

The other body has already weighed in on this measure. It passed with bipartisan support. Today, the Members of the House get our chance to go on record finally and say where we stand.

I joined this resolution as an original cosponsor because I think it will lead to a sort of reckoning for our government.

What is our role in the conflict in Yemen?

What is Congress' voice in our foreign policy?

How will we exercise American leadership and American power?

What will we provide and what will we withhold to push warring parties toward peace?

I want to thank Mr. KHANNA for his hard work and for his leadership in shining the light on this issue.

I want to thank our members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee who have contributed so far to a valuable debate.

I want to thank Mr. MCCAUL, who has made his opposition to this about the policy, not about the politics or the personalities. We are going to have a lot more debates; sometimes we will be on the same side and sometimes not, but I hope we can always grapple with these challenges in a substantive way.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just begin by extending my appreciation for the chairman. I know his arguments are well-intentioned, as are mine. I believe that we both completely agree and completely support Congress' solemn duty under Article I of the Constitution, to authorize the commitment of U.S. troops to foreign hostilities; and perhaps there will be another example where we can join forces in that. But that is not the issue here.

Allow me to quote the actual War Powers Act, from Title 50 of the United States Code. This procedure applies to "the removal of United States Armed Forces engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States."

This has always meant, historically, and today, U.S. troops being directly involved in live-fire combat. As the Department of Defense has repeatedly confirmed, U.S. Armed Forces are not engaged in hostilities against the Houthi forces in Yemen.

This resolution is directing us to remove troops that simply, Madam Chair, are not there. Even the aerial refueling of coalition jets, which does not constitute traditional hostilities, ended last November.

This resolution, in my judgment, misuses the tool to try to get at the different issue of security assistance to third countries. It provides no clear decisions on which forms of assistance are cut off. It does not address the humanitarian catastrophe inside Yemen and, alarmingly, it completely ignores the destabilization role that Iran is playing in Yemen and the region.

This irresponsible measure is trying to hammer a square peg in a round hole.

This resolution really stretches the definition of "hostilities" to cover non-U.S. military operations by other countries. It reinterprets U.S. support to those countries as "engagement in hostilities."

This overreach has dangerous implications far beyond Saudi Arabia. This approach will now allow any single Member to use this privileged mechanism to second-guess U.S. security cooperation relationships with more than 100 countries throughout the world.

Under this model, if one Member doesn't like something that any of our security partners does overseas, that Member can force quick consideration of a resolution directing the removal of U.S. forces from hostilities "in or affecting" that situation. It no longer matters that U.S. forces are not actually conducting those hostilities.

This could impact our assistance to Israel. It could affect our cooperation with our NATO allies. It could impact counterterrorism cooperation with African nations in the Sahel. We could recklessly undo critical security relationships that we have spent decades building.

That is not what the War Powers Resolution has ever meant, and I don't think that is what Congress designed it to do, and it should not be used in this way now.

No one is saying that U.S. security assistance to Saudi Arabia, or anyone else, is beyond congressional scrutiny. Congress has many tools at its disposal. Our committee receives regular arms sales notifications. Congress can condition or cut off security assistance through targeted legislation or the annual appropriations process.

But this resolution is the wrong tool. It is vague and irresponsible. It will create new doubts for our partners and allies around the world.

For those reasons, Madam Chair, I strongly oppose this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), the author of this joint resolution.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman ENGEL for his extraordinary leadership to help bring a war in Yemen to an end. I want to thank him and Chairman MCGOVERN, Speaker PELOSI, and Majority Leader HOYER, for finally speaking up for the millions of Yemenis who are on the brink of starvation.

This is not a complex issue. For the last 2 years, we have been assisting the Saudis in bombing Yemeni civilians; and the reports say there are 14 million Yemenis who face starvation; 14 million.

Let's put that in context: 800,000 people died in Rwanda; 100,000 in Bosnia, and 14 million face famine in Yemen. And it is not because the world doesn't have enough food or medicine to get in there. It is because there is a systematic bombing preventing the food and medicine to get in.

We want to send the food. We want to send medicine, but the Saudis aren't allowing that food and medicine to get in.

And what do we know about Saudi Arabia? We know that they were responsible for the murder of Khashoggi. We know recently, that MBS admitted that he wanted Khashoggi dead.

We know that they, the Saudis, are supplying arms to al-Qaida in Yemen who are fighting our troops. The Saudis are giving arms to the very people who are fighting our troops. This is why Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM has said he may support this resolution.

The only patriotic thing, if you care about our troops, if you care about American interests, if you care about the outrage that the Saudis are inflicting on Americans, and on the world, the only patriotic thing to do is to vote

for this resolution. I am convinced it will pass with a bipartisan majority.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, this resolution is misguided, and let me take a few moments to illustrate some of the reasons.

Number 1, as the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. MCCAUL, has described, this is a misuse of the War Powers Resolution. It conflates two different sections. It has definitional problems. I am not going to repeat all the arguments he has used.

My point is that, if we use that powerful law, it should be clear, direct, and applicable. To misuse it in this way actually weakens the authority of Congress, the exact opposite of what the chairman of the committee was talking about.

Secondly, the message coming from this resolution is, Iran, you can do whatever you want to.

Now, it is clear we do not have troops in the fight against the Houthis. We do, however, want other countries to join in trying to constrain Iran's aggression in various parts of the world. But with this resolution, we are saying, Okay, you are on your own. We are not going to assist you in any way. And that message reverberates throughout the Middle East. It will have lasting consequences.

Third, if anything, this resolution will make our military more cautious when targeting ISIS and al-Qaida.

Now there is a section in here that says, Well, it doesn't really apply when you are going against terrorists. But Yemen is a messy place. You have individuals commingled in the same location. Sometimes the same individual can have multiple loyalties.

Our military will be overly cautious in interpreting this resolution. They will be less likely to target ISIS and al-Qaida.

Mr. Chairman, don't forget. It wasn't very long ago the most serious threats coming to our homeland, to Americans emanated from Yemen. This adds danger to the world.

Fourth, I think this resolution makes a humanitarian situation worse. As long as rockets are fired from Yemen into Riyadh, there will be a military response.

Now, the U.S. has been assisting the Saudis in targeting, so that it is narrower; so that they are only targeting military targets and minimizing civilian casualties. And yet, this resolution says, No, you can't offer that sort of help.

So what is the result? It is going to, unfortunately, be less specific targeting, and I am afraid that the humanitarian situation will only grow worse.

Fifth, and finally, if this passes and signs into law, it will not help the peo-

ple of Yemen one iota. There are lots of things we just heard from the author of the resolution, why he does not approve of some of the actions going on with Saudi Arabia. This does not help any of that.

It is an attempt to make us feel better, that we have at least done something. And yet, the result is, we reduce our influence in the Middle East; we encourage and enhance the position of Iran; and we lead to a more dangerous world for us. That is quite an after-noon's work.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee's Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, a very valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 37, and applaud Chairman ENGEL, as well as my colleague from California, Mr. KHANNA, on their leadership.

This joint resolution would direct the removal of U.S. forces from supporting the Saudi and Emirati that campaign in Yemen. We will still be supporting our fight against ISIS and al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, which Congress has specifically authorized. We are not debating that.

We are also not debating, as some might suggest, setting a precedent when it comes to cooperating with our allies. This is about hostilities we are engaged in because we are supporting a coalition in war.

We have not authorized our military to act in the Yemeni civil war. This is about reclaiming the jurisdiction of Congress in making a war. That is our job. That is what we were elected to do. I would say that if there were a Democrat or a Republican in the White House.

Now, if the administration wants to be involved there, they need to come to Congress and make a compelling case. But let's have that discussion.

For that reason, I support this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to join me in helping to move this resolution out of the House.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), the ranking member on the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chair, I urge opposition to H.J. Res. 37, directing the removal of U.S. Armed Forces from the hostilities in Yemen. Actually, the U.S. is not directly engaged in any hostilities in Yemen. This is not my independent assessment, but the determination of the Department of Defense.

The U.S. is currently supporting the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen by providing targeting assistance, intelligence sharing, and joint planning to defeat the Houthi rebels who are armed by Iran, with missiles that they have directed at civilian airports in Saudi Arabia.

There is no doubt that the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen has made terrible targeting mistakes. But what would happen if the U.S. were to pull the plug on our intelligence-sharing and targeting cooperation?

□ 1430

Would this improve the coalition's targeting or possibly make it worse, increasing the chances for collateral damage and civilian casualties?

I am concerned that, if we walk away now, these terrible tragedies will simply multiply.

The United States must be at the table so that we can insist on and respect international law. This does not mean that the coalition will always do the right thing, but it does mean that we will have leverage and influence to promote the right direction.

Instead of this resolution, I hope that our colleagues, Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ELIOT ENGEL and Ranking Member, Republican leader, MIKE MCCAUL, will work together on a bipartisan initiative that can address these important concerns in Yemen.

We can all agree that the humanitarian crisis in Yemen must be addressed and that the ongoing conflict must come to an end. Let's work together as we have always done on the Foreign Affairs Committee to address this issue and end the suffering of the Yemeni people.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a new member on the House Foreign Affairs Committee who is already making his mark.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman ENGEL for his incredible leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chair, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of Congressman KHANNA's resolution.

The Saudi-led war in Yemen has led to a staggering crisis, and it is happening on our watch. This bombing campaign would not be happening without the active involvement of the United States military with the Saudis.

More than 75 percent of Yemen's population needs humanitarian assistance. Yemen has one of the highest maternal death rates in the region. Its health infrastructure has crumbled, and tens of thousands of pregnant women are at risk of serious complications. The list goes on and on.

It is long past time to bring U.S. involvement in this calamity to an end.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Congressman KHANNA for his leadership and Chairman ENGEL for making this a top priority.

We have a responsibility not just as Members of Congress, but as human beings not just to talk about these horrors, but to do everything in our power to end them.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PANETTA). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding the additional time.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), the ranking member on the Asia, the Pacific, and Nonproliferation Subcommittee.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chair, I think the chairman for yielding. I appreciate it.

Mr. Chair, this is something that we do need to get resolved, but I cannot support H.J. Res. 37.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to this resolution, which I could not support as it was pushed through the Foreign Affairs Committee over strong objection from me and my 16 colleagues.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has a proud tradition of bipartisanship, but that was thrown out the window with this bill.

Among my objections to this bill is the basic premise of the bill, which is flawed. U.S. Forces are not engaged in hostilities between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthi forces in Yemen.

This bill distorts the definition of hostilities to cover non-U.S. military operations by third countries. It then reinterprets U.S. activities in support of those countries as U.S. engagement in those hostilities.

I have been well documented throughout my time in Congress as opposing the misuse of the War Powers Act. That is really what needs to be addressed: the misapplication of the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs.

While I wholeheartedly believe that the U.S. Forces put into combat roles must be approved by Congress, I cannot stand by as those firm beliefs in the Constitution are twisted around to make a political messaging point.

Keep in mind, my colleagues from the other side talk about the humanitarian crisis in Yemen, yet they fail to mention the Houthi rebel fighters overthrew the legitimate government of President Hadi, and this overthrow was sponsored by Iran, which Iran is the largest sponsor of state terrorism. That is really where the problem is in this. We are there in a different capacity.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues not to vote for this partisan bill because, if we break this agreement, we have got over 100 other agreements that we would have to negotiate with our allies, and this would be bad for America's foreign policy.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for sponsoring this.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our majority leader.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman ENGEL, Chairman SMITH, Representative KHANNA, and others for ensuring that the House ex-

presses its views on the humanitarian catastrophe in Yemen.

After the Republican leader declined to allow this resolution to come to the floor in December, I promised to bring it to the floor.

Here we are, and now the House will have an opportunity to express its views to the President and to the country that he ought to end his administration's support of the Saudi coalition's military campaign in Yemen. It is a campaign that has led to tremendous human suffering, with minimal military gains. After 4 years, it is time for a change in policy.

Let me be clear: The Houthi rebels in Yemen are bad actors, engaging in brutal actions against civilians, and they are sponsored by Iran. The Houthis commit human rights abuses, prevent humanitarian assistance to starving civilians, and exercise a brute form of governance in the areas they control. We should have no illusion that there are two parties responsible for this humanitarian catastrophe; however, we are supporting one of them.

The result of the coalition campaign thus far has been an unmitigated humanitarian disaster as well as a military stalemate.

Using military force to pressure the Houthi rebels into accepting coalition demands has demonstrably not worked. It is time, therefore, for Congress to make clear to the Trump administration and to our country and to the international community that it cannot simply keep our Yemen policy on autopilot while the situation not only has not improved, but deteriorates.

With the United States supporting one party to this conflict, the best way we promote a peaceful and positive solution is by focusing our efforts on the variables that we can affect. It is time that we set a new course forward on Yemen and that the House and Senate need to demand that the administration uphold basic American values in its exercise of our foreign policy. That means ending our support for the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen.

Although not the focus of this resolution, I am mindful that this debate is taking place a day after the President disregarded the law and failed to report to Congress who was responsible for the murder of journalist Jamal Khashoggi. The more the President tries to sweep this heinous incident under the rug, the more incumbent upon Congress it is to act.

This resolution is bipartisan. A similar resolution passed the United States Senate. It was not brought to this floor. I hope it will receive the strong support of both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I am opposed to H.J. Res. 37, Mr. Chair. This resolution is poor policy

and will not achieve the aims of those who support it. That is really the crux of the issue here.

My colleagues are using this resolution to express their concerns with the actions of Saudi Arabia and the status of the war in Yemen, disregarding the dangerous precedent this resolution will send.

The joint resolution improperly expands the definition of hostilities to include non-U.S. military operations by third countries. This bill then reinterprets the U.S. activities in support of those countries as U.S. engagements in said hostilities.

The Department of Defense and the White House have both correctly stated that, under the longstanding definition of hostilities, the United States is not engaged in such in Yemen.

In order to force a privileged measure in the Senate, my colleagues had to expand and distort the definitions in the War Powers Resolution to achieve their goals. This is absolutely poor policy, and we cannot support such a measure.

The misuse of this privileged tool endangers U.S. security cooperation with over 100 partners around the world, to include Israel, NATO, and many antiterror allies.

Now, I understand my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are unhappy with the actions taken by Saudi Arabia. Frankly, I am as well. Unfortunately, we live in an imperfect world, Mr. Chairman, with imperfect actors. We must deal with the reality of geopolitics in the way that they are and not the way that we wish they would be.

We and I find many of the things the Saudis to be doing horrific, including the murder of Muslim Brotherhood member Khashoggi. I was one of the first people to go on the record demanding the declassification of the 9/11 report concerning Saudi Arabia, but this will not be the first action Saudi Arabia takes that is counter to our beliefs here in the United States. During the first 4 months of 2017, Saudi Arabia beheaded 48 people.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, according to the reports, half of those deaths were for nonviolent drug charges. The Saudi Kingdom executes its citizens for blasphemy and crimes against the state, actions that are protected under the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

I understand that we are dissatisfied—I am, too—but using poor policy to terminate U.S. assistance will not improve conditions in Yemen. Iran's own IRGC commander openly admitted that Iran provides military assistance to the Houthis in Yemen.

In this body, we can choose to stand with Iran or the Houthis or, as I suggest, to stand with Israel and Saudi Arabia.

Mr. Chair, this resolution is not the right step. It is poor policy. I encourage my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), a very well-respected member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman ENGEL for his leadership.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this resolution. I want to commend Congressman KHANNA for offering it. It is another step in years of pressure that Congress has put on the executive branch to get us out of this bloody war in Yemen.

In 2015, I wrote a letter to the Pentagon about what was then a little-known war in Yemen, asking why the U.S. was involved in war crimes committed by the Saudis in Yemen.

I previously served in Active Duty in the military. It was clear to me that what the Saudi jets were doing in dropping bombs on innocent civilians was a war crime.

In 2016, I introduced legislation to limit the transfer of air-to-ground munitions from the U.S. to Saudi Arabia. And then, working with other Members such as Representatives Pocan and Welch and others, we were able to cause the Obama administration to stop a shipment of air-to-ground munitions to Saudi Arabia.

In 2017, I worked with Representative TED YOHO, and we helped insert language into the NDAA requesting the administration to certify what the heck it was doing in Yemen.

And then last August, I wrote a letter to the Pentagon inspector general asking for an investigation of whether U.S. personnel were aiding and abetting Saudi war crimes in Yemen.

I am very pleased that a few months later, in November of last year, the Trump administration announced it was going to stop the U.S. refueling of Saudi jets in Yemen.

Now we need to pass this resolution as another step in increasing the pressure on the administration to get us out of the war in Yemen.

It is not a partisan issue. This started under Obama’s watch, continues under Trump’s, and at the end of the day, war crimes and humanitarian catastrophes are not partisan issues. Every Member of Congress should vote for this.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), the ranking member of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman MCCAUL for yielding. I have great respect for him, as well as our committee chair, ELIOT ENGEL.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 37, directing the removal of U.S. Armed Forces from unauthorized hostilities in Yemen. One of the reasons why is because we aren’t even engaged in hostilities in Yemen.

□ 1445

The United States is not involved in any direct live fire exchanges. Last November, the U.S. stopped aerial refueling of Saudi jets.

According to the Department of Defense, U.S. support to the coalition is for defensive purposes only. It focuses only on helping minimize civilian casualties, which means that this resolution, if passed and implemented, will actually result in less food and medicine getting into Yemen and more civilians dying, and the war will not end.

If anyone wants to propose a bill and pass one cutting off or conditioning specified U.S. security assistance to Saudi Arabia, they have the ability to do so. That is not this bill.

What is also important is that there are a lot of freshman Members here in this Chamber, and the fact that we are rushing this to the floor so quickly without having a classified briefing for all of those Members is also deeply unfortunate. That should take place before passing this resolution.

Congress has many other ways to engage in oversight efforts for U.S. security assistance with Saudi Arabia, including approving arms sales and through appropriations.

Our assistance for Saudi Arabia started in 2015, when the Houthis overthrew a legitimate government, backed by Iran. The Houthis fired missiles against Saudi Arabia with support from Iran, and the U.S. provided intelligence and logistical support in compliance with the law of armed conflict.

Iran poses a massive geostrategic threat to Yemen and to the United States and many of our allies. Iran is providing training and support to the Houthi rebels, including supplying ballistic missiles that have been fired into Saudi Arabia. In 2016, missiles were fired by Iranian-backed Houthi rebels at a U.S. Navy warship near the Bab el-Mandeb. If Iran has the ability to cut off global shipping through the Strait of Hormuz and el-Mandeb, it would have disastrous consequences.

If this resolution passes, we are emboldening Iran to continue their nefarious ambitions in the region without restraint.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.J. Res. 37. I think Iran would endorse it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT), another very valuable member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman ENGEL for allowing me this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 37, in which Congress will finally reclaim its constitutional authority over the power to declare war and will finally address the terrible suffering happening in Yemen.

For 4 years, we have aided the Saudi-led campaign in Yemen, which has contributed to the gravest humanitarian crisis in the world, a man-made crisis that we could help alleviate, rather

than contribute to. This is 4 years too long.

The Trump administration has coozied up to the Saudis, ignoring the harm they cause in Yemen and their egregious violations of human rights. The President has expressed his personal affirmation for the Saudi Kingdom on several occasions, saying, “They give us a lot of business,” and, “They’ve been a great ally to me.”

Trump and those opposed to this resolution have argued that our ties to Saudi Arabia are too precious and that our cooperation on counterterrorism and countering Iran would be jeopardized by this resolution. But in December, when discussing an earlier version of this resolution, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM wrote the following: “The fear that the Saudis will stop cooperating with the U.S. on terrorism or Iran isn’t rational. Those threats pose as much of a danger to the Saudis as they do to America. Demanding better from allies isn’t downgrading the relationship; it’s a sign that Americans take our principles seriously and won’t be taken advantage of by anyone, friend or foe.”

Mr. Chairman, I urge Congress to reassert its constitutional authority to work to end the suffering of millions and to pass this war powers resolution. This is what it is.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WATKINS), a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my Republican leader, Mr. MCCAUL, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition of H.J. Res. 37, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

As a combat veteran, with many years of experience in conflict and postconflict environments, I am particularly concerned about this resolution. Passing it would pose a threat to many other important bilateral agreements that help keep us and our allies safe and make the world a better place.

Even the resolution is misleading. Our Armed Forces are not engaged in hostilities in the Yemen conflict. Outside of Yemen, the U.S. Armed Forces support an ally, through intelligence sharing, threat analysis, and logistical support.

The strength of our international relations lies on the numerous global relationships that we hold. We help each other understand, forecast, and eliminate threats. This is especially true in the Arabian Peninsula, where ISIS and al-Qaida have been notoriously active.

Furthermore, pertinent facts relating to Yemen are classified, leaving Congressmen and -women to vote blind.

Mr. Chairman, we have a long history of free-thinking bipartisanship when it comes to foreign policy. I ask my colleagues to think for themselves, not merely vote along party lines.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE), another new member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for the joint resolution. It is important for us in this institution, in this critical moment, to undertake serious debate regarding the use of U.S. military in the conflict in Yemen.

As my colleagues have pointed out, Article I of our Constitution clearly states that the power to declare war belongs to the Congress. Congress must put down a marker stating it is unacceptable for our military to support hostilities we have not authorized.

Our support for the Saudi-led coalition's efforts in Yemen has proven problematic in so many ways. The impact on civilian lives is real and painful. Overall, 60,000 lives have been lost.

Ultimately, the question should be really simple: Did Congress authorize our military to engage in hostilities in Yemen? The answer is no.

So, today, we must pass this resolution to stand up for our Constitution and stand up for what is right.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to lend their support to that effort.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member of the committee for his leadership.

I rise to speak against this resolution, which would direct the removal of U.S. forces from Yemen. This resolution is dangerous, and the majority should immediately take this vote off of our schedule.

The majority claims to be concerned about the threat of Iranian and Russian influence around the world. If that were the case, they would not force a vote on this war powers resolution.

Let's be clear: The U.S. is not involved in hostilities in Yemen, so this resolution would set a dangerous precedent by calling into question many security agreements we have with nations around the world that do not involve hostilities. The Pentagon has repeatedly stated that America is only providing support to our allies in the region as they combat the Houthis, and everyone is trying to reduce civilian casualties. Ultimately, we want to limit Iran's ability to gain more influence in the region.

The Houthi rebels are just one part of the Iranian regime's proxy battles around the world with the ultimate goal to destroy Israel, America, and all those who share our democratic values.

Mr. Chairman, a vote for this resolution is a vote for Iran. A vote against this resolution is a vote for Israel. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this dangerous resolution, and I urge the administration to veto this resolution, if it should somehow pass.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), a champion of progressive causes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for shepherding this important resolution to the floor.

Today, Yemen is the worst humanitarian crisis on the planet. Eighty-five thousand children under the age of 5 have died of starvation since 2015, and 150 children die every single day.

The U.S., alongside Saudi Arabia, which has used starvation as a weapon of war, has supported targeting for deadly airstrikes, provided logistical support and refueling, and sent Special Operations Forces to the Yemeni border.

It is time for these activities to end, absent congressional consent. The American people deserve a transparent debate and a vote by Congress, per Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, before the U.S. engages in war-making.

While the President is tweeting about wars and nuclear bombs, we must reassert our authority and end the unconstitutional U.S. participation in Yemen's civil war.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for allowing me time, as I do support H.J. Res. 37. Fundamentally, it is about Article I and the authority of Congress as addressed in Federalist Paper No. 69.

As the President said, great powers don't fight endless wars. I would add nor do they fight or participate in undeclared wars.

The United States is not participating in the Yemen war in the sense that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have characterized. In fact, I personally asked Secretary Mattis on two occasions to help draft authorization against Iranian proxies.

This is, at best, a half measure in that it stops any active participation in undeclared unauthorized combat. But it also fails to advance the policy of our country, which is to treat Iran as the threat it is, not just to the United States of America, but to its neighbors and our allies in the region.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Also, I thank Representative KHANNA, Representative POCAN, and Chairman MCGOVERN for their work in bringing this very critical measure to the floor.

Of course, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 37. Today, I am remembering our dear friend and colleague, Congressman Walter Jones, who was an original cosponsor. I miss him tremendously. I know he would be down here speaking on behalf of this resolution.

Since 2015, the United States has participated in the Saudi-led military campaign in Yemen without authorization from Congress. We have helped create and worsen the world's largest humanitarian crisis. 22.2 million Yemenis, 75 percent of the population, need

humanitarian assistance. At least 85,000 children under the age of 5 have died from war-related hunger and disease.

Our involvement in this war, quite frankly, is shameful. That is why this bipartisan measure to end the United States' unconstitutional role in this war is so important. I have long pushed efforts to repeal the overly broad 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.J. Res. 37 and to support this bipartisan bill to end the United States' role in the war on Yemen.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), another very valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. It is a delight to call him that title.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 37, directing the President to remove U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities in or affecting Yemen within 30 days.

Since 2015, the United States has provided support to the Saudi-led coalition in its war against the Houthi rebels in Yemen.

In addition to claiming an estimated 60,000 Yemeni lives, this war is fueling the world's largest humanitarian and refugee crisis. Humanitarian agencies estimate that 85,000 children have died from malnutrition, more than half the population currently requires emergency food assistance, and 1 in every 10 Yemeni children has been forcibly displaced from their homes due to the conflict.

In September of 2018, Secretary Pompeo certified to Congress that the Saudi and Emirati Governments were mitigating harm to civilians and civilian infrastructure in Yemen. Meanwhile, the Saudi-led coalition conducted attacks killing dozens of civilians at a time, often with U.S.-provided munitions.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution states unequivocally that Congress shall have the power to declare war and to raise and support armies and other Armed Forces. That is Congress' prerogative in the Constitution.

Pursuant to the War Powers Resolution, the President must remove U.S. Armed Forces engaged in hostilities outside U.S. territory without a specific statutory authorization from Congress.

Congress must reclaim its constitutional role, and American complicity in the ongoing humanitarian crisis in Yemen must end. That is why I am glad to support H.J. Res. 37, which

would direct such a removal of U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities associated with the Saudi-led coalition war in Yemen.

Importantly, this legislation defines hostilities to include in-flight fueling of non-U.S. aircraft conducting counter-Houthi missions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this resolution.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chair, finally, this House is doing what the Constitution demands: to debate war and peace.

The problem here is that President Trump has essentially subcontracted out American foreign policy in the Middle East to a murderous Saudi regime, and the result has been that 85,000 little children under the age of five have been starved to death or have died of disease as a result of Saudi blockades and aggression. Indifference to their suffering is dooming a generation—unlawful, murderous airstrikes with bombs made in America on schools, on hospitals, on weddings, on markets.

All these people who speak out about the security of Israel and of America, they seem to have forgotten that these same Saudis have been giving away American-made weapons to al-Qaida—al-Qaida—once the sworn enemy of the Houthis about whom they complain.

The Saudi leadership, which approved the killing and dismemberment of an American resident journalist, is unsurprisingly not moved by the suffering of these children. They are intent on annihilation of the Yemenis.

We cannot let the slaughter continue in the name of American taxpayers. The Saudis do not represent our values, but they are using our tax dollars and our weapons.

Instead of shutting down our government, President Trump needs to shut down cooperation with the regime that tortures women who speak out, that kills its enemies who dare to speak the truth, and that is waging an immoral conflict, the world's largest humanitarian catastrophe.

Mr. Chairman, the days of symbolic action have far passed. Months, years, hundreds of small graves ago this Congress should have acted. Today, we can act to put a stop to this nonsense, this misappropriation of our values in the Middle East.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

I have listened to the arguments of my colleagues who say that Saudi Arabia is an ally and a partner and we have to support them. Saudi Arabia is a questionable ally—we all know that—

and it is time to reexamine that relationship.

But I have a question that this raises: If we have an ally that is engaged in violent strikes killing innocent civilians, including children, do we turn a blind eye and condone that behavior because it is “an ally”?

Do we condone the bombing of schools, of hospitals, of funerals because it is a partner or an ally?

Do we disregard our own responsibility as human beings to oppose violence against innocence because that violence is being perpetrated by an ally?

And, yes, it is true, our troops are not there, but our bombs are, our mid-air refuelers are, our targeting folks are.

We are allowing ourselves to be complicit in what is the greatest humanitarian tragedy that is on the face of this Earth at this moment. We should not be doing that, and we should stop by voting for this resolution.

Mr. Chair, we have a proud tradition in this country that both sides want to honor, and that is to stand up for freedom and for human decency and dignity.

This policy of Saudi Arabia to bomb and bomb again and bomb yet again, despite the devastating impact upon innocent people, despite how reckless and ineffective it is, must end. Let's end it.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers, so I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, let me state a few points.

We all condemn the murder of Khashoggi. I have condemned it publicly, very strongly, what happened with the Saudis killing Khashoggi, executing him.

We are talking about the situation in Yemen.

Who started this humanitarian crisis in the first place? The Houthis tried to take over the Yemeni Government—the Houthis, backed by Iran.

This is about the geopolitics of Iran, Houthis in Yemen, Iran and the Shia crescent in Iraq and Syria, and a direct threat to Israel by the largest state-sponsored terror, Iran, that is a mortal sworn enemy to Israel, as they chant “death to Israel,” “death to America.”

So let's put this all in proper context of what we are really talking about here. Are we defending Iran and the Houthis here today?

So I would like to close by putting two documents in the RECORD. The first is a letter sent by the Department of Defense Office of General Counsel stating that “DOD opposes the resolution because the resolution's fundamental premise is flawed” because the United States support to the Saudi-led coalition “does not involve any introduction of U.S. forces into hostilities.”

Are we going to go around and second-guess every security cooperation agreement we have with 117 countries, including Israel and NATO and other partners?

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD this letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,

Washington, DC, Feb. 27, 2018.

Hon. MITCHELL “MITCH” MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MAJORITY LEADER: On February 22, 2018, the Department of Defense (DoD) briefed your staff concerning DoD support to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's (KSA) operations in Yemen. Subsequently, you requested an unclassified letter reflecting DoD's views on a draft joint resolution that would “direct[] the President to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities in or affecting the Republic of Yemen, except United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula or associated forces. . . .” DoD opposes this Joint Resolution. Even if enacted into law, the Joint Resolution would not achieve its apparent purpose of restricting U.S. support to the KSA-led coalition, because, as described below, that support does not constitute “hostilities.” In addition to the potential constitutional concerns raised by such a proposal, the draft resolution's restrictions on U.S. military support to our partners could undermine our ability to foster long-term relationships, increase interoperability, promote burden sharing, and build strong security architectures throughout the world. The KSA is a key U.S. partner in the Middle East and we rely on our strong military partnership to promote regional security.

DoD opposes the resolution because the resolution's fundamental premise is flawed. Specifically, the draft resolution incorrectly asserts that U.S. forces have been “introduced into hostilities between the [KSA-led] coalition and the Houthis. . . .” The limited military and intelligence support that the United States is providing to the KSA-led coalition does not involve any introduction of U.S. forces into hostilities for purposes of the War Powers Resolution or of section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 USC 1546a).

Since 2015, the United States has provided limited support to KSA-led coalition military operations against Houthi and Saleh-aligned forces in Yemen. With the exception of a defensive strike in October 2016, U.S. forces are not taking direct military action in this Saudi-led effort in Yemen. Instead, the United States provides the KSA-led coalition defense articles and services, including air-to-air refueling; certain intelligence support; and military advice, including advice regarding compliance with the law of armed conflict and best practices for reducing the risk of civilian casualties.

The draft resolution incorrectly describes United States support to the KSA-led coalition as an operation that introduces U.S. forces into hostilities or imminent involvement in hostilities for purposes of the War Powers Resolution. It has been the longstanding view of the Executive Branch that “hostilities” refers to “a situation in which units of U.S. armed forces are actively engaged in exchanges of fire with opposing units of hostile forces.” U.S. personnel providing support to the KSA-led coalition are not engaged in any such exchanges of fire. Further, the limited U.S. support to the KSA-led coalition does not implicate the activities identified in section 8(c) of the War Powers Resolution. Section 8(c) defines the term “introduction of United States Armed Forces” but does not address the term “hostilities.” “[W]hen applying section 8(c), the

relevant question remains whether U.S. forces—not the foreign forces they are accompanying—are introduced into hostilities or situations involving the imminent threat thereof.” With respect to U.S. support to the KSA-led coalition, U.S. forces do not currently command, coordinate, accompany, or participate in the movement of coalition forces in counter-Houthi operations. Thus, no U.S. forces are accompanying the KSA-led coalition when its military forces are engaged, or an imminent threat exists that they will become engaged, in hostilities. Accordingly, U.S. forces supporting the KSA-led coalition have not been introduced into hostilities or situations where hostilities are imminent.

Although the resolution’s requirement to remove U.S. forces from hostilities would not implicate U.S. support to the KSA-led coalition, this requirement could call into question the statutory authority for ongoing U.S. counterterrorism operations in Yemen. Pursuant to the 2001 Authorization to Use Military Force (AUMF) (Public Law 107–40), U.S. armed forces are currently engaged in hostilities against both al-Qa’ida in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) and the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) in Yemen. Hostilities against AQAP and associated forces are explicitly exempted from the resolution’s termination requirement, but hostilities against ISIS are not similarly exempted.

The resolution also asserts incorrectly that there is no authorization for U.S. participation in a Joint Combined Planning Cell with the KSA and mid-air refueling of KSA-led coalition aircraft. President Obama directed such military and intelligence support pursuant to his authority under Article II of the Constitution as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive and his authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations. See *Fleming v. Page*, 50 U.S. (9 How.) 603, 615 (1850) (explaining that the President “is authorized to direct the movements of the naval and military forces placed by law at his command”); *Training of British Flying Students in the United States*, 40 Op. Att’y Gen. 58, 62 (1941) (“[T]he President’s authority has long been recognized as extending to the dispatch of armed forces outside the United States, either on missions of goodwill or rescue, or for the purpose of protecting American lives or property or American interests.”). Because, as discussed above, this limited support to the KSA does not involve the introduction of U.S. forces into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated, it does not implicate section 4(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution. See 50 U.S.C. §1543(a)(1). The Obama Administration published its summary of that limited support to the KSA-led coalition as part of the December 2016 “Report of the Legal and Policy Framework Guiding the United States Use of Military Force and Related National Security Operations.” As discussed further below, DoD and the Department of State have implemented the President’s direction through statutory authorities available to the respective Secretaries.

Article II of the Constitution likewise supplies the legal authority for the October 2016 strikes against radar facilities in Houthi-controlled territory in defense of U.S. Navy ships in international waters. The President has authority pursuant to Article II to take military action that furthers sufficiently important national interests. The limited October 2016 strikes were taken to protect U.S. vessels and personnel. Consistent with the War Powers Resolution, President Obama notified Congress of these strikes on October 14, 2016. The Obama Administration also published a summary of its legal analysis for the strike in its December 2016 report.

In late July 2017, President Trump completed a review of the Obama Administra-

tion’s policy of limited support to the Saudi-led coalition. President Trump decided to continue that support, adjusting the priorities in light of the recommendations of Secretary of Defense James Mattis and intervening developments in Yemen. President Trump’s policy guidance for support to the KSA-led coalition’s operations in Yemen is to focus on ending the war and avoiding a regional conflict, mitigating the humanitarian crisis, and defending Saudi Arabia’s territorial integrity and commerce in the Red Sea. Authorized types of support continue to include intelligence, logistics, and advisory support to the KSA-led coalition.

DoD and the Department of State have implemented the President’s policy guidance to provide limited support to the Saudi-led coalition pursuant to legal authorities available to the respective Secretaries. The most prominent forms of support to the KSA and the United Arab Emirates (UAE), as well as the corresponding legal authorities, are detailed below.

Arms and Other Defense Articles: The Arms Export Control Act (AECA) is the underlying authority through which the United States provides or licenses defense articles and defense services to the KSA, UAE, and other members of the KSA-led coalition; many of these defense articles and defense services have been used in the conflict in Yemen. The AECA and associated delegations of authority provide the Secretary of State with the authority to approve the transfer of arms and other defense articles and defense services, primarily through the Foreign Military Sales program (which is overseen by the State Department and implemented through DoD) and through the State Department’s licensing of Direct Commercial Sales to foreign partners. The authority to approve such transfers or licenses is not contingent upon whether the foreign recipient is engaged in an ongoing armed conflict, although the existence of such a conflict clearly increases demand and can be a policy factor in approval decisions. Transfers and licenses made pursuant to the AECA are subject to various requirements (such as notifications to Congress when transfers are above certain monetary thresholds) as well as restrictions on end-use (including no further transfer by the end-user without U.S. consent and that proposed uses must be consistent with the law of armed conflict).

Logistics: Pursuant to licenses issued by the State Department under the AECA, U.S. contractors provide defense services in the form of essential maintenance and sustainment for KSA and UAE combat aircraft engaged in hostilities in Yemen. The in-flight refueling of KSA and UAE aircraft, including combat aircraft, and certain other support, may also be provided pursuant to 10 U.S.C. §§2341 et seq., which authorizes DoD to provide logistic support, supplies, and services to the military forces of a country with which DoD has an Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreement (ACSA) in force. DoD must first obtain State Department approval to conclude an ACSA; DoD has ACSAs with the Ministry of Defense of the KSA (applied provisionally pending its formal entry into force) and with the Armed Forces General Headquarters of the UAE.

I trust that this response will be helpful to your understanding of U.S. support to the KSA’s operations in Yemen, and the reason for the DoD’s opposition to this proposed Joint Resolution. Thank you for your continued support of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM S. CASTLE,

Acting.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD this second document,

which is a Statement of Administration Policy on this point.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

S.J. RES. 54—TO DIRECT THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY THE CONGRESS—SEN. SANDERS, I-VT AND 16 COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly opposes passage of S.J. Res. 54, a joint resolution that purports to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces that have not been authorized by the Congress from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen. The fundamental premise of S.J. Res. 54 is flawed—United States forces are not engaged in hostilities between the Saudi-led coalition and Houthi forces in Yemen. Since 2015, the United States has provided limited support to member countries of the Emirati and Saudi-led coalition, including intelligence sharing, logistics, and, until recently, aerial refueling. This support is provided in accordance with licenses and approvals under the Arms Export Control Act, statutory authorities to provide logistics support, and the President’s constitutional powers. United States counterterrorism operations and an October 2016 strike on radar facilities in Houthi-controlled territory, which was the subject of a prior report consistent with the War Powers Resolution of 1973, are separate matters. Other than those engagements, no United States forces have been introduced into hostilities, or into situations where hostilities are clearly imminent, in connection with ongoing support to the Saudi-led coalition. As a result, this United States support does not implicate the War Powers Resolution.

In addition to its erroneous premise, the joint resolution would harm bilateral relationships in the region and negatively impact the ability of the United States to prevent the spread of violent extremist organizations such as al-Qa’ida in the Arabian Peninsula and ISIS in Yemen. The continued cooperation of the United States allows the Administration to support diplomatic negotiations to end the war, ensure humanitarian access, enhance efforts to recover United States hostages in Yemen, and defeat terrorists that seek to harm the United States.

Accordingly, if S.J. Res. 54 were presented to the President in its current form, his advisors would recommend that he veto the joint resolution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chair, I am deeply troubled by the one-sided nature of this resolution and what is missing from this resolution, which I just stated earlier, and that is Iran, the world’s leading state sponsor of terror and the Houthis’ benefactor. By staying silent on Iran and by not condemning the Houthis in this resolution, it sends a green light to the Houthis and to the Iranian backers to press on.

This resolution is counterproductive, also, to the efforts that are ongoing right now to negotiate peace in Yemen between the Houthi rebels and the Government of the Yemen Republic.

As we speak, the U.N. envoy is working with the full support of the United States to negotiate a political resolution to this conflict. Getting to these talks has required placing substantial pressure on all parties involved.

The U.N. is encouraging the Houthis to uphold these agreements and to make further agreements with the Yemeni Government and the Saudi-led

coalition. But this resolution might cut the U.N. efforts off at its knees.

The Democrats can't tell specifically what assistance this resolution cuts off, but what I can say for sure is that what this resolution says to the Houthis and to Iran is: You have got a green light. Keep going on. You can gain more ground and cause more destruction and humanitarian crisis and cause more problems for Israel and our Saudi ally.

Advancing this pro-Houthi, pro-Iran, anti-Israel resolution does not help to end this war. In Yemen, it only emboldens the rebels in Iran who violently overthrew Yemen's Government and the radical regime that backs them, Iran.

So I would say, Mr. Chairman, in closing, this resolution is not only a dangerous precedent legally—it violates the construction of the War Powers Act—but it is damaging and very bad policy, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Today is the day that Congress begins to take back its jurisdiction over war and peace. For time after time and year after year, administration after administration, Congress after Congress, the Congress has relinquished its responsibility given to us by the Constitution.

The Constitution clearly says that Congress has the power to wage war, and yet, since President Roosevelt declared war against Japan on December 7, 1941, we have had war after war and conflict after conflict, and Congress has not had anything to do with it. Congress has been silent.

This is not a matter of whether a war is a good war or a bad war. This is a matter of the fact that this Congress needs to make that determination.

Article I makes us a coequal branch of government. And, again, for too long, we have had administration after administration, Republican and Democratic, usurp the power that should be the Congress'. So this is the day my colleagues would begin to take it back.

Mr. Chair, I know that my friends on the other side of the aisle have been saying that this is not the best way to do it, but, you know, I have learned through the years that, if you don't take the bull by the horns, it is never the best way to do it.

There is always a reason not to do it. There is always a reason to point out certain things and say, well, this is not a perfect situation. This isn't the perfect situation. I will be the first to say that. But it is perfect in terms of saying we will take back our jurisdiction and do what the American people elect-ed us to do.

Again, I want to thank Mr. KHANNA for his tireless work on this issue.

As I mentioned, this measure is an important step in Congress reclaiming its role in foreign policy by debating

where and when the United States military is engaged abroad. I don't think that is too much to ask. I think that is what we should be doing.

With the humanitarian crisis in Yemen, it is critical that we act now. We can go after Iran another time—and heaven knows I have been the sponsor of many resolutions and bills sanctioning Iran—but this is not to mix apples with oranges.

There is a civil war going on now in Yemen, and innocent children are dying. We have an ability to put an end to that, and that is what we should do. With this humanitarian crisis, it is critical that we don't delay.

So I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 37, which would end U.S. involvement in the Yemen conflict that has claimed tens of thousands of lives and will soon enter its 4th year.

The humanitarian situation in Yemen is grave and deteriorating. Since the conflict began in 2015 between the Saudi-led military coalition and the Houthi militias, Yemen has faced what is widely recognized as the worst humanitarian crisis in the world.

The conflict has displaced millions of Yemenis, shattered the country, and triggered a famine that has 13 million men, women and children facing starvation.

Additionally, the country is facing an outbreak of cholera of unprecedented scale, with over a million cases of this disease because of the destruction of Yemen's water and sanitation infrastructure.

The United States has provided weapons, targeting assistance and refueling support to the Saudi-led coalition since the conflict began. However, this support was never authorized by Congress and is not covered by any existing Authorization for the Use of Military Force.

In addition, the coalition's bombing campaign has caused significant numbers of civilian casualties, and the conflict continues with no end in sight.

My district is home to a large Yemeni-American community, and I constantly hear stories of the suffering caused by the Yemen conflict and the dire humanitarian situation on the ground.

The breadth and magnitude of the humanitarian crisis is almost unimaginable, and we must take action to address this without delay.

This begins with ending our nation's involvement in the Yemen war. U.S. involvement in the Yemen conflict has undermined our nation's moral authority and has never been authorized by Congress.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this important resolution, which will send a strong signal that this Congress will not stand idly by in the face of such actions.

H.J. Res. 37 will help bring an end to the suffering of the Yemeni people and reassert Congress's authority as a coequal branch of government. It is my hope that passage of this resolution will be the first step toward healing Yemen and ending this brutal and senseless conflict.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 37, which directs the removal of United States Armed

Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

The passage of H.J. Res. 37 would mark the first time in the 45 years since the enactment of the War Powers Act that the House of Representatives successfully invoked the statute's removal mechanism to compel the Executive Branch to remove American troops from harm's way.

I support this resolution because, Congress has the sole power to declare war under Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the United States Constitution.

Mr. Chair, Congress has not declared war with respect to, or provided a specific statutory authorization for, the conflict between military forces led by Saudi Arabia, including forces from the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Kuwait, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Senegal, and Sudan (the Saudi-led coalition), against the Houthis, also known as Ansar Allah, in the Republic of Yemen.

Since March 2015, members of the United States Armed Forces have been introduced into hostilities between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis, including providing to the Saudi-led coalition aerial targeting assistance, intelligence sharing, and mid-flight aerial refueling.

The United States has established a Joint Combined Planning Cell with Saudi Arabia, in which members of the United States Armed Forces assist in aerial targeting and help to coordinate military and intelligence activities.

Mr. Chair, the conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis constitutes, within the meaning of Section 4(a) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543(a)), either hostilities or a situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances into which United States Armed Forces have been introduced.

Section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)) states that, "at any time that United States Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States, its possessions and territories without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President if the Congress so directs".

Most importantly, no specific statutory authorization for the use of United States Armed Forces with respect to the conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis in Yemen has been enacted.

Also, no provision of law explicitly authorizes the provision of targeting assistance or of midair refueling services to warplanes of Saudi Arabia or the United Arab Emirates that are engaged in such conflict.

For this reason, the resolution directs that the President remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities in or affecting the Republic of Yemen, except United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at al-Qaeda or associated forces, by not later than the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment.

The resolution makes clear that the term "hostilities" includes in-flight refueling, non-United States aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing civil war in Yemen.

Mr. Chair, Yemen is the largest humanitarian crisis in the world right now.

The Yemen crisis began in the Arab Spring of 2011, when an uprising forced the country's long-time authoritarian president, Ali Abdullah

Saleh, to hand over power to his deputy, Abdrabbuh Mansour Hadi.

Since 2015, Saudis Arabia has launched an estimated 18,000 air strikes on Yemen, attacking hospitals, schools, water treatment plants, funerals, markets and even farms.

The Saudis also imposed a blockade on food, fuel and medicine from freely entering the country in what can only be described as a deliberate effort to starve the civilian population into submission.

More than 14 million Yemenis are steps away from starvation and at least 85,000 children under the age of five have perished from war-related hunger and disease.

The United States has supported the Saudi-led air campaign with mid-air refueling support, intelligence and targeting assistance, and other support.

Yemen is experiencing the world's worst famine in 100 years, with 12 million to 13 million innocent civilians at risk of dying from the lack of food within months.

Mr. Chair, too many lives hang in the balance to allow American involvement in Yemen war to continue.

I ask all members to join me in supporting H.J. Res. 37.

□ 1515

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original joint resolution for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-4. The amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H. J. RES. 37

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Congress has the sole power to declare war under article I, section 8, clause 11 of the United States Constitution.

(2) Congress has not declared war with respect to, or provided a specific statutory authorization for, the conflict between military forces led by Saudi Arabia, including forces from the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Kuwait, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Senegal, and Sudan (the Saudi-led coalition), against the Houthis, also known as Ansar Allah, in the Republic of Yemen.

(3) Since March 2015, members of the United States Armed Forces have been introduced into hostilities between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis, including providing to the Saudi-led coalition aerial targeting assistance, intelligence sharing, and mid-flight aerial refueling.

(4) The United States has established a Joint Combined Planning Cell with Saudi Arabia, in which members of the United States Armed Forces assist in aerial targeting and help to coordinate military and intelligence activities.

(5) In December 2017, Secretary of Defense James N. Mattis stated, "We have gone in to be very—to be helpful where we can in identifying how you do target analysis and how you make certain you hit the right thing."

(6) The conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis constitutes, within the

meaning of section 4(a) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543(a)), either hostilities or a situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances into which United States Armed Forces have been introduced.

(7) Section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)) states that, "at any time that United States Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States, its possessions and territories without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President if the Congress so directs".

(8) Section 8(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(c)) defines the introduction of United States Armed Forces to include "the assignment of members of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become engaged, in hostilities", and activities that the United States is conducting in support of the Saudi-led coalition, including aerial refueling and targeting assistance, fall within this definition.

(9) Section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a) provides that any joint resolution or bill to require the removal of United States Armed Forces engaged in hostilities without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization shall be considered in accordance with the expedited procedures of section 601(b) of the International Security and Arms Export Control Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-329; 90 Stat. 765).

(10) No specific statutory authorization for the use of United States Armed Forces with respect to the conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis in Yemen has been enacted, and no provision of law explicitly authorizes the provision of targeting assistance or of midair refueling services to warplanes of Saudi Arabia or the United Arab Emirates that are engaged in such conflict.

SEC. 2. REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS.

Pursuant to section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a) and in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-329; 90 Stat. 765), Congress hereby directs the President to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities in or affecting the Republic of Yemen, except United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at al-Qaeda or associated forces, by not later than the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution (unless the President requests and Congress authorizes a later date), and unless and until a declaration of war or specific authorization for such use of United States Armed Forces has been enacted. For purposes of this resolution, in this section, the term "hostilities" includes in-flight refueling, non-United States aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing civil war in Yemen.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING CONTINUED MILITARY OPERATIONS AND COOPERATION WITH ISRAEL.

Nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to influence or disrupt any military operations and cooperation with Israel.

SEC. 4. REPORT ON RISKS POSED BY CEASING SAUDI ARABIA SUPPORT OPERATIONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the risks posed to United States citizens and the ci-

vilian population of Saudi Arabia and the risk of regional humanitarian crises if the United States were to cease support operations with respect to the conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis in Yemen.

SEC. 5. REPORT ON INCREASED RISK OF TERRORIST ATTACKS TO UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES ABROAD, ALLIES, AND THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES IF SAUDI ARABIA CEASES YEMEN-RELATED INTELLIGENCE SHARING WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the increased risk of terrorist attacks on United States Armed Forces abroad, allies, and to the continental United States if the Government of Saudi Arabia were to cease Yemen-related intelligence sharing with the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 116-8. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 1 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 116-8.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, after line 13, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING INTELLIGENCE SHARING.

Nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to influence or disrupt any intelligence, counterintelligence, or investigative activities conducted by, or in conjunction with, the United States Government involving—

- (1) the collection of intelligence;
- (2) the analysis of intelligence; or
- (3) the sharing of intelligence between the United States and any foreign country if the President determines such sharing is appropriate and in the national security interests of the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I am an original cosponsor of this resolution, and it was my understanding at the time that I cosponsored this that we would have the opportunity to make this resolution better. This amendment that I have offered does just that.

I actually thought of this amendment after the chairman of the committee held a hearing on this issue, and I listened carefully to the witnesses.

The witnesses talked about the fact that our intelligence sharing with Saudi Arabia helped target sites in Yemen to bomb and reduced civilian casualties.

I want to make sure that we continue to help Saudi Arabia reduce civilian casualties. I want to make sure that we are doing everything we can to avoid the humanitarian crisis there. At the same time, we recognize the geopolitical significance of our relationship with Saudi Arabia.

I support the resolution with the understanding that we have an opportunity to improve this legislation. I am concerned about how broadly the legislation is drafted, and it may inadvertently call into question our ability to maintain intelligence-sharing agreements around the globe; not just in this situation.

My amendment addresses these potential unintended consequences by guaranteeing that this resolution does not curtail our Nation's intelligence-sharing capabilities. It ensures our country will not face another major terrorist attack or be caught flat-footed in battle because the necessary intelligence information didn't reach our leaders.

My amendment keeps the spirit of this important legislation intact, while ensuring that this Congress isn't hamstringing our intelligence capabilities.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment that will keep our intelligence sharing agreements in place.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I yield myself 1 minute. I actually support intelligence sharing. We need to work to reduce civilian casualties and ensure that the United States has a clear picture into the security threats in the region.

However, this amendment is unnecessary. The underlying resolution does not implicate intelligence sharing. I have been very clear about what this resolution would do. We have made necessary changes to this resolution, but I do not support adding unnecessary rules of construction to a resolution which has already passed the Senate.

For that reason, I am opposed to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, but it doesn't. This resolution is not clear, and that is the problem. This amendment clarifies something that is unclear.

My friends on the other side of the aisle feel that we must cut our intelligence-sharing operations in order to fully withdraw our forces from the re-

gion. I don't believe that this is the right course.

The Middle East is a dangerous, war-torn part of the world where we need intelligence sharing more than ever. As such, we must ensure that we are not putting our intelligence agreements in jeopardy by passing this resolution.

My amendment keeps the intent of this legislation, allowing Congress to exercise its Article I powers, while ensuring that we are not cutting off our nose to spite our face.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BUCK. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 177, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

AYES—252

Abraham	DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (SD)
Allen	Duffy	Jordan
Amodei	Duncan	Joyce (OH)
Armstrong	Dunn	Joyce (PA)
Arrington	Emmer	Kaptur
Axne	Estes	Katko
Babin	Ferguson	Kelly (MS)
Bacon	Finkenauer	Kelly (PA)
Baird	Fitzpatrick	Kim
Balderson	Fleischmann	King (IA)
Banks	Flores	King (NY)
Barr	Fortenberry	Kuster (NH)
Bergman	Fox (NC)	Kustoff (TN)
Biggs	Fulcher	LaHood
Bilirakis	Gaetz	LaMalfa
Bishop (UT)	Gallagher	Lamb
Bost	Gianforte	Lamborn
Brady	Gibbs	Latta
Brindisi	Gohmert	Lee (NV)
Brooks (AL)	Golden	Lesko
Brooks (IN)	Gonzalez (OH)	Loeb sack
Buchanan	González-Colón	Long
Buck	(PR)	Loudermilk
Bucshon	Gooden	Lucas
Budd	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Burchett	Gottheimer	Luria
Burgess	Granger	Lynch
Bustos	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Byrne	Graves (LA)	Marshall
Calvert	Graves (MO)	Mast
Carter (GA)	Green (TN)	McAdams
Carter (TX)	Griffith	McBath
Case	Grothman	McCarthy
Chabot	Guest	McCaul
Cheney	Guthrie	McClintock
Cisneros	Hagedorn	McHenry
Cline	Harder (CA)	McKinley
Cloud	Harris	Meadows
Cole	Hartzler	Meuser
Collins (GA)	Hastings	Miller
Collins (NY)	Hern, Kevin	Mitchell
Comer	Herrera Beutler	Moolenaar
Conaway	Hice (GA)	Mooney (WV)
Cook	Higgins (LA)	Morelle
Correa	Hill (AR)	Moulton
Craig	Hill (CA)	Mullin
Crawford	Holding	Murphy
Crenshaw	Hollingsworth	Newhouse
Crow	Horn, Kendra S.	Norman
Cuellar	Horsford	Nunes
Cunningham	Houlahan	O'Halleran
Curtis	Hudson	Olson
Dauids (KS)	Huizenga	Palazzo
Davidson (OH)	Hunter	Palmer
Davis, Rodney	Hurd (TX)	Panetta
Delgado	Johnson (LA)	Pappas

Pence	Schrier	Torres Small
Perlmutter	Schweikert	(NM)
Perry	Scott (VA)	Turner
Peterson	Scott, Austin	Upton
Phillips	Sensenbrenner	Van Drew
Porter	Sherman	Wagner
Posey	Sherrill	Walberg
Ratcliffe	Shimkus	Walden
Reed	Simpson	Walker
Reschenthaler	Slotkin	Walorski
Rice (SC)	Smith (MO)	Waltz
Riggelman	Smith (NE)	Waters
Roby	Smith (NJ)	Watkins
Rodgers (WA)	Smucker	Weber (TX)
Roe, David P.	Spanberger	Webster (FL)
Rogers (AL)	Spano	Wenstrup
Rogers (KY)	Stauber	Westerman
Rooney (FL)	Stefanik	Wexton
Rose (NY)	Steil	Williams
Rose, John W.	Steube	Wilson (SC)
Rouda	Stevens	Wittman
Rouzer	Stewart	Womack
Roy	Stivers	Woodall
Ruiz	Taylor	Wright
Rush	Thompson (PA)	Yoho
Rutherford	Thornberry	Young
Scalise	Timmons	Zeldin
Schrader	Tipton	

NOES—177

Adams	Gabbard	Neal
Aguilar	Gallego	Neguse
Amash	Garamendi	Norcross
Barragán	Garcia (IL)	Norton
Bass	García (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez
Beatty	Gomez	Omar
Bera	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Beyer	Green (TX)	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Peters
Blumenauer	Haaland	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Hayes	Plaskett
Bonamici	Heck	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins (NY)	Pressley
F.	Himes	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Raskin
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carbajal	Jayapal	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Sablan
Cartwright	Johnson (TX)	San Nicolas
Casten (IL)	Keating	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Scanlon
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Schiff
Cicilline	Kildee	Schneider
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Serrano
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Sewell (AL)
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Shalala
Clyburn	Langevin	Sires
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Smith (WA)
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Soto
Cooper	Lawrence	Speier
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Stanton
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Suozi
Cox (CA)	Levin (CA)	Swalwell (CA)
Crist	Levin (MI)	Takano
Cummings	Lewis	Thompson (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Thompson (MS)
Davis, Danny K.	Lipinski	Titus
Dean	Lofgren	Tlaib
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Tonko
DeGette	Lowey	Torres (CA)
DeLauro	Luján	Trahan
DelBene	Malinowski	Trone
Demings	Maloney	Underwood
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Vargas
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Doggett	Matsui	Vela
Doyle, Michael	F.	Velázquez
F.	McCollum	Visclosky
Engel	McEachin	Wasserman
Escobar	McGovern	Schultz
Eshoo	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Españillat	Meeks	Welch
Evans	Meng	Wild
Fletcher	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Mucarsel-Powell	Yarmuth
Frankel	Nadler	
Fudge	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—8

Allred	Payne	Ryan
Dingell	Quigley	Sánchez
Kinzinger	Radewagen	

□ 1556

Messrs. GONZALEZ of Texas, GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Messrs. COHEN, SCHNEIDER, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. JEFFRIES changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. WILSON of South Carolina, MCHENRY, MARCHANT, WALKER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Messrs. CORREA, CUELLAR, BROOKS of Alabama, and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. RUSH. Madam Chair, during Roll Call Vote number 81 on H.J. Res. 37, the Buck Amendment, I mistakenly recorded my vote as Yes when I should have voted No.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) having assumed the chair, Ms. PLASKETT, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress, and, pursuant to House Resolution 122, she reported the joint resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kustoff of Tennessee moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 37 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end of section 1 the following:

(1) It is in the national security interest of the United States to combat anti-Semitism around the world because—

(A) anti-Semitism is a challenge to the basic principles of tolerance, pluralism, and democracy, and the shared values that bind Americans together;

(B) there has been a significant amount of anti-Semitic and anti-Israel hatred that must be most strongly condemned; and

(C) there is an urgent need to ensure the safety and security of Jewish communities, including synagogues, schools, cemeteries, and other institutions.

(2) It is in the foreign policy interest of the United States to continue to emphasize the importance of combating anti-Semitism in our bilateral and multilateral relations, including with the United Nations, European Union institutions, Arab League, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

(3) Because it is important to the national security interest of the United States to maintain strong bipartisan support for Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East, all attempts to delegitimize and deny Israel's right to exist must be denounced and rejected.

(4) It is in the national security interest of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against other countries friendly to the United States or against any United States person.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It would not kill the bill nor send it back to committee. If adopted, the resolution will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, the attack in October last year against the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh was a devastating assault on the Jewish community. By inflicting violence on a neighborhood congregation's Shabbat morning service, the gunman sent a bone-chilling message; even in 2018, hate-filled individuals will attack Jews simply for being Jewish.

The Anti-Defamation League believes that this is the deadliest attack on the Jewish community in the history of the United States of America. This tragedy is merely one part of an upsetting development that has emerged in recent years, a resurgence of anti-Semitism around the globe.

The Anti-Defamation League reported a 60 percent rise in anti-Semitic incidents in the United States from 2016 to 2017.

In December, the European Union released a survey of over 16,000 European Jews, which reported that “anti-Semitism pervades everyday life,” undermining European Jews' feelings of safety and security.

Mr. Speaker, we should all be alarmed by this international trend. No one should be forced to live in fear of violence, or be deterred from participating in their faith community.

The United States must remain a global leader, not only in speaking out against anti-Semitism, but in holding those who enable these vile beliefs accountable.

Our motion to recommit adds language to H.J. Res. 37 that affirms that it is in the national security interest of the United States to combat anti-Semitism around the world. It states that we must make combating anti-Semitism a priority in all of our diplomatic relationships; and we need to ensure that Jews around the world feel safe in their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I remain deeply concerned by the measure the Democrats have called up today on Yemen, but if this resolution is going to move forward, it should do so while making a strong statement that the United States has no tolerance for anti-Semitism.

I urge all Members to stand in solidarity with Jews around the world and support the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I accept this resolution, and I agree with everything that Mr. KUSTOFF just said. Anti-Semitism is a scourge. It is a scourge on humanity; it is a scourge on this country; and it has to be fought just the way prejudice of any kind has to be fought.

I think that this entire House should support this and say, once and for all, with a united voice, we will not tolerate anti-Semitism in any shape or form.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of the joint resolution, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 995, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, answered “present” 2, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

AYES—424

Abraham	Allen	Axne
Adams	Amodei	Babin
Aderholt	Armstrong	Bacon
Aguilar	Arrington	Baird

Balderson Duncan
 Banks Dunn
 Barr Emmer
 Barragán Engel
 Bass Escobar
 Beatty Eshoo
 Bera Espaillat
 Bergman Estes
 Beyer Evans
 Biggs Ferguson
 Bilirakis Finkenauer
 Bishop (GA) Fitzpatrick
 Bishop (UT) Fleischmann
 Blumenauer Fletcher
 Blunt Rochester Flores
 Bonamici Fortenberry
 Bost Foster
 Boyle, Brendan F. Foxx (NC)
 Frankel
 Brady Fudge
 Brindisi Fulcher
 Brooks (AL) Gabbard
 Brooks (IN) Gaetz
 Brown (MD) Gallagher
 Brownley (CA) Gallego
 Buchanan Garamendi
 Buck Garcia (IL)
 Bucshon Garcia (TX)
 Budd Gianforte
 Burchett Gibbs
 Burgess Gohmert
 Bustos Golden
 Butterfield Gomez
 Byrner Gonzalez (OH)
 Calvert Gonzalez (TX)
 Carbajal Gooden
 Cárdenas Gosar
 Carson (IN) Gottheimer
 Carter (GA) Granger
 Carter (TX) Graves (GA)
 Cartwright Graves (LA)
 Case Graves (MO)
 Casten (IL) Green (TN)
 Castor (FL) Green (TX)
 Castro (TX) Griffith
 Chabot Grijalva
 Cheney Grothman
 Chu, Judy Guest
 Cicilline Guthrie
 Cisneros Haaland
 Clark (MA) Hagedorn
 Clarke (NY) Harder (CA)
 Clay Harris
 Cleaver Hartzler
 Cline Hastings
 Cloud Hayes
 Clyburn Heck
 Cohen Hern, Kevin
 Cole Herrera Beutler
 Collins (GA) Hice (GA)
 Collins (NY) Higgins (LA)
 Comer Higgins (NY)
 Conaway Hill (AR)
 Connolly Hill (CA)
 Cook Himes
 Cooper Holding
 Correa Hollingsworth
 Costa Horn, Kendra S.
 Courtney Horsford
 Cox (CA) Houlihan
 Craig Hoyer
 Crawford Hudson
 Crenshaw Huffman
 Crist Huizenga
 Crow Hunter
 Cuellar Hurd (TX)
 Cummings Jackson Lee
 Cunningham Jayapal
 Curtis Jeffries
 Davids (KS) Johnson (GA)
 Davidson (OH) Johnson (LA)
 Davis (CA) Johnson (OH)
 Davis, Danny K. Johnson (SD)
 Davis, Rodney Johnson (TX)
 Dean Jordan
 DeFazio Joyce (OH)
 DeGette Joyce (PA)
 DeLauro Kaptur
 DelBene Katko
 Delgado Keating
 Demings Kelly (IL)
 DeSaulnier Kelly (MS)
 DesJarlais Kelly (PA)
 Deutch Kennedy
 Diaz-Balart Khanna
 Doggett Kildee
 Doyle, Michael Kim
 F. Kim
 Duffy Kind

King (IA) Raskin
 King (NY) Ratcliffe
 Kirkpatrick Reed
 Krishnamoorthi Reschenthaler
 Kuster (NH) Rice (NY)
 Kustoff (TN) Rice (SC)
 LaHood Richmond
 LaMalfa Rigglesman
 Lamb Roby
 Lamborn Rodgers (WA)
 Langevin Roe, David P.
 Larsen (WA) Rogers (AL)
 Larson (CT) Rogers (KY)
 Latta Rooney (FL)
 Lawrence Rose (NY)
 Lawson (FL) Rose, John W.
 Lee (CA) Rouda
 Lee (NV) Rouzer
 Lesko Roy
 Levin (CA) Roybal-Allard
 Levin (MI) Ruiz
 Lewis Ruppertsberger
 Lieu, Ted Rush
 Lipinski Rutherford
 Loebsack Sánchez
 Lofgren Sarbanes
 Long Scalise
 Loudermilk Scanlon
 Lowenthal Schakowsky
 Lowey Schiff
 Lucas Schneider
 Luetkemeyer Schrader
 Luján Schrier
 Luria Schweikert
 Lynch Scott (VA)
 Malinowski Scott, Austin
 Maloney, Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean Serrano
 Marchant Sewell (AL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2
 Amash Massie
 NOT VOTING—5
 Allred Kinzinger Ryan
 Dingell Quigley

□ 1616

Mr. VISCLOSKY changed his vote from "nay" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report the joint resolution, H.J. Res 37, back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL:

Add at the end of section 1 the following:

(1) It is in the national security interest of the United States to combat anti-Semitism around the world because—

(A) anti-Semitism is a challenge to the basic principles of tolerance, pluralism, and democracy, and the shared values that bind Americans together;

(B) there has been a significant amount of anti-Semitic and anti-Israel hatred that must be most strongly condemned; and

(C) there is an urgent need to ensure the safety and security of Jewish communities, including synagogues, schools, cemeteries, and other institutions.

(2) It is in the foreign policy interest of the United States to continue to emphasize the importance of combating anti-Semitism in our bilateral and multilateral relations, including with the United Nations, European Union institutions, Arab League, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

(3) Because it is important to the national security interest of the United States to maintain strong bipartisan support for Israel, the only democracy in the Middle

East, all attempts to delegitimize and deny Israel's right to exist must be denounced and rejected.

(14) It is in the national security interest of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against other countries friendly to the United States or against any United States person.

Mr. McCAUL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

Mr. HOYER. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.
 The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 177, answered "present" 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]
 YEAS—248

Adams	Courtney	Gottheimer
Aguilar	Cox (CA)	Green (TX)
Axne	Craig	Griffith
Barragán	Crist	Grijalva
Bass	Crow	Haaland
Beatty	Cuellar	Harder (CA)
Bera	Cummings	Hastings
Beyer	Cunningham	Hayes
Biggs	Davids (KS)	Heck
Bishop (GA)	Davidson (OH)	Higgins (NY)
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Hill (CA)
Blunt Rochester	Davis, Danny K.	Himes
Bonamici	Dean	Hollingsworth
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeFazio	Horn, Kendra S.
Brindisi	DeGette	Horsford
Brooks (AL)	DeLauro	Houlihan
Brown (MD)	DelBene	Hoyer
Brownley (CA)	Delgado	Huffman
Buck	Demings	Jackson Lee
Bustos	DeSaulnier	Jayapal
Butterfield	Deuth	Jeffries
Carbajal	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Cárdenas	Doyle, Michael F.	Johnson (TX)
Carson (IN)	Engel	Jordan
Cartwright	Escobar	Kaptur
Case	Eshoo	Keating
Casten (IL)	Espaillat	Kelly (IL)
Castor (FL)	Evans	Kennedy
Castro (TX)	Finkenauer	Khanna
Chu, Judy	Fletcher	Kildee
Cicilline	Foster	Kilmer
Cisneros	Frankel	Kim
Clark (MA)	Fudge	Kind
Clarke (NY)	Gabbard	Kirkpatrick
Clay	Gaetz	Krishnamoorthi
Cleaver	Gallego	Kuster (NH)
Cloud	Garamendi	Lamb
Clyburn	Garcia (IL)	Langevin
Cohen	Garcia (TX)	Larsen (WA)
Connolly	Gohmert	Larson (CT)
Correa	Golden	Lawrence
Costa	Gomez	Lawson (FL)
	Gonzalez (TX)	Lee (CA)
		Lee (NV)

Levin (CA)	Pallone	Sires
Levin (MI)	Panetta	Slotkin
Lewis	Pappas	Smith (WA)
Lieu, Ted	Pascrell	Soto
Lipinski	Payne	Spanberger
Loeb sack	Perlmut ter	Speier
Lofgren	Peters	Stanton
Lowenthal	Peterson	Stevens
Lowey	Phillips	Suo zzi
Lujan	Pingree	Swalwell (CA)
Luria	Pocan	Takano
Lynch	Porter	Thompson (CA)
Malinowski	Posey	Thompson (MS)
Maloney,	Pressley	Tipton
Carolyn B.	Price (NC)	Titus
Maloney, Sean	Raskin	Tlaib
Massie	Rice (NY)	Tonko
Matsui	Richmond	Torres (CA)
McAdams	Rose (NY)	Torres Small
McBath	Rouda	(NM)
McCollum	Roy	Trahan
McEachin	Roybal-Allard	Trone
McGovern	Ruiz	Underwood
McNerney	Ruppersberger	Van Drew
Meadows	Rush	Vargas
Meeks	Sánchez	Veasey
Meng	Sarbanes	Vela
Mooney (WV)	Scanlon	Velázquez
Moore	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Morelle	Schiff	Wasserman
Moulton	Schneider	Schultz
Mucarsel-Powell	Schrader	Waters
Murphy	Schrier	Watson Coleman
Nadler	Schweikert	Webster (FL)
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Welch
Neal	Scott, David	Wexton
Neguse	Serrano	Wild
Norcross	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (FL)
O'Halleran	Shalala	Yarmuth
Ocasio-Cortez	Sherman	
Omar	Sherrill	

NAYS—177

Abraham	Gibbs	Moolenaar
Aderholt	Gonzalez (OH)	Mullin
Allen	Gooden	Newhouse
Amodei	Gosar	Norman
Armstrong	Granger	Nunes
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Olson
Babin	Graves (LA)	Palazzo
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Palmer
Baird	Green (TN)	Pence
Balderson	Grothman	Perry
Banks	Guest	Ratcliffe
Barr	Guthrie	Reed
Bergman	Hagedorn	Reschenthaler
Bilirakis	Harris	Rice (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Riggleman
Bost	Hern, Kevin	Roby
Brady	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers (WA)
Brooks (IN)	Hice (GA)	Roe, David P.
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Hill (AR)	Rogers (KY)
Budd	Holding	Rooney (FL)
Burchett	Hudson	Rose, John W.
Burgess	Huizenga	Rouzer
Byrne	Hunter	Rutherford
Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Johnson (SD)	Shimkus
Cheney	Joyce (OH)	Simpson
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Smith (MO)
Cole	Katko	Smith (NE)
Collins (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NJ)
Collins (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Comer	King (IA)	Spano
Conaway	King (NY)	Stauber
Cook	Kustoff (TN)	Stefanik
Crawford	LaHood	Steil
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Steube
Curtis	Lamborn	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Latta	Stivers
DesJarlais	Lesko	Taylor
Diaz-Balart	Long	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	Loudermilk	Thornberry
Duncan	Lucas	Timmons
Dunn	Luetkemeyer	Turner
Emmer	Marchant	Upton
Estes	Marshall	Wagner
Ferguson	Mast	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Walden
Fleischmann	McCaul	Walker
Flores	McClintock	Walorski
Fortenberry	McHenry	Waltz
Foxx (NC)	McKinley	Watkins
Fulcher	Meuser	Weber (TX)
Gallagher	Miller	Wenstrup
Gianforte	Mitchell	Westerman

Williams	Womack	Yoho
Wilson (SC)	Woodall	Young
Wittman	Wright	Zeldin

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—5

Allred	Kinzinger	Ryan
Dingell	Quigley	

□ 1628

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained this afternoon immediately following the vote on final passage of H.J. Res. 37. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 83.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, as I am back home in Dallas, Texas on paternity leave with my family, I submit the following vote explanation. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 78, "yea" on rollcall No. 79, "yea" on rollcall No. 80, "yea" on rollcall No. 81, "yea" on rollcall No. 82, and "yea" on rollcall No. 83.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE LATE HONORABLE WALTER B. JONES

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues in the North Carolina delegation, to remember and honor the life of Representative Walter Jones, Jr., a treasured colleague, a conscientious public servant, and a personal friend to many across this Chamber.

Walter died on February 10, his 76th birthday. He lived a life full of service: 4 years in the North Carolina National Guard, 10 years in the North Carolina General Assembly, and nearly a quarter century in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Walter and I met long before either of us served in the House. We worked together on the North Carolina Presidential campaign of Jimmy Carter in 1976. I have a photo on my desk of a very youthful-looking campaign team to prove it.

Walter went on to chart a different course politically, a course that was uniquely his own. In fact, he found himself frequently at odds with if not one party, then the other. But by the same token, he sometimes found possibilities for alliances and cooperation in unexpected places and did not hesitate to take those opportunities.

This approach was rooted in Walter's strong conscience and his personal sincerity. He stood out in an age when sincerity is sometimes in short supply in our Nation's politics, earning him respect and admiration on both sides of the aisle. The outpouring of tributes and remembrances we have seen in recent days is a testament to that fact.

Much has been said about the personal encounters Walter had with veterans of the Iraq war and the families of those who never returned, and how these encounters led him to reassess his past and present policy stances.

Walter sent over 10,000 letters to families of fallen troops, and he memorialized those who died from North Carolina's Camp Lejeune with photos outside his office.

Walter's determined and effective voice for our military—certainly, the Marines especially—and his deep love for his home State of North Carolina will be missed in these halls and in the coastal, farming, and military communities that make up the Third Congressional District.

We extend heartfelt condolences to Walter's wife, Joe Anne; his daughter, Ashley; his loyal staff; and the countless friends, neighbors, and community members whose lives he touched along the way. Our State, our Nation, and the institution of Congress will be poorer without him.

We will miss Walter's reliable and cordial presence right here in this center aisle.

Mr. Speaker, before we observe a moment of silence in Walter's honor, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the senior Republican in the North Carolina delegation.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PRICE for yielding and for his wonderful comments remembering Walter.

On behalf of the Republican Members of the North Carolina delegation—indeed, all the Members of our Republican Conference—we remember our long-serving colleague, Walter B. Jones, already miss him, and express our prayers for him and his family.

Walter asked to be memorialized on the floor by his dear friend THOMAS MASSIE, and Mr. PRICE will yield to him in a moment for that purpose.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for those remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PRICE for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague and my great friend, Walter Jones, was both courageous and kind.

He frequently quoted a statement by Senator John Ashcroft's father: "Washington is the spirit of arrogance, and Christ is the spirit of humility." Walter had the spirit of Christ.

It didn't matter if you were a waiter at his table, a summer intern in his office, or the chairman of his committee, Walter extended the same respect to everyone. In his heart, he never believed that he was any better than the most common person.

Walter's chief, Josh, who has been with him for 16 years, reminded me that some people in Washington, DC, kiss up and punch down. Walter often did the opposite. Walter would kiss down and punch up.