



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 9, 2020

No. 5

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2020, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO FIX THE WAR POWERS ACT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, undeniably the worst foreign policy mistake in the history of the United States of America was the invasion of Iraq based on phoned-up intelligence that was trumpeted by Dick Cheney, Scooter Libby, and other characters in the Bush administration.

But just this last week, President Trump took us to the verge of an even worse foreign policy mistake in the Middle East. He recklessly and impatiently took us to the brink of war that would have been even worse.

Now, yesterday, I went to the so-called intelligence briefing. They offered no intelligence regarding immediate imminent threats to the United States, our troops, or allies in the region.

They did certainly make a case that Soleimani was a rotten guy and he was responsible for many, many deaths of Americans and others in the region, but that is all recited past history that

didn't talk about any immediate threats or any intelligence that would lead to it.

They further went on to say that the legal justification was the Authorization for Use of Military Force in the invasion of Iraq, which, of course, was based on phony intelligence regarding weapons of mass destruction he didn't have. So that is even more extraordinary if you think about that.

Last week, also, the President tweeted what he said was his compliance with war powers. He then went on to tweet a threat of all-out war against Iran, and then he went further to tweet that he would order that war crimes be committed during an all-out war against Iran.

That was walked back a little bit by the Secretary of Defense who said they would follow the law. And then Trump later said: I like laws. I will follow the laws. So he walked back from saying he was going to destroy cultural threats a little bit.

Today, on the floor of the House, we will take up a rebuke of the President for those actions. Hopefully, we will go further and we will repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force from 2002 based on fake intelligence.

We will further, hopefully, take up legislation that was adopted as an amendment to the defense authorization last summer, with bipartisan support, to say that the President couldn't initiate hostilities against Iran without first coming to Congress.

Congress has the authority, and only Congress has the authority, to declare war. Once we are at war, the President, as Commander in Chief, can utilize the Armed Forces as he sees fit.

But the President does not have the authority. This is extraconstitutional when it isn't an attack or an imminent attack on the United States, its troops, or its citizens.

So we need to do those things.

Further, we need to fix the War Powers Act. That was adopted after the il-

legal actions of another President, Richard Nixon, the bombing of Cambodia.

There were two versions. One followed the Constitution, and said, no, no, any offensive actions into hostilities you first have to come to Congress. The second version said, well, you can initiate them, but you have to report within 48 hours, and if Congress doesn't authorize it within 60 days, you have to withdraw. That was defective and weak and doesn't reflect at all the congressional duties of this body.

Now, I know a lot of Members love to dodge the issues of war and peace—it is the toughest vote you can make—and that is essentially what they did at the time, a wink and a nod: Well, we will let the President do these things. Hey, if it works out, we will take credit; if it doesn't work out, oh, well, then we can castigate him later.

So I have introduced, yet again, a bill that comprehensively reforms the War Powers Act to reflect the constitutional authorities and duties of the United States Congress. It would say that the President cannot initiate hostilities without first coming to Congress.

It would define what consultation means. It doesn't mean a tweet to the Congress. It doesn't mean sending up a letter. It means a meaningful consultation. It establishes an executive legislative consultative group.

It also includes, most importantly, a sunset clause for any authorization by Congress.

I mean, a thousand years from now, the United States, I guess, if we don't repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force, can attack whatever Iraq is a thousand years from now. That is absolutely absurd.

Finally, it does give Congress the authority and standing to go to the courts should the President violate the Constitution and the War Powers Act in the future—any President.

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

I have had problems with both Democratic and Republican Presidents over this issue over the years: Clinton, Bosnia; Bush, obviously in a number of cases; and then Obama in Libya and other things that they did, also based on the fake intelligence in the 2002 authorization.

So let's first vote today. That is just a starting point in reasserting our constitutional duties.

IRAN IS A TERROR STATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, as a terror state, Iran is no friend of the United States or our allies. For three decades, Iran has been a leading state sponsor of terrorism and an eager empire builder. Its history of money laundering, terrorism, and murder of U.S. soldiers is undeniable.

Last week, the President, as Commander in Chief, took the legal and decisive action when he eliminated terrorist combatant leader Qasem Soleimani from the battlefield. Across the years in the region, this man of murder has the blood of hundreds of thousands of innocents on his hands.

To refer to this combat operation as an assassination or to offer moral equivalence between Soleimani and a state-sponsored terror organization with a rule-following nation actively engaged in the family of nations is laughable.

In my view, Soleimani ranks up there with the worst exporters of terror in the region, including the likes of Osama bin Laden or al-Baghdadi, the most recent demised head of ISIS.

Over these three decades, the United States and our allies have faced greater and more violent Iranian or Iranian proxy attacks orchestrated by the terror general Soleimani against the United States and our allies, dating as far back as 1983, when Iran's proxy Hezbollah committed the Beirut, Lebanon, bombing, killing 241 marines.

Soleimani, Iran, Hezbollah, and their thirst for violence is well documented and undeniable. In the face of this record and their very aggressive actions of the last few weeks, including the killing of an American contractor, targeting of U.S. forces, attacking Saudi Arabian oil operations, disrupting shipping in the Persian Gulf, shooting down an American drone, and then blatantly and aggressively attacking our Embassy in Baghdad, President Trump has been quite restrained during the course of that record.

However, the killing of an American contractor and orchestrating that storming and destruction at the American Embassy in Baghdad and the eminent planning of additional threats that this Congress learned the details of yesterday and attacks potentially on American troops or diplomats was the final straw.

Mr. Speaker, the provocateur is Iran, not President Trump. The assassin is Soleimani, not President Trump. The destabilizing force in the region is Iran, not the United States.

Yesterday, President Trump reiterated that the United States does not seek to start a war with Iran. His recent actions have sent an unambiguous signal to Iran and their proxies: Harm Americans, pay a price.

President Trump's objectives are clear: End Iran's export of terror; end its advancing regional ballistic missile capabilities; and prohibit their obtaining a nuclear weapon.

Instead, President Trump encourages the Iranian people to assert their own aspirations and form a more open and pluralistic future for their children and their children's children. This rich, historic land deserves to return to a time when the beautiful, intelligent Iranian people chart their own course for good, as citizens of a country eager to be part of the family of nations.

SAY NO TO ANOTHER WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with the thousands of patriots who are taking to the streets of towns and cities throughout our Nation later today, taking to the streets to stand up, to speak out, and to say no to yet another war in the Middle East.

Less than 48 hours ago, our Nation was gripped by fear as we watched missiles rain down on our servicemembers and other allied forces in Iraq, an attack that was a direct response to this administration's reckless and impulsive decisions to assassinate a high-ranking military leader in Iran.

Like so many of my colleagues, I prayed. I prayed for all of the servicemembers and their families. I prayed for the innocent civilians in Iraq who once again find themselves in the crossfire in a battlefield of our own making. I prayed for peace.

But I also know perfectly well that the people of the Massachusetts 7th did not send me to Washington, D.C., to just pray. As a woman of faith, I will continue to send prayers up and to work for peace. But what this moment demands and what this country deserves is a strategy.

For more than 3 years now, this administration has been devoid of a coherent approach, instead implementing our Nation's foreign policy like a game of Battleship. They have actively incited further conflict in the region, abandoned diplomacy, and isolated our country from even our strongest allies.

The administration tore up the international agreement keeping Iran from developing nuclear weapons. The administration then engaged in a maximum pressure campaign that has rav-

aged the Iranian economy and harmed innocent civilians.

Yesterday, the White House had the opportunity to change course. Instead, we heard more of the same.

Let me be clear: We cannot allow our country to be lied into another war. We have the opportunity to learn from the mistakes of our past.

For nearly two decades, endless wars have claimed the lives of hundreds and thousands of civilians and servicemembers alike. An entire generation has only known war. Millions of refugees have been permanently displaced.

I remind my colleagues today that war is never inevitable. We reject the false choice between peace and security.

The 116th Congress is a fundamentally different Congress, and it is time to advocate for a fundamentally different foreign policy: foreign policy centered in the dignity and humanity of all people.

Prayers alone will not suffice. We need prayers and strategy. This is our chance. Let me be abundantly clear. The American people do not want war.

□ 1015

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION DOES NOT LIMIT THE PRESIDENT'S POWER TO ACT WITHOUT CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to a dangerous and partisan resolution offered by my Democrat colleagues designed to handcuff our President and limit his constitutional authorities as Commander in Chief to defend our Nation against Iranian aggression.

The resolution before us today needlessly politicizes our national security and shows that Democrats have once again put their partisan agenda ahead of the American people simply because they do not like President Trump.

Let's be clear. President Trump's decisive and defensive action to eliminate the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps Quds Force commander, Qasem Soleimani, is not the reason for the recent escalation between the United States and Iran. The President ordered the strike because of Iran's own escalation and aggression, for which General Soleimani was largely and personally responsible.

For over 40 years, Iran and its proxies have been attacking U.S. interests and our allies, but since the flawed Iran nuclear deal, under which the regime received billions of dollars in sanctions relief, the Islamic republic has used that economic windfall to accelerate its support for terrorist proxies, restart its ballistic missile program—in violation of U.N. resolutions—and cheat on its denuclearization aims.

My colleagues have heard the quote of the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg,

chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that: "We must stop partisan politics at the water's edge."

Senator Vandenberg, a Republican, who worked across the aisle with Democrat President Truman in the early days of the Cold War was right.

This resolution is not safeguarding our Constitution, but attacking our Constitution by attempting to divest a duly elected President of his Commander in Chief powers, and in the process, emboldening our enemies.

In fact, President Trump has demonstrated enormous restraint in his targeted action against Soleimani making this vote entirely unnecessary. There was no invasion of Iran, but a strike against a terrorist in a country we had the legal authority to operate in under the 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard many of my colleagues doubt the applicability of that AUMF, so for those colleagues who are unconvinced that that is a sufficient authority, consider the fact that even in the absence of explicit congressional authorization for the Soleimani strike, here is a helpful reminder: Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution provides that: The President shall be Commander in Chief. And it is true that the Constitution gives Congress the sole power to declare war and the sole power of the purse to either fund or defund military action, but dating back to the Prize cases in 1863, the Supreme Court has long held that the President may act without Congress to defend the Nation.

In recent years, the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel has opined that the Constitution authorizes the President as Commander in Chief to order military action without congressional permission if the President determines that the action would be anticipatory self-defense or otherwise serves the interest of the United States, at least where the nature, scope, and duration of the anticipated hostilities are limited.

And that was what was the case here.

Specifically, the OLC has said the President's inherent constitutional authority as Commander in Chief, his broad foreign policy powers, and his duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, empower him to deplore the armed forces abroad, without a declaration of war by Congress or other congressional authorization.

The courts have generally declined to review the exercise of such unilateral executive power.

The War Powers Resolution does not limit the President's power to act without Congress. At most, it imposes a reporting and consultation requirement that this President has complied with.

Furthermore, the War Powers Resolution applies only to the deployment of significant bodies of military personnel and would not apply to a drone strike.

Finally, according to OLC, "... if our Armed Forces otherwise lawfully

stationed in a foreign country were fired upon and defended themselves, we doubt that such engagement in hostilities would be covered by the consultation and reporting provisions of the War Powers Resolution."

Of course, that is precisely the scenario here involving the President's decisive strike against Soleimani in response to an attack on our embassy.

Thank goodness we have a Commander in Chief who will not allow another Benghazi on his watch. Don't forget, the Framers of the Constitution specifically rejected a proposal that Congress be empowered to "make war," and implied power for the President to "repel sudden attacks."

This was in recognition of the slow pace and inefficiency of legislative proceedings under the Articles of Confederation. As Members of Congress, we have a special duty to jealously guard legislative prerogatives, including the power to declare war, and to provide a check on the executive branch for overreach. But we also must have the humility to acknowledge that Congress lacks the power to divest the President of his Commander in Chief powers under Article II.

RECOGNIZING ASSISTANT CHIEF LAURA QUATTLEBAUM FOR HER YEARS OF SERVICE WITH THE CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that on National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, I rise to recognize California Highway Patrol Assistant Division Chief Laura Quattlebaum for her years with the California Highway Patrol and congratulate her on her retirement.

Assistant Chief Quattlebaum is a shining example of the selflessness and courage our Nation's law enforcement possesses. She is truly an amazing woman, full of passion, character, and integrity. I am humbled to have worked alongside her in our community, and I am honored to call her my friend.

For more than 30 years, Assistant Chief Quattlebaum has served as a dedicated public officer for my constituents, as well as countless other Californians. After graduating from the CHP academy she went on to act as public information officer for the city of Indio.

From this critical position to her current role as California Highway Patrol assistant chief, she has answered the call to defend our public safety many times. Throughout her career, Assistant Chief Quattlebaum has been recognized on numerous occasions for her outstanding work. As lieutenant in the Indio area, she received the Commissioner's Commendation for Leadership and Cultural Awareness and Racial Profile training.

Six years later, Assemblyman Brian Nestande awarded her the 2013 Women

of Distinction award, and in 2014, Assemblyman Manuel Perez presented her with the Woman of the Year award in recognition of her service to the people of California.

Assistant Chief Quattlebaum is known to her colleagues as a hardworking and selfless leader. Her commitment to bettering the lives of others is reflected in her tireless advocacy for those she served alongside and for peace officers throughout the country.

I have witnessed this commitment firsthand on multiple occasions, notably, when we worked together to more than double our Nation's funding for mental health services for our local law enforcement agencies just last year.

Assistant Chief Quattlebaum's career in public service is a true testament to her devotion to community, country, and public safety. Her unwavering dedication to the people of California is admirable.

On behalf of California's 36th Congressional District, I thank Assistant Chief Quattlebaum for her years of service and thank all of our law enforcement agents who work tirelessly to uphold the safety of our communities.

I congratulate Assistant Chief Quattlebaum on her retirement. We must carry the spirit of National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day with us every day by showing our gratitude for our public safety officers year-round.

CONFLICT WITH IRAN

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of Americans in my district and across the country who are anxious that the events of this past week are sending us down a path to war with Iran.

Over the past week, I have been thinking most about our servicemembers and their families, the people whose lives will be immediately and irreversibly affected by the decision to go to war: sons, daughters, mothers, fathers, siblings, our neighbors and our friends, who will put at risk their lives; families worried about their loved ones put in harm's way; servicemembers who have seen multiple deployments and are now faced with the prospect of being sent overseas yet again.

Our veterans and their families have dealt with the human toll of war for nearly 20 years. It is time for a new approach. Americans don't want another endless war in the Middle East. After 19 years of conflict, America doesn't need another war. We do not want reckless, high-risk provocations of war that make Americans less safe for years to come.

That is why I urge President Trump to deescalate the situation and pursue a diplomatic path forward. In the meantime, I hope everyone will join me in continuing to pray for the servicemembers overseas defending our Nation and for a strategic, peaceful solution to avoid another costly war in the Middle East.

STANDING IN FIRM SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT TRUMP ON HIS ACTIONS AGAINST TERRORISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand in firm support of President Trump's leadership in his decisive actions against evil terrorists.

America and the world are safer without Qasem Soleimani. Not only is America safer, it is more prosperous than ever before and now energy independent.

The Iranian regime would be wise to not further test this President's mettle and the overwhelming capabilities of the greatest fighting force the world has ever known: our U.S. military.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GENERAL PAUL KELLEY

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of General P.X. Kelley. General Kelley was the embodiment of the Marine Corps. His distinguished record inspired me, the marines with whom I served, and will continue to inspire marines for generations to come.

In Vietnam, General Kelley earned the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit with Valor, and two Bronze Stars with Valor.

As commandant, he led the Corps during the dark days following the 1983 Iran-backed bombing of the Marine Corps barracks in Beirut. General Kelley's leadership inspired every marine to hold true to the values of the Corps. I am terribly saddened by the passing of General Kelley, but I will be forever grateful of serving under his command.

Semper fi.

CONGRATULATING GATORADE INDIANA FOOTBALL PLAYER OF THE YEAR CHARLIE SPEGAL

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate an exemplary student-athlete, Charlie Spegal.

Charlie was recently named the Gatorade Indiana Football Player of the Year. He has had an outstanding football career, holding the all-time State career record in rushing yards, rushing touchdowns, and career touchdowns.

Finishing with 10,867 career rushing yards and 175 touchdowns, he did this while maintaining above a 3.5 GPA. Charlie has been a role model for student athletes everywhere.

I congratulate Charlie on his wonderful career throughout high school and wish him the best of luck in college.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF AMERICAN HERO CHARLES "RED" WHITTINGTON

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker I rise today to remember the life of American Hero Charles "Red" Whittington.

Red served in France during World War II as a member of the 377th Infantry Regiment and the 95th Infantry Division.

His regiment was given the nickname "Iron Men of Metz" for their fierce liberation in defense of the town of Metz from German counterattacks.

Whittington was the recipient of a Bronze Star, two Purple Hearts, the Combat Infantryman Badge, the European Theater of Operations Campaign Medal with two battle stars, a Good Conduct medal and the Victory Medal.

I give my deepest condolences to the Whittington family and hope they find comfort in knowing that Charles "Red" Whittington was a true American hero.

CONGRATULATING SOUTH DEARBORN HIGH SCHOOL ON REIMPLEMENTING FFA AG PROGRAM

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate South Dearborn High School for reimplementing their FFA Ag program. FFA educates students on agricultural success, as well as providing hands-on career training experience.

After a 30-year absence, students and future farmers at South Dearborn will again be able to gain the knowledge and experience they need to succeed in the agriculture industry.

Congratulations to South Dearborn FFA, and I look forward to seeing your chapter grow.

PRESIDENT NEEDS TO MAKE THE CASE FOR MILITARY ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, young men and women enlisting in our military for the first time will enter recruitment offices across our country this year.

On their IDs will be birth dates that reflect the fact that they are signing up to fight in wars that started before they were born.

Nineteen years. That is how long we have been in Afghanistan. Seventeen years. That is how long we have been in Iraq. Not to mention the American weapons, the American dollars, the American boots, the American lives that have been sent to Yemen, Syria, Somalia, and many, many other corners of our globe.

□ 1030

We are a generation that has spent the better part of its life at war in a country in the Middle East, perpetual wars fought under the cover of two permission slips that this body gave the executive branch nearly 20 years ago.

In 2001, Congress authorized our offensive against al-Qaida and the Taliban in the wake of 9/11 in what became the largest armed conflict in American history. In 2002, Congress authorized the invasion of Iraq, and it became the greatest foreign policy mistake of a generation.

And our response has been silence, silence from this collective body; silence as we have sent hundreds of thousands of American men and women to Afghanistan and tens of thousands more to Iraq; silence as three administrations, Democratic and Republican, have used these two authorizations to

expand, to evolve, to justify, and to prolong our presence in a volatile and violent region; and silence as our role has become less clear and our mission less certain.

What we have lost in this silence is hard to quantify—the lives that could have been spared, the families we could have protected, the money we could have used to do good, and the credibility we could have saved if we had summoned the collective courage to tear up those permission slips.

The vote today on the War Powers Resolution to restrict the current administration's actions against Iran is an important one. It is a necessary response to a reckless President without a plan. But it is not enough because, yesterday, this administration told us that the legal authority to launch a strike targeting Iran 6 days ago was granted based on the authority that this body allowed to invade Iraq 18 years ago, using a deceased dictator to justify a potential war against an entirely different adversary, making a mockery of matters of war and peace.

So now, facing the threat of war with a different yet brutal regime, this body must finally act to cut off any avenue that this President or any other President has to enter our people into a war that we do not want because this isn't just about the actions of a current administration. It is about the precedent that we set from this day forward.

We must pass a War Powers Resolution today. We must repeal the 2001 and 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force. We must compel the executive branch to come to Congress and make the case that any military action that is required to protect American lives is in our best interests and justified.

And we in Congress must be prepared to take some tough votes because that is our job. It is the very least that we owe our men and women in uniform putting their lives on the line so the rest of us might sleep safe and free.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN MICHAEL FITZPATRICK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor my friend and former colleague, Michael Fitzpatrick. Former Congressman Mike Fitzpatrick passed away on January 6 after a 12-year battle with cancer.

He served as chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services' Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing. Over a 2-year period, the task force investigated the financial mechanisms used to fund terrorist activities.

Mike was a leading voice in Congress on medical device safety, pressing the FDA after dangerous medical devices remained in use after causing serious injury and death. He was an Eagle

Scout from the Bucks County Council and former president of that council and was honored with the Silver Beaver Award for his service to scouting.

Mike retired in 2017 and was consistently ranked among the most bipartisan Members of Congress.

I lift my prayers for Mike's wife, Kathleen; their six children; his brother, Congressman BRIAN FITZPATRICK; and the Fitzpatrick family during this difficult time.

Mr. Speaker, it is also appropriate to celebrate the tremendous accomplishments and difference Congressman Mike Fitzpatrick made in a relatively short life.

Well done, my friend. Rest in God's loving arms.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to honor the life and the accomplishments of Congressman Mike Fitzpatrick. He was a great and trusted colleague. More importantly, he was a good friend, and he was my friend.

He didn't seek the spotlight; he just sought to do the right thing.

He was all about representing his district. Representing his district put him at odds, oftentimes, with popular sentiment around here, but Mike wasn't bothered by any of that. He was true to his convictions; he was true to his family; and he was true to his friends.

Guys like Mike Fitzpatrick who come here, serve, and stay focused on what is important and stay true are hard to find and even harder to replace.

We wish God's blessing on Mike Fitzpatrick and his entire family. We pray the Lord will fill the intolerable emptiness of his passing.

I would just like to say: We miss you, Mike Fitzpatrick, and Godspeed.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I as well rise today to pay tribute to our friend, the Honorable Michael G. Fitzpatrick, a longtime Republican who served as a Bucks County, Pennsylvania, commissioner and served as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, who, sadly, passed away Monday, January 6.

Mike was the oldest son of eight children, born on June 28, 1963, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He grew up and resided in Bucks County. Mike was an Eagle Scout, an Eagles fan, and a graduate of Dickinson Law School.

Those who knew Mike said the same thing: He worked hard every day to make his constituents' lives better.

First elected to Congress in 2004, he served four terms and then stepped down, honoring his self-imposed pledge to term limits. Mike's brother, BRIAN FITZPATRICK, succeeded his older brother and continues to serve their home district honorably. BRIAN is a great Member and a friend to us all.

Mike was described by a friend as a classic Bucks County Irishman and a man whose family always came first.

Congressman BRIAN FITZPATRICK and the entire Fitzpatrick family appreciate our prayers. Mike is survived by, in addition to his brother BRIAN, his six other brothers and sisters; his parents, James and Mary; a grandson; a granddaughter; his wife of 31 years, Kathleen; and their six children.

I thank you for your work to make Pennsylvania and our country a better place, Congressman Fitzpatrick.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and the legacy of former Pennsylvania Congressman Mike Fitzpatrick.

Mike was a dedicated public servant who proudly represented the people of Pennsylvania's Eighth Congressional District, showcasing incredible courage not only in Congress but throughout his life.

This week, former Congressman Fitzpatrick passed away after a valiant battle with metastatic melanoma. As a dermatologist, I have witnessed this disease claim many lives and devastate too many families. Here in Congress, it is my privilege to serve as co-chair of the Skin Cancer Caucus, and I remain dedicated to promoting innovative treatments and cures for melanoma.

On behalf of the 13th District of Pennsylvania, I am grateful to Congressman Mike Fitzpatrick for his longstanding service to our Commonwealth and to our entire Nation.

As we honor him today, I extend my sincere sympathies to the entire Fitzpatrick family, including my friend, Congressman BRIAN FITZPATRICK, upon the loss of a great leader from Pennsylvania and a great leader in our Nation.

RELEASE FUNDS FOR PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday morning, southwest Puerto Rico was struck by a 6.4 magnitude earthquake.

That seismic event followed hundreds of smaller quakes that had rattled the region since December 28. However, Tuesday's quake inflicted enormous damage, causing a school to collapse, killing at least one person, and leaving almost the entire island without power.

Indeed, today, Puerto Rico's largest power generation facility, Costa Sur, remains offline as we speak. That power plant is responsible for 40 percent of electricity generation on the island. Even as of last night, more than two-thirds of Puerto Ricans had no electricity.

Mr. Speaker, 250,000 Puerto Ricans were without water. Hundreds of homes

were damaged. As of last night, more than 5,200 Puerto Ricans were sleeping on the street, afraid their homes could collapse on them.

For the people of Puerto Rico, this natural disaster evokes dark memories seared in our minds of how this administration and the Federal Government failed, turning a natural disaster into a humanitarian crisis.

In 2017, because of this administration's incompetence and indifference, the Puerto Rican people suffered immensely. They endured the longest blackout in American history, and 3,000 of our fellow citizens lost their lives. We cannot afford to repeat those mistakes.

Sadly, today, this administration's disdain for the people of Puerto Rico remains on full display, this time in the form of previously approved funds that it is withholding. In response to Hurricanes Maria and Irma, Congress passed \$8.3 billion in HUD relief and mitigation funding, resources that HUD to this day refuses to release. Let me repeat that: The Secretary of HUD is violating the law, scoffing at congressional intent, and blocking the people of Puerto Rico from receiving previously approved disaster funds. This comes even after another disaster has stricken the island.

We do not know yet how bad the devastation from this earthquake will be. We also do not know if there will be yet more earthquakes. But this is certain: It is unacceptable, especially now, for Secretary Carson and HUD to stand in the way of Puerto Rico's receiving previously allocated assistance. It is also illegal.

Mr. Speaker, these are our fellow citizens. They deserve our compassion and our assistance. When wildfires or earthquakes hit California or hurricanes strike Texas, Americans stand together and assist one another. They give each other the helping hand that they deserve. But when it comes to Puerto Rico, this administration instead chooses to stand in the way, to block necessary aid, and to put lives at risk.

Mr. Speaker, if these funds are not released and if Puerto Rican people perish in the aftermath of this earthquake, then I have to say that it will be the U.S. Federal Government that is responsible.

We cannot afford further delay. HUD must release these funds immediately, and FEMA must get to work, helping Puerto Rico recover from the latest catastrophe.

RECOGNIZING ALLEN BEERMANN'S RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Allen Beermann, who is retiring from his

longtime position as the executive director of the Nebraska Press Association after having been Nebraska's secretary of state for 24 years.

Through his 48 years of public service, Allen has been an example of dignity and a source of inspiration to countless Nebraskans. Allen is well known across Nebraska and even around the world for his commitment to his work and his affinity for meeting new people.

□ 1045

As a Nebraska Secretary of State, he worked tirelessly to protect the integrity of our elections. He brought this commitment to integrity with him into his next role as executive director of the Nebraska Press Association as well.

He has traveled to many countries and met with people from all walks of life, establishing relationships with everyone he meets along the way. Allen likes to say his career took him to "48 countries in 48 years," and I am sure he has no shortage of stories from these trips.

I have known Allen for many years, and I can say, in addition to his hard work, Allen has always been a great person to be around. Allen is always one to lighten a conversation with his quick wit and positive attitude, and his many friends around the world are a testament to his character. He has even been known to poke fun at himself a little bit, stating, recently, that the Nebraska Historical Society has recognized him as the "official State artifact."

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Mr. Allen Beermann's commendable public service, and wish him good luck in his retirement.

A TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL FITZPATRICK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I speak from the heart about someone who was not just a colleague but a good friend. We heard some of my Republican colleagues, also from Pennsylvania, speaking about Mike Fitzpatrick earlier.

I had the privilege to say that I was Mike's constituent for a few years. Under the old, old lines in Pennsylvania, he represented a portion of Philadelphia in the far northeast, where I reside. He and I became friends when I was a State representative and he was my Congressman.

We quickly realized we had so much in common: similar sort of families, both born in Philadelphia, both proud Irish American families, both went to Catholic high school—Mike went to Bishop Egan, now Conwell-Egan; I went to Cardinal Dougherty. So it was not exactly difficult for the two of us to get along and to work so well together,

especially when I would become a Member of Congress and he immediately reached out to me and helped in any way he could.

As colleagues, we worked well together on a whole host of issues. Our districts shared the entire Philadelphia-Bucks County border and then much of the Montgomery County-Bucks border as well.

When I think of Mike, though, it is not so much the water safety issues and PFOS that we worked on or transportation or so many issues that affect northeast Philadelphia, Bucks County-Montgomery County. What really strikes me is just what a nice and decent person Mike was and his basic human decency. You see those same traits in his brother, now our colleague, BRIAN.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am deep in mourning today for Mike, his wife, Kathleen, his six children, Mike's parents, including his father, whom I had the opportunity to spend time with and meet this summer. My heart breaks for the Fitzpatrick family, but I hope that they can take solace in the fact that Mike left his mark on this institution.

Mr. Speaker, to also speak about the life of Mike Fitzpatrick, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), my friend and colleague.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman BOYLE.

Frankly, it is my honor and privilege to join the Pennsylvania delegation as they honor their friend and mine, Congressman Mike Fitzpatrick.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman BOYLE would appreciate this. I had never heard of Bucks County until I came to Congress, but I learned of it quickly because of a young Congressman named Mike Fitzpatrick, who consistently talked about his home, his relationship with the people whom he served, whom he loved, whom he was devoted to.

The gentleman gave some beautiful, generous comments about the nature of his character: He was devoted to his family; he was a man of high principle; he was personable. I think it is important to point out as well: The gentleman is a Democrat; he was a Republican; I am a Republican. And here we are, talking about things that actually unite us because of the character of people, good Americans like Mike Fitzpatrick, who looked for a way to be in authentic dialogue—while standing on his principles. He was a fighter, as well, but looked for a way to be in authentic dialogue, even with people he might have a disagreement with.

He was my friend. I remember in that corner back there, we had a very intimate conversation one day of how he was facing a true dilemma because there was a vote that was about to be taken, for which he said, "This may cost me my election." He took that vote anyway, and it did cost him the election, but then he came back and joined us again.

Mr. Speaker, let me join with Congressman BOYLE and the entire Penn-

sylvania delegation in expressing my condolences to Kathleen and his six kids, whom he talked about and whom we got to know as well.

Being from Nebraska, again, I am a long way from Bucks County, but learned a great deal about the gentleman's home and, of course, the deep character and the place that formed this wonderful public servant, Mike Fitzpatrick.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, as all of my colleagues, not just Pennsylvanians, but all the others, stand up to speak about a young man, because he was a young man, Congressman Michael Fitzpatrick.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember him not as just a departed colleague from the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but he was also a good person. He was someone whom I knew from the fact that, when I was in the State legislature and he was a Congressman, that although I was not in his congressional district, I knew him very much as a person. I knew his leadership; I knew what he provided; and I knew his friendliness.

He, both, was a principled conservative and comfortable working with people on both sides of the aisle. That is how he got things done, including the creation of the Washington Crossing National Cemetery.

He also led the effort to better secure passenger planes from terrorism, a cause inspired by September 11 families from Bucks County.

Bucks County was very close to the congressional district in the legislative district I represented. Limekiln Pike is something that led up directly to Bucks County. So Mike was not a stranger to the issues in the southeast part of Pennsylvania, as well as the city of Philadelphia, as well as the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

My fellow Democrats from this district all remember him as a true patriot, a father to Bucks County, a man of grace and honor who looked past politics in the community.

There is a quote from my departed colleague, and this is what he said: "Some legislators look back at how many bills they passed. I measure my time by how many people I helped."

That was a quote that Mike has stated, and I think it is important if all of us remember this. So, in that spirit, we from Pennsylvania stand with that spirit of Michael Fitzpatrick. It is safe to say he helped a lot of people.

Mr. Speaker, to BRIAN and his family, please know that you are in our prayers and our thoughts. We don't take that lightly. We understand it. I say to you that I am honored to be a part of the delegation of people who are standing here today to add my voice to the importance of what Michael Fitzpatrick meant to this body and to this country, and I thank him.

IN MEMORY OF MICHAEL
FITZPATRICK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I want to, as well, today, pay tribute to Michael Gerard Fitzpatrick, who, as has been mentioned, served in this House, representing Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District.

It was a privilege to serve with Mike, and, from the first time that I met Mike here in Washington in the House, I knew he was a man of character and a man of principle.

Mr. Speaker, I think you have heard from the words that were spoken this morning before I spoke that, indeed, was the reputation that he had here in Washington, D.C., as I am sure he had back in the State of Pennsylvania.

Today, as we pay tribute to Michael and his life, I am reminded, with just the passing of my own mother-in-law at 5 o'clock this morning, Shirley McDonald from Huntsville, Alabama, who was struggling from Parkinson's disease, of just how short life is. Literally, I am reminded of the shortness of time and the greatness of eternity.

But my mother-in-law, Shirley, and Michael knew that there is a life beyond this one and that, because of Christ, we can have hope to enter an eternal life.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF GREG KIRK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Georgia State Senator Greg Kirk, who passed away on December 22 at the age of 56 after a battle with cancer.

A former pastor, Senator Kirk was first elected to the State senate in 2014. Representing Americus in southwest Georgia, he spent his 6 years in the State senate working hard for rural Georgians: spurring job creation, protecting life, and always putting God first.

His colleagues in the State senate remember him as an exceptional public servant who was always a champion for doing what is right, making him one of the State's most fervent and gracious leaders.

One of his most important pieces of legislation included a bill that would legally protect people who broke into a vehicle to help rescue a child that had been left unattended in hot weather.

His presence, leadership, and passion for service will be dearly missed in the Georgia State senate. Senator Kirk's family and friends will be in my thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

IN RECOGNITION OF INTERNATIONAL SEAFARERS'
CENTER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the International Seafarers' Center in Brun-

wick, Georgia, for all of their work throughout the First Congressional District of Georgia.

Operating in coastal Georgia for the last 38 years, the International Seafarers' Center strives to provide spiritual, emotional, physical, and material support to mariners passing through our area. Currently, the Port of Brunswick, alone, receives 16,000 seafarers annually who have very little access to the conveniences of home while they are at sea.

The International Seafarers' Center is guided by its Christian faith, and with their two hospitality centers, they have done an exceptional job of serving those mariners from all walks of life, different religions, countless languages, and diverse races.

One of the most notable examples of their work includes their effort to provide clothing and food to 20 crew members of the Golden Ray cargo ship that had capsized off the coast of St. Simon's Island in September of 2019.

I cannot thank everyone involved with the International Seafarers' Center enough for making the First Congressional District of Georgia such a welcoming place for seafarers to pass through during their time at sea.

Keep up the good work.

□ 1100

HONORING THE SERVICE OF BETTY GILLIS

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Betty Gillis, who is retiring after 41 years serving as supervisor of Ware County's Board of Elections and Registration.

Throughout the past 4 decades, Ms. Gillis has done an exceptional job in the First Congressional District, ensuring that Ware County's elections are both robust and fair.

Looking back on her time, she remembers that she has enjoyed every minute of it, and she has come to think of her colleagues as extended family.

In her retirement, Ms. Gillis is planning to spend more time with her family. However, it will simply be impossible to replace a public servant as dedicated and excited about her role as Ms. Gillis.

Thank you for your service to the First Congressional District of Georgia, Ms. Gillis. Congratulations on a retirement well-deserved.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CLAIR
WOFFORD FRAZIER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Ms. Clair Wofford Frazier, who passed away on December 23, 2019, at the age of 58, after a battle with cancer.

Ms. Wofford Frazier dedicated her life to serving her alma mater, Young Harris College. A member of the Board of Trustees for over a decade, she served on a number of different committees that impacted daily campus life, including committees on academic affairs, development, and student affairs.

She also created the Wofford-Frazier scholarship to help a Young Harris edu-

cation be as accessible as possible for deserving students. A testament to her work, the executive board room at the college is named in her honor, and she won the Susan B. Harris Award from the Alumni Association in 2008.

Similar to her generosity with the college, those who knew her remember that Ms. Wofford Frazier was always the first person to offer help to someone in need.

My thoughts and prayers will be with Ms. Wofford Frazier's family during this most difficult time.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. PINGREE) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, Lord of us all, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

You, O Lord, are the source of life and love. You hear the prayer of Congress, both for the good of this Nation and for the good of humanity around the world. Help this Congress and the President to discern your will in our day.

May short-term gains, self-interest, or partisan advantage never prove to be an obstacle to true vision. Rather, Lord, grant to each member depth of perception, clear analysis, and creative response to the needs of our time.

Today we especially remember our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico as they recover from yet another natural disaster. Bless them, and especially those who labor, sometimes dangerously, to help in the long return to normalcy on that beleaguered island.

In these days give wisdom to all Members. And may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I rise for a parliamentary inquiry or a series thereof.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, am I correct that H. Res. 755 was passed by vote of the House on December 18, 2019?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not verify the status of a measure not currently pending.

Mr. GRIFFITH. A measure not currently pending.

Additional parliamentary inquiry, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, since H. Res. 755 passed on December 18, 2019, and the motion to reconsider H. Res. 755 was laid on the table on that same date, December 18, 2019, is there any action the House of Representatives can now take on H. Res. 755?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not respond to hypothetical questions.

Mr. GRIFFITH. It is not a hypothetical.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not respond to hypothetical questions.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Additional parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I am not inquiring hypothetically. I may wish to take action. Is there any action currently available to a Member of the House in regard to H. Res. 755?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not issue advisory opinions.

Mr. GRIFFITH. All right. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Is H. Res. 755 currently within the bosom of the U.S. House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is inquiring about the status of a measure not currently pending on the House floor.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I thank the Speaker. Additional parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Since 21 calendar days, 12 working days, and seven legislative days have gone by since H. Res. 755 passed the House and the Speaker of the House has not been physically able to deliver H. Res. 755 to the United States Senate, does clause 8(b)(3)(C) of rule I of the House rules automatically cause a vacancy in the Office of the Speaker, or what action does the House need to take since the Speaker has not been able to physically do an essential part of her administrative duties as the Speaker of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has stated the form of clause 8(b)(3) of rule I. However, the gentleman is not stating a parliamentary question within the purview of the Chair at this point. The gentleman is free to consult the rule and its accompanying legislative history for further clarification.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I thank the Chair.

Additional parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Reviewing its parliamentary history, I would ask the Chair, is there any precedent, other than incapacity, of a Speaker not timely transmitting action of the House to the United States Senate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not issue an advisory opinion. The Chair is prepared to entertain one more parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Additional parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, clause 8(b)(3)(C) says that a physical incapacity to do the job of Speaker causes or may cause a vacancy. I am asking if there is any precedent related to that rule that the Chair can direct me to, having found none on my own?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will again respond that she will not issue an advisory opinion.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I respectfully disagree that it is an advisory opinion and thank the Chair for her indulgence.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

TAKE ACTION ON PFAS

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I come to the well of the House today to call on my colleagues to support the PFAS Action Act. This bill, like so many that have come to the floor under Democratic leadership, is about taking action for the people; in this case, ensuring access to clean and safe water.

PFAS, so-called forever chemicals that have leached into water supplies for decades, are hazardous to human health. Their presence is linked with reduced kidney function, reduced immune system function, and increased risk for diseases like diabetes and cancer.

These chemicals are in our water because of corporate negligence, and like in many other cases, our working families trying to make ends meet are hit the hardest. That is why it is critical that Congress step up and take action, and that is why this legislation is so important and what it is about.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand up for the people and vote for the PFAS Action Act.

FORT JACKSON EXPANSION

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the addition of the Civil Affairs and Psychological Operations Advanced Individual Training courses at Fort Jackson, South Carolina, which is one of the most military friendly communities in America.

Civil affairs and psychological operation soldiers bring unique skill sets. The relocation of Fort Jackson, where over half of all soldiers attend basic training, effectively organizes courses in the Army Training and Doctrine Command environment.

Through job growth at Fort Jackson, the local economy of Columbia will benefit with nearly \$5 million in initial establishment, and \$3.5 annually.

Congratulations to Commanding General Milford Beagle, Jr., of Fort Jackson on this expansion. I appreciate his extraordinary leadership.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th, defeating terrorists overseas, in the global war on terrorism with the courageous leadership of President Donald Trump.

Our sympathy goes out to the family of Nawres Hamid, an Iraqi American Muslim from California who was murdered by the Soleimani-financed terrorists on December 27.

SALUTING JACK YATES HIGH SCHOOL

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise this morning to congratulate a very significant and historic high school, Jack Yates High School. Jack Yates High School was founded by the founding father, if you will, of the African American community in Houston, Freedmen's Town.

He is the founder of Wheeler Avenue Baptist Church. He is respected at Texas Southern University, and today they announced in a public school that they will implement an international baccalaureate.

In the midst of the tumultuous times that we have, how important it is that high school students will be engaged in discussions of peace, diplomacy, understanding world engagement, understanding the value of languages and being diverse, recognizing the wonderful experiment of the United States founded by those who fled persecution and indicated in the Constitution we have organized to create a more perfect union.

The more young people, more minorities that we can get in programs like an international baccalaureate where they will come out with that document and be ready to perch on the leadership role is outstanding.

To Jack Yates High School, I salute you. You are mighty. You are important, and God bless you.

CELEBRATING KELLY'S ANGELS ON THEIR 10TH ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. STEFANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate Kelly's Angels on their 10-year anniversary. This charitable organization has been serving the children of the Capital Region of New York for the past decade.

After Kelly Mulholland, a local teacher and mother of two from my district, tragically lost her battle with cancer in 2007 at the age of 37, her husband, Mark, founded Kelly's Angels in her honor.

Their mission is to provide grants for children in upstate New York who have lost parents or siblings to cancer or other illnesses. Children receive fund grants to use for whatever the child can dream up.

The goal of these grants is to bring a smile to a child's face, create positive new memories, and help with the healing process.

Kelly's Angels has worked with countless families in our local communities over the past decade, and their work continues to have a positive impact on so many lives.

On behalf of New York's 21st Congressional District, I want to congratulate and thank Mark, his children, McKenna and Connor, and the entire Kelly's Angels team for achieving this milestone.

I thank them for their amazing work. We are so proud of them.

STOP TRUMP'S WAR WITH IRAN

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, President Trump has committed an illegal and unconstitutional act of war, pushing our Nation headlong into a war with Iran without any authorization from Congress, a war that would be so costly and devastating, it would make our wars in Iraq and Afghanistan look like a picnic.

In doing so, he has undermined our national security in two critical ways: number one, Iran is no longer complying with the Iran nuclear agreement and is quickly speeding forward in developing their nuclear weapons capability, putting us and the world at greater risk.

Number two, our troops in Iraq are no longer focusing on preventing a resurgence of ISIS and al-Qaida. Instead, all of their efforts are now focused on Iranian forces and Iranian-backed Shia militias.

Congress must act today to stop further escalation of this war. Vote "yes" on H. Con. Res. 83 to uphold the Constitution which we all took an oath to support. Vote "yes" to stop Trump's war with Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 1215

HIGHLIGHTING SERVICE ACADEMY NOMINATION BOARD

(Mr. BUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight one of the most rewarding responsibilities I have as a Member of Congress: the honor of nominating students to the service academies.

This past weekend, I met with my Service Academy Nomination Board for North Carolina's 13th Congressional District to begin the review process. This year's board includes Mr. Ronald Hope of Advance, Mr. Matt Reyes of Mooresville, Mr. Doug Lain of High Point, Mrs. Rayne Brown of Lexington, Mr. Wayne Davidson of Greensboro, Mr. John Sherden of Mocksville, and Mr. Frank Pugh of Greensboro.

I am grateful that these individuals sacrificed their time and effort to help review applications, interview candidates, and recommend qualified individuals for the nominations. I look forward to announcing our nominees in the coming weeks.

Madam Speaker, please join me in thanking the members of our board and all the applicants who want to serve our great country.

PREVENTING WAR WITH IRAN

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I am here to condemn the President's hostile actions against Iran that led us to the brink of war.

President Trump had no legal justification to launch an attack against Iran. The President's dangerous provocation was unlawful and unconstitutional, and Congress must assert its sole authority to declare war. His actions made America less safe.

Today, I will be voting for a War Powers Resolution to check the President's use of military action against Iran. But the need for Congress to reassert its authority does not end there. We must repeal the 2002 AUMF and prevent the administration from engaging in an unauthorized war by restricting funding from being used to wage war against Iran.

We must not yield to the voices of extreme hawks that see war as the only answer. We must not go to war with Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

RECOGNIZING U.S. ASTRONAUT CHRISTINA KOCH

(Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, as a North Carolinian and member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I take great joy today in rising to recognize United States astronaut Christina Koch.

Christina grew up in eastern North Carolina in Jacksonville and graduated from the prestigious North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics. She later earned her bachelor's and master's degrees from N.C. State.

On December 28, 2019, Christina set the record for the longest continuous spaceflight by a female. She surpassed the previous record of 288 days achieved by fellow astronaut Peggy Whitson. She is now at 300 days and counting. In addition, Christina participated in the first all-female space walk on October 18 alongside fellow astronaut Jessica Meir.

She is, without a doubt, one of the most accomplished people in North Carolina's history. Christina has made her country, her State, and all of eastern North Carolina proud. I wish her luck on her continuous voyage amongst the stars. We look forward to her safe return to Earth in February.

SUPPORT PROGRAMS FOR WOMEN VETERANS

(Ms. BROWNLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in support of my bill, the Women Veterans TRUST Act, a bill that aims to address the need for women-specific programs that treat veterans with drug and alcohol dependency.

The over 2 million women veterans who live in the United States face unique challenges that far too often are not appropriately addressed. Women veterans have higher rates of post-traumatic stress that can lead to substance abuse. Tragically, women veterans with substance-use disorders often have higher rates of suicide than their nonveteran peers.

To address this crisis, women-specific programs make all the difference. As chair of the Women's Veterans Task Force, I have heard how critical these treatment programs are to saving lives.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to cosponsor this important bill to ensure our Nation's women veterans have the resources and programs they need to thrive.

SEND ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT TO SENATE

(Mr. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pose a simple question to my colleagues: Are we, as a body, subject to the rules in the Constitution? The answer is: Of course we are.

However, Speaker PELOSI has chosen to ignore the Constitution and go rogue. Last month, she stood on this very floor and told us how important it is that we impeach the President immediately. Now, outrageously, she claims for herself new powers never contemplated by the Constitution.

By not transferring the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate, Speaker PELOSI has claimed for herself the authority to veto any bill passed by this House with no possibility of override. This is a monstrous abuse of her position and an outright attack on the trust of the American people.

Clearly, she knows the impeachment process has been a sham all along and will fail in the Senate. I urge the Speaker to do her job and move the articles to the Senate immediately.

ACT TO LOWER PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

(Ms. FRANKEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, I am holding in my hand a pill cutter. Pharmacists tell me that it is one of the most popular gadgets in the drugstore.

Why? Because many prescription drugs are so unaffordable that, at the expense of their health, Americans are

cutting their pills in half. Even some folks who have insurance go to the counter with a prescription and leave empty-handed because they can't afford the copay.

That is why Democrats passed H.R. 3 that will give Medicare the power to negotiate with drug companies, lowering the cost of the most expensive drugs for all Americans and stopping pharmaceutical companies from charging more for drugs that are cheaper in other countries. The new law would also set limits on prescription drug costs for Medicare beneficiaries while delivering them vision, dental, and hearing care.

Madam Speaker, I urge the Senate to take up and pass this lifesaving bill.

COMMENDING PRESIDENT TRUMP ON IRAN ACTIONS

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, last week, President Trump used his authority and took clear, decisive action to protect American lives.

By eradicating Iran's top terrorist, he sent a clear message to our enemies that the Obama days of appeasement are over, and America will, once again, stand up to terrorists. We cannot allow another Benghazi.

However, I am in disbelief that some Members of this body are finding ways to blame President Trump for the current situation in Iran.

Fact one, Iran's regime has been an enemy of America since 1979. In recent months, they have shot down U.S. drones, attacked oil tankers, shot rockets at our bases, and attacked and tried to take over our embassy. Taking out Soleimani was a long-overdue action to make the world a safer place and protect American lives.

Fact two, President Trump does not want war. Yesterday, while addressing the Nation, President Trump made clear there is a path forward with peace for Iran if they are willing to set aside their nuclear ambitions.

This is personal for me. My son and his family currently serve in an embassy abroad in a war-torn land. I want to thank President Trump for protecting my family and our women and men in uniform abroad.

CALLING FOR COHERENT STRATEGY ON IRAN

(Mr. TED LIEU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam Speaker, I rise because it is one of the highest forms of patriotism to speak out when a government engages in reckless military action that could lead us to war.

I previously served in Active Duty in the United States military, and the

goal of any military action should be to make us more safe, not less safe.

Unfortunately, as a result of Donald Trump's impulsive decisionmaking, the following negative consequences have happened. Iran is no longer abiding by any limits on its nuclear program. The Iranian people who previously were protesting their own leadership have now rallied behind their government. The Iraqi parliament recently voted to kick U.S. troops out of their country, one of the goals of Iran. And we have had to stop counterterrorism actions against ISIS.

This was a lose-lose-lose decision. We don't need the President to make any more reckless decisions. We don't need him to tweet out flag pictures. We need the President to articulate a coherent Iran strategy, which he still has failed to do.

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS EDWARD KRAMER

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor one of our fallen servicemembers in Iraq, Sergeant First Class Edward Kramer.

Sergeant Kramer was a North Carolina National Guard soldier killed in action by an IED on his last day of combat operations while he was deployed to Iraq, leaving a family and young children behind.

General Soleimani's brutal reign of terror was responsible for the deployment of the IEDs that killed and wounded soldiers such as Sergeant First Class Kramer. In fact, Soleimani's reign of terror killed and wounded over 600 servicemembers in Iraq.

We can never fully repay the families of our fallen soldiers, but we can seek justice. Terrorism must never prevail over American freedom and identity.

CONSTRAIN IRAN THROUGH DIPLOMACY

(Ms. JUDY CHU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, America does not need or want a war with Iran.

There are no political objectives we can reasonably achieve through force, and the President must not be allowed to fabricate a pretext for a conflict that will leave America, our allies, and the whole region less safe. But that is what he has been doing since tearing up the Iran nuclear deal and beginning a campaign of maximum pressure.

Today's War Powers Resolution reasserts Congress' authority to declare war and imposes crucial restrictions on the President; namely, he cannot start a war without demonstrating an actual threat. This is something the administration has failed to do, according to

both Democrats and Republicans from yesterday's intelligence briefing.

The best way to constrain the true threat of Iran is through the multilateral diplomacy that achieved the historic nuclear deal. With this clear congressional statement that Congress has not authorized a war, I urge the President to immediately stop his erratic and impulsive provocations and take us back from the brink.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

CALLING ON SPEAKER TO DO HER JOB

(Mr. GRIFFITH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, once a resolution passes the House, it goes to the Senate. Once all action is done, the Speaker is a mere functionary in transmitting the will of the House to the Senate.

It has been 21 calendar days, 12 working days, and 7 legislative days since the impeachment resolution was passed by this House. Since the resolution has not yet been delivered to the Senate, clause 8(b)(3)(C) of House rule I says that a vacancy in the Office of the Speaker may exist if the Speaker cannot do her job. She has not done her job.

America, I submit a vacancy exists in the Office of the Speaker of the United States House.

REPEAL AUMF, PROHIBIT WAR FUNDING

(Mr. CLAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of Congresswoman SLOTKIN's War Powers Resolution, which I am proud to cosponsor, and also to express my support for legislation introduced by Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congressman KHANNA to repeal the much-abused 2002 AUMF and to prohibit funding of any offensive military operations against Iran.

President Trump's incoherent strategy has brought us to the brink of another disastrous war in the Mideast.

I have seen this madness before. In 2002, I stood here to oppose the use of force in Iraq because I knew that tragic war was based on a lie.

The Constitution is clear. Donald Trump needs congressional authorization to use force against Iran.

So I say to you all today: No more lies, no more lost lives, and no war with Iran.

□ 1230

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, today, on National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, I rise to recognize the brave men and women who work to keep our communities safe across central and west central Illinois.

From Peoria to Springfield, Jacksonville to Quincy, Macomb to Beardstown, law enforcement officers in Illinois' 18th Congressional District are the hidden heroes of our State. Each day, Illinois police officers, deputies, and State troopers leave their families with no certainty they will return home safely; yet they are willing to face these risks to keep our families, our children, and our schools safe.

I am grateful for the courageous men and women who button up the uniform each day and thank them for protecting our families with bravery and pride.

Madam Speaker, while we set aside today to recognize law enforcement, may we remember, each and every day throughout the year, the courage and sacrifice of these men and women.

TERMINATION OF USE OF ARMED FORCES TO ENGAGE IN HOSTILITIES IN OR AGAINST IRAN

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my colleague Representative SLOTKIN's resolution regarding war powers.

First and foremost, I am extremely grateful that the Iranian ballistic missile attacks on Al Asad Air Base and Erbil resulted in zero injuries or casualties to our U.S. servicemembers or Iraqi allies. As always, I will continue to prioritize the safety of our deployed government officials, servicemembers, and contractors.

Madam Speaker, let me be clear: Qasem Soleimani was a terrorist, and I hope his removal from the battlefield will, in fact, improve U.S. security in the long run. That being said, in the wake of the strike on Soleimani, let us not forget that we invest in our highly capable military to promote stability, not to undermine it.

Our Founding Fathers made abundantly clear in the Constitution that only Congress has the power to authorize use of military force. This resolution that we will be voting on later today is a necessary step to ensure de-escalation with Iran while we await a clear strategy from the administration on how the President's actions will reduce the chances of Iran becoming a nuclear state.

U.S. Forces will always retain the inherent right to self-defense; however,

any further military actions that can lead to war will require congressional authorization.

NO WAR WITH IRAN

(Ms. CLARKE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address what I believe is in the best interests of the American people, the Iranian people, and our global community to say: No war with Iran.

As an early opponent of the Iraq war back when I served in the New York City Council, I know we cannot afford to make reckless, irresponsible, violent decisions that put the lives of our servicewomen and -men, diplomats, and the people here and in the Middle East in danger of death and destruction.

We must exhaust all diplomatic means and put our political differences aside to stand for peaceful resolutions to human conflict before taking the ultimate step of engaging in war.

For close to 20 years now, our Nation has been engaged in low-grade war games in the Middle East with the constant threat of putting our children, our families, and our civil liberties at risk. We must oppose senseless acts of violence that take us many steps away from our progress.

When we look back in our history books and tell the next generation stories of 2020, I want us to be able to say with pride that we kept the interests of our Nation we loved at heart without provocation, without the death and destruction of war.

Madam Speaker, I stand before you today opposed to these efforts, and I support the War Powers Resolution, H. Con. Res. 83.

FOR THE PEOPLE— INFRASTRUCTURE

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, as I rise today to begin discussing infrastructure, I cannot let go the remarks from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, their being completely appalled by the Speaker not bringing over one resolution in what they believe to be a timely manner, but expressing no concern for the fact that the Senate has not taken up 400 bills that have been passed by this House, 275 that were bipartisan, from their own side.

But they have no concern for that. They do have concern for one bill. That is inappropriate, and I am very sad about my colleagues for this.

Democrats have been working hard to fulfill a promise to the Nation. Americans in the Virgin Islands and in Puerto Rico are feeling the brunt of aging and weakening infrastructure—

demonstrated by a series of recent major disasters—which the Democrats are working hard to support.

We must remain committed to rebuilding disaster-stricken communities, replacing crumbling infrastructure, and developing and deploying the infrastructure needed to connect us like never before, including through 5G.

We cannot allow the Senate and this administration to impede our efforts to make American infrastructure better, safer, and more resilient.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 9, 2020, at 9:28 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1228.

That the Senate passed S. 1611.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 583.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 83, IRAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 781 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 781

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities in or against Iran. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SEC. 2. Section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546) shall not apply during the remainder of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress to a measure respecting Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 781, providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 83 under a closed rule. The resolution also provides 1 hour of general debate, controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee on Foreign Affairs.

Madam Speaker, the question before us today is very simple: Should President Trump be allowed to send the United States hurtling toward war with Iran without prior congressional approval?

It is a question we must wrestle with following the President's actions last Thursday. That is when he ordered the lethal drone attack on Iraqi soil that killed Iranian General Soleimani. The outgoing Prime Minister has said the strike was carried out without Iraqi permission or knowledge. It was done without any plan for the consequences in the region or the world. And, more troubling still, it was carried out without any input from the people's Representatives here in Congress.

Think about that.

Madam Speaker, just a month ago, Iran was staring down some of the most intense antigovernment protests in a decade. Thousands took to the streets of Tehran to express growing frustration and anger with their leaders.

But what a difference a month makes. Protestors—men, women, and children—have again taken to the streets of Tehran. Only this time, their anger wasn't directed at their own leaders; it was directed at the United States of America—all because of the President's unilateral decision.

Madam Speaker, that is what happens when monumental decisions of war and peace are made in a vacuum with no regard for the consequences. Things usually don't go very well.

Rather than protect our national security and stabilize the region, President Trump's reckless decision to strike Soleimani united Iran. It has led to retaliatory strikes on two bases used by U.S. and coalition forces in Iraq, and it has put our troops and diplomats serving overseas in greater danger.

Now, make no mistake: This decision has endangered all Americans everywhere. Hardliners are emboldened; 4,000

more U.S. troops have been deployed to the region; operations against ISIS have been suspended; the Iraqi Parliament has voted to kick American troops out of Iraq—all because of the brash decision of one man: the President of the United States.

Madam Speaker, there was no question that Soleimani was a ruthless military commander. He had American, Syrian, Lebanese, Iraqi, and Yemeni blood on his hands. But that is not up for debate today, nor is the question of whether or not killing him was a good or bad idea.

The President of the United States assassinated a high-level foreign military commander without asking or even notifying Congress beforehand.

Madam Speaker, with little evidence, the President claims his actions prevented an imminent threat, but the American people have heard that one before. We remember the stories about weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. We remember the tens of thousands of American soldiers who paid the price for that deception.

Madam Speaker, is this Congress going to sit by and allow that to happen in Iran, or are we going to ensure that this body acts before a war begins that could continue long after President Trump leaves office?

Now, the Constitution is clear; it is crystal clear. Article I, Section 8 gives Congress the power to declare war, but President Trump treated Congress as if it were an afterthought in a decision that has destabilized the region and shaken the world.

More than 4,000 of our brave men and women are now being sent to the Persian Gulf, all without any input from the people's Chamber.

We represent the brave young men and women who are deploying to Kuwait; we represent those deploying to Iraq; and we represent those deploying elsewhere across the Middle East. Each of us speaks for them, and we speak for their families, who are scared sick as their loved ones receive orders to deploy.

Madam Speaker, we must summon the courage to be their voice.

Now, I am glad that the United States and Iran have taken a step back from the brink of war, but what we heard from the President yesterday was more of the same bluster. It is clear, even after the briefing by the administration yesterday that many of us attended, that he has no clue at all—none—about what could come next.

Now, make no mistake: The world is less safe because of Trump's chaotic foreign policy. The impacts of his strikes are still reverberating in the region and across the world, and we cannot sit silently by.

The Constitution makes the President Commander in Chief, but it gives only Congress the power to declare war. The Founders knew that decisions of this magnitude required consultation between the branches of government, no matter who is in the White

House, no matter who controls the majority on Capitol Hill.

Our Democrats don't want war with Iran; most Republicans don't want war with Iran; and the American people certainly don't want a war with Iran. I think that would be catastrophic. We should be stopping costly, endless wars, not creating new ones.

But whatever you believe, have the courage of your conviction, have the courage to vote, and that is what the underlying War Powers Resolution is all about. Congress needs to authorize any additional hostilities with Iran.

Madam Speaker, these decisions aren't easy. I understand that. There is no more consequential vote than deciding whether to send men and women off to war and into harm's way. We weigh that decision knowing that, despite our hopes and prayers, lives are lost in combat.

□ 1245

Mothers and fathers could lose their children. Kids could be forced to grow up without a parent.

But when we were sworn in, each of us took an oath to defend the Constitution, and that means wrestling with this very tough decision when necessary. The only question now is whether we have the guts to uphold that oath.

Madam Speaker, with the Middle East held captive to the whims of a reckless President, and with the Commander in Chief without a clue, I pray that we, in Congress, have that courage.

On behalf of our troops, their families, and the American people, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Today, we consider H. Con. Res. 83 or, technically, we are considering the rule to consider H. Con. Res. 83, a resolution to remove the United States Armed Forces from hostilities in Iran.

But the thing is, we are not engaged in hostilities in Iran. Once again, we are considering a measure that will have no force of law. This is a non-binding concurrent resolution.

There was some debate in the Rules Committee last night on whether a concurrent resolution under the War Powers Resolution is, in fact, non-binding. But in the Senate, a joint resolution has been introduced, making it likely that this House Concurrent Resolution will go no further than the action today.

The Constitution grants Congress the power to declare war. The Constitution also designates the President as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. This sets up a conflict. The courts have not delineated the boundaries of these authorities or deter-

mined gaps between them that would either deny power to a President or to the Congress, one at the expense of the other.

In Federalist Number 69, Alexander Hamilton argued the President's power resides only in the direction of the military as placed by law at his command. Presidents have long argued that their role as Commander in Chief, coupled with their inherent authority over foreign affairs, grants them the power to engage the Armed Forces, short of war, as they see fit.

Since the founding of our country, the Supreme Court has ruled both that the President enjoys greater discretion when acting with respect to matters of foreign affairs and, that absent an authorization of action during wartime, any action by the President was void.

Despite the struggle to maintain the separation of powers with regard to engaging our Armed Forces, the motivation underlying the inclusion in the Constitution of these powers for both the President and the Congress continues to this day: The desire to protect and defend the United States, its persons, and its assets.

Congress passed the War Powers Resolution in 1973, largely in response to the experiences in Korea and Vietnam. The War Powers Resolution authorizes the engagement of the forces of the United States in hostilities when: There is a declaration of war; or there exists a specific statutory authorization; or a national emergency created by attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces.

To assess the current situation, let's examine what has led us to this point.

In June of 2019, Iran shot down a surveillance aircraft that was flying over international waters near the Strait of Hormuz. This was an unmanned aerial drone.

At the time, President Trump was advised by his military advisers to strike back, but the President opted not to strike back because it would have resulted in Iranian casualties, and he felt he could not justify creation of human casualties because of the loss of a machine. I agree with the President in that decision. I think his restraint was remarkable, but, certainly, exemplary.

In September of 2019, Iranian cruise missiles struck nearly 20 targets of critical energy infrastructure in Saudi Arabia. This disrupted a significant portion of Saudi oil production.

In December of 2019, Iranian-backed forces in Iraq targeted military facilities where United States forces were co-located.

On December 27, an Iranian-backed Hezbollah group, a U.S.-designated foreign terrorist organization, attacked a base in northern Iraq, and they killed a U.S. contractor and wounded four U.S. servicemembers.

The United States responded, and it launched a retaliatory air strike in Iraq and Syria.

On January 2, 2020, acting on intelligence of imminent threat to American interests, and in response to the persistent attack by Iranian-backed entities, the United States military killed General Qasem Soleimani. Soleimani was the long-time leader of the Iran Revolutionary Guard Corps Quds Force.

The Iran Revolutionary Guard is a U.S.-designated terrorist organization. It has been supporting proxy forces throughout the Middle East and attacking United States interests and allies for over a decade.

Soleimani previously operated under strict security but, in recent years, he has moved much more freely and openly, believing that the United States did not have the willpower to be able to attack him. His atrocities include the deaths of hundreds of Americans and the attempted assassination of a Saudi diplomat in the United States, among other things.

President Obama's former Secretary of Homeland Security, Secretary Jeh Johnson, stated that General Soleimani was a legitimate military target.

I do want to be clear. The last thing that I want to see and I suspect anyone in this body wants to see is our men and women committed to another conflict in the Middle East. We want those conflicts to end, as does the President.

But, Madam Speaker, today the world is a safer place without General Soleimani. And who would want him to come back?

Despite the disagreement in how further to engage in the Middle East, in the country of Iran, be it militarily or diplomatically, the last thing we should be doing is broadcasting our plans to the enemy.

By passing this War Powers Resolution, directing the President to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities with Iran, a point that is, in itself in contention, we are effectively telling the Iranian mullahs that it is okay to push forward with their aggressive posturing. Rather than stating what the President cannot do, perhaps we should be authorizing what the President can do.

Last night, in the Rules Committee, it became clear that both Republicans and Democrats agree that the world is a safer place without General Soleimani, and any war with Iran needs to be authorized by Congress seemed to be general agreement.

Democrats want to maintain the separation of powers, as do I, but the question is, to what extent are we jeopardizing our safety?

I believe Congress does need to authorize military action and maintain the separation of powers as intended by the Founders, but we don't need to broadcast it to the world.

While we may be divided on the need for this resolution, let us recognize the privilege that we enjoy each and every day, being able to stand in this House and debate these issues without fear of

retribution of our government. Those protesters in Iran did not enjoy that freedom. They cut off the internet and eliminated those protesters. That is why you don't see them anymore.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just respond to the gentleman when he says that this is a concurrent resolution here in the House and it is nonbinding and merely symbolic. Let me point out to him that the law states clearly that this sort of resolution reins in the President. The War Powers Resolution requires the President to stop using American forces and hostilities if Congress so directs by concurrent resolution.

Moreover, the Constitution gives war powers to the Congress, not to the President. And if both Houses pass this resolution, it is a clear statement that Congress is denying the President the authority to wage war, and that the President must come to Congress for an authorization prior to further hostilities.

And by the way, we are not just pursuing a concurrent resolution. Senator KAINE of Virginia, over in the Senate, is pursuing a joint resolution; so we are covering all bases here because we are deeply concerned that we may end up in a war inadvertently here, and that Congress will have no role in it.

Again, I would urge the gentleman to read the War Powers Resolution. I have a copy here, and the accompanying report when this resolution was signed into law. The report, with regard to consultation, is crystal clear that consultation is meant prior to introducing our forces and engaging into hostilities, which is something the President didn't even notify us of.

And in terms of the President's exercising this remarkable restraint, I just have a very different opinion. Have you read his Twitter account? Have you been listening to him on TV as he brags about the shiny, expensive weapons we have that he would love to use? The rhetoric, the threat to bomb cultural sites, which is a war crime? I mean, the gentleman may be totally at ease with all of that, but I am not; and most of the American people are scared as hell of this President's rhetoric when it comes to a potential war with Iran.

All we are saying here is that we ought to stand up for this institution, and stand with the Constitution, and make it very clear that if the President wants to go to war in Iran, that he needs to come to Congress to get that declaration, to get that authorization.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the War Powers Resolution to limit the President's military actions regarding Iran.

As a Member of Congress, one of our most sacred votes is our vote to declare war. We, therefore, have an obligation to study the evidence and share concerns about the administration's decision to engage in hostilities against Iran. We have a duty to question its strategy, or lack of strategy, moving forward.

My expertise, Madam Speaker, is not foreign policy, but I know Iran. I lived there. I worked there as a Peace Corps volunteer many years ago. I have been a student of Iranian history and politics for more than 3 decades.

There is no question about Iran's role in sponsoring terrorism. Soleimani himself was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of Americans and thousands around the world. He actively worked to foment instability across the Middle East on behalf of the government of Iran.

Nevertheless, the President of the United States, in his response to Iran, announced that he would commit a war crime by targeting Iran's extraordinary cultural sites. War crimes. No matter who is President of the United States, when he or she indicates that they are prepared to commit a war crime, then Congress better step up and reassert its authority under the Constitution.

We must demand that the President justify any act, and that is what this resolution does. That is why I support it.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, let me yield myself 30 seconds for the purpose of response before I yield to Mr. COLE.

And my response would be, had the gentleman from Massachusetts yielded to me for a question, my question was going to be, was he asking for unanimous consent to change the concurrent resolution to a joint resolution such that it could align and harmonize with the Senate activity and then, therefore, maybe accomplish something. But he didn't.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Dr. BURGESS, for yielding.

I rise, Madam Speaker, in reluctant opposition, quite frankly, to both the rule and the underlying legislation.

As my good friend, Chairman MCGOVERN knows, we have actually worked together to try and expand and reclaim war-making authority for the Congress of the United States, and I would offer and continue to work with him in that partnership. I think that is something that needs to be continued.

I also think we have no difference that if we were to engage in a war with Iraq, it would require congressional authorization. And frankly, last night, in the Rules Committee, I offered a process whereby we could work together in a bipartisan fashion; that is, let's just follow the War Powers Resolution.

Let's submit something to the committee of jurisdiction, which is actually the Foreign Affairs Committee. We have a deadline or a timeline laid out in the War Powers Act; they could operate within that. Within a matter of a few weeks we would then, in a very bipartisan manner, bring something to the floor.

Let's contrast that with how this particular resolution came to the floor. We got it about 45 minutes before the Rules Committee meeting. It is written in the Speaker's Office; rewritten in the Speaker's Office, and it is sent down here to make a political point, not to actually do something that would substantively restore congressional war-making power. This is all politics; that is all it is.

□ 1300

The political aim here is for our friends to suggest that the President either wants war with Iran or has acted hastily, precipitously, and recklessly. Neither of those things is true.

Frankly, our latest dispute with Iran begins with the decision by this administration appropriately to withdraw from the very ill-advised Iranian nuclear deal, a deal, by the way, that the majority of this House and the majority of the United States Senate opposed, but President Obama went ahead with it anyway.

What has been the Iranian response to our withdrawal? A series of provocations to which, as my good friend Mr. BURGESS pointed out, the President, by and large, has acted with remarkable restraint. Let's just go through some of those provocations.

First, it was attacks on ships in the Strait of Hormuz in the gulf. What was the President's response? Well, let's organize an international flotilla to defend these ships. He did not attack Iran.

Next, as my good friend from Texas pointed out, we see strikes into Iraq itself. Particularly, we see an attack on Saudi Arabian oil refineries. What is the President's response? Well, let's not attack Iran. Let's send defensive capabilities from our country there and protect those sites.

Then, we see attacks on American forces in Iraq. What is the President's response? As my friend pointed out, let's go after the Shia militias. Let's not attack Iran.

Finally, after that, when the President responds, we see another attack. In that attack, as my friend pointed out, an American contractor died, and four American servicemembers were wounded. Again, the President responds by attacking Shia militia.

Then, the next response, our embassy is assaulted. Thank goodness, no loss of life, but I think the President had had enough.

By the way, just after that assault happens, who magically shows up in violation of a U.N. resolution in Iraq? Our good friend General Soleimani, a designated terrorist for 13 years, a person who has killed hundreds of Americans, wounded thousands more, not to

mention the tens of thousands across the region. What does the President do? The President takes out a legitimate terrorist target. In Iran? No, the President doesn't want to do that. He does it in Iraq.

Now, how anybody could have any doubt about the President's desire to, number one, strike at a terrorist, and, number two, avoid war, I will never know.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, passing this resolution, as my good friend Dr. BURGESS suggested, sends the wrong message to the wrong people at precisely the wrong time.

The President did the right thing here. He has acted in a restrained manner. He has endured, and our country has endured, endless provocations.

We should reject this rule. Frankly, we should have a regular process where we actually go back to the committee of jurisdiction. We should absolutely reject the underlying resolution.

Before I conclude, I want to mention I know my friend is very sincere in his opinions on expanding congressional war power. There is no doubt in my mind about it. We have worked on that before. I look forward to working with my friend on that issue again. This is the wrong vehicle, the wrong place, the wrong time, the wrong consequences for our own country to pass this kind of legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I look forward to working with him on the war powers and other issues related to the executive branch encroaching on legislative powers in the future. I hope we can work in a bipartisan way and make some progress here.

I include in the RECORD a January 4 New York Times article entitled "As Tensions With Iran Escalated, Trump Opted for Most Extreme Measure."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 4, 2020]

AS TENSIONS WITH IRAN ESCALATED, TRUMP OPTED FOR MOST EXTREME MEASURE

(By Helene Cooper, Eric Schmitt, Maggie Haberman and Rukmini Callimachi)

WASHINGTON.—In the chaotic days leading to the death of Maj. Gen. Qassim Suleimani, Iran's most powerful commander, top American military officials put the option of killing him—which they viewed as the most extreme response to recent Iranian-led violence in Iraq—on the menu they presented to President Trump.

They didn't think he would take it. In the wars waged since the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, Pentagon officials have often offered improbable options to presidents to make other possibilities appear more palatable.

After initially rejecting the Suleimani option on Dec. 28 and authorizing airstrikes on an Iranian-backed Shiite militia group instead, a few days later Mr. Trump watched, fuming, as television reports showed Iranian-backed attacks on the American Embassy in Baghdad, according to Defense Department and administration officials.

By late Thursday, the president had gone for the extreme option. Top Pentagon officials were stunned.

Mr. Trump made the decision, senior officials said on Saturday, despite disputes in the administration about the significance of what some officials said was a new stream of intelligence that warned of threats to American embassies, consulates and military personnel in Syria, Iraq and Lebanon. General Suleimani had just completed a tour of his forces in Syria, Lebanon and Iraq, and was planning an "imminent" attack that could claim hundreds of lives, those officials said.

"Days, weeks," Gen. Mark A. Milley, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said on Friday, when asked how imminent any attacks could be, without offering more detail other than to say that new information about unspecified plotting was "clear and unambiguous."

But some officials voiced private skepticism about the rationale for a strike on General Suleimani, who was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American troops over the years. According to one United States official, the new intelligence indicated "a normal Monday in the Middle East"—Dec. 30—and General Suleimani's travels amounted to "business as usual."

That official described the intelligence as thin and said that General Suleimani's attack was not imminent because of communications the United States had between Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, and General Suleimani showing that the ayatollah had not yet approved any plans by the general for an attack. The ayatollah, according to the communications, had asked General Suleimani to come to Tehran for further discussions at least a week before his death.

Secretary of State Mike Pompeo and Vice President Mike Pence were two of the most hawkish voices arguing for a response to Iranian aggression, according to administration officials. Mr. Pence's office helped run herd on meetings and conference calls held by officials in the run-up to the strike.

Defense Secretary Mark T. Esper and General Milley declined to comment for this article, but General Milley's spokeswoman, Col. DeDe Halfhill, said, without elaborating, that "some of the characterizations being asserted by other sources are false" and that she would not discuss conversations between General Milley and the president.

The fallout from Mr. Trump's targeted killing is now underway. On Saturday in Iraq, the American military was on alert as tens of thousands of pro-Iranian fighters marched through the streets of Baghdad and calls accelerated to eject the United States from the country. United States Central Command, which oversees American military operations in the Middle East, said there were two rocket attacks near Iraqi bases that host American troops, but no one was injured.

In Iran, the ayatollah vowed "forceful revenge" as the country mourned the death of General Suleimani.

In Palm Beach, Fla., Mr. Trump lashed back, promising to strike 52 sites across Iran—representing the number of American hostages taken by Iran in 1979—if Iran attacked Americans or American interests. On Saturday night, Mr. Trump warned on Twitter that some sites were "at a very high level & important to Iran & the Iranian culture, and those targets, and Iran itself. WILL BE HIT VERY FAST AND VERY HARD."

The president issued those warnings after American spy agencies on Saturday detected that Iranian ballistic missile units across the country had gone to a heightened state of readiness, a United States official said on Saturday night.

Other officials said it was unclear whether Iran was dispersing its ballistic missile units—the heart of the Iranian military—to avoid American attack, or was mobilizing the units for a major strike against American targets or allies in the region in retaliation for General Suleimani's death.

On Capitol Hill, Democrats voiced growing suspicions about the intelligence that led to the killing. At the White House, officials formally notified Congress of a war powers resolution with what the administration said was a legal justification for the strike.

At Fort Bragg, N.C., some 3,500 soldiers, one of the largest rapid deployments in decades, are bound for the Middle East.

General Suleimani, who was considered the most important person in Iran after Ayatollah Khamenei, was a commanding general of a sovereign government. The last time the United States killed a major military leader in a foreign country was during World War II, when the American military shot down the plane carrying the Japanese admiral Isoroku Yamamoto.

But administration officials are playing down General Suleimani's status as a part of the Iranian state, suggesting his title gave him cover for terrorist activities. In the days since his death, they have sought to describe the strike as more in line with the killing of Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the Islamic State leader, who died in October in an American commando raid in Syria.

Administration officials insisted they did not anticipate sweeping retaliation from Iran, in part because of divisions in the Iranian leadership. But Mr. Trump's two predecessors—Presidents George W. Bush and Barack Obama—had rejected killing General Suleimani as too provocative.

General Suleimani had been in Mr. Trump's sights since the beginning of the administration, although it was a Dec. 27 rocket attack on an Iraqi military base outside Kirkuk, which left an American civilian contractor dead, that set the killing in motion.

General Milley and Mr. Esper traveled on Sunday to Mar-a-Lago, Mr. Trump's Palm Beach resort, a day after officials presented the president with an initial list of options for how to deal with escalating violence against American targets in Iraq.

The options included strikes on Iranian ships or missile facilities or against Iranian-backed militia groups in Iraq. The Pentagon also tacked on the choice of targeting General Suleimani, mainly to make other options seem reasonable.

Mr. Trump chose strikes against militia groups. On Sunday, the Pentagon announced that airstrikes approved by the president had struck three locations in Iraq and two in Syria controlled by the group, Kataib Hezbollah.

Jonathan Hoffman, the chief Pentagon spokesman, said the targets included weapons storage facilities and command posts used to attack American and partner forces. About two dozen militia fighters were killed.

"These were on remote sites," General Milley told reporters on Friday in his Pentagon office. "There was no collateral damage."

But the Iranians viewed the strikes as out of proportion to their attack on the Iraqi base and Iraqis, largely members of Iranian-backed militias, staged violent protests outside the American Embassy in Baghdad. Mr. Trump, who aides said had on his mind the specter of the 2012 attacks on the American compound in Benghazi, Libya, became increasingly angry as he watched television images of pro-Iranian demonstrators storming the embassy. Aides said he worried that no response would look weak after repeated threats by the United States.

When Mr. Trump chose the option of killing General Suleimani, top military officials, flabbergasted, were immediately

alarmed about the prospect of Iranian retaliatory strikes on American troops in the region. It is unclear if General Milley or Mr. Esper pushed back on the president's decision.

Over the next several days, the military's Special Operations Command looked for an opportunity to hit General Soleimani, who operated in the open and was treated like a celebrity in many places he visited in the Middle East. Military and intelligence officials said the strike drew on information from secret informants, electronic intercepts, reconnaissance aircraft and other surveillance tools.

The option that was eventually approved depended on who would greet General Soleimani at his expected arrival on Friday at Baghdad International Airport. If he was met by Iraqi government officials allied with Americans, one American official said, the strike would be called off. But the official said it was a "clean party," meaning members of Kataib Hezbollah, including its leader, Abu Mahdi al-Muhandis. Mr. Trump authorized the killing at about 5 p.m. on Thursday, officials said.

On Friday, missiles fired from an American MQ-9 Reaper blew up General Soleimani's convoy as it departed the airport.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished chair and my colleague from the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding me this minute.

We begin the new year in turbulent and uncertain times, particularly with regard to Iran and the Middle East. Protecting our national interests and securing the safety and security of the American people must be the highest priorities of our government. I am gravely concerned the recent actions of the Trump administration have destabilized the region and undermined those priorities.

Article I of the United States Constitution vests in the House and Senate the responsibility to declare war, to appropriate money for the national defense, and, in doing so, to ensure no President employs military action without careful consultation of and authorization by Congress.

That is why it is so important that we take action to reaffirm these responsibilities by passing the resolution before us, which I am proud to cosponsor.

The use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities against Iran must come only after thoughtful deliberation and approval by Congress. As we move forward, we must all seek to achieve a peaceful resolution that protects American interests at home and abroad.

I join with all Americans in praying for the safety of our courageous servicemembers and urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), a valuable member of the House Committee on Rules.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, I thank President Trump for making a decisive action to protect Americans. Thank you.

The world now knows that Obama's appeasement strategy policies, including giving billions of dollars to Iran, are over. It didn't work. The world knows that when President Trump says we are not going to cross this red line, they know he means it.

In Rules Committee last night and again today, I listened as my Democratic colleagues claim what this resolution is all about. They claim that it is about making sure Congress exerts its authority to approve future war against Iran. But that is not what this resolution does.

In fact, let's read the title of this resolution. It says: "Directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities in or against Iran." It doesn't say anything about future war.

We do not currently have U.S. Armed Forces engaged in hostilities in or against Iran. If Democrats are serious about making sure Congress has its say in declaring war, they would follow the statutory guidelines as described by Representative COLE. They are already in there. Go to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Instead, Democrats have chosen to short circuit the process yet again to achieve a partisan objective.

As a member of the Rules Committee, I saw the language of the resolution 45 minutes before the Rules Committee started. This is not a serious effort for such a serious subject.

Here are the facts. Iran and Iranian-backed militias have escalated their attacks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, in June 2019, Iran shot down a U.S. drone. Trump said, no, we are not going to retaliate because no U.S. lives were lost. Iran attacked Saudi oil fields. Iran-backed militia killed a U.S. citizen and wounded four troops. Then, an Iran-backed militia attacked the U.S. Embassy.

Soleimani was a terrorist designated by the Obama administration.

Let me read very quickly what the Joint Chiefs of Staff have said. He has had 40 years of military experience under all different administrations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. General Milley said the trigger for the drone strike that killed

Soleimani was "clear, unambiguous intelligence indicating a significant campaign of violence against the United States in the days, weeks, and months," and that the administration would have been "culpably negligent" if it did not act.

This is a man who has been in the military for 40 years under different administrations, and you are going to doubt what he has to say?

I thank President Trump for protecting American citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a January 8 Vanity Fair article entitled "There Is No Strategy: Diplomats React to Trump's Erratic, Narcissistic Iran Policy."

[From Vanity Fair, Jan. 8, 2020]

"THERE IS NO STRATEGY": DIPLOMATS REACT TO TRUMP'S ERRATIC, NARCISSISTIC IRAN POLICY

(By Abigail Tracy)

After the American drone strike and Iran's measured retaliation, some State vets worry that Trump is a wild card, the biggest danger: "From a political standpoint," says one, "they have behaved a hell of a lot more rationally and predictably than we have."

In the aftermath of Iran's strike against two airbases, in retaliation for the drone strike that killed Qasem Soleimani last week, a sigh of relief was breathed, but for what? That there had been no casualties from Iran's cruise missiles was a huge reason to be thankful. (U.S. officials have since suggested this was intentional.) But there was also a sense of relief that Trump had stepped back—as if he were the wild card. The developments laid bare what diplomats I spoke with identified as a discomfiting reality in the Trump era. "Up is down and down is up," a former U.S. ambassador in the region told me, noting Iran's decision to notify the Iraqis ahead of the attack on Tuesday and Mohammad Javad Zarif's message of detente in the face of Trump's bluster. "Who would've imagined that it's the American president who is a crazy person gunning for war and the mullahs who are being careful and deliberate and cautious . . . They have done terrible things—I am not going to defend the fact that the country holds hostages and has absolutely supported terrorist groups and those sorts of things—but from a political standpoint, they have behaved a hell of a lot more rationally and predictably than we have," this person added. "Do you take comfort in the fact that Iran is the rational actor or does that scare the bejesus out of you even more?"

A former Foreign Service Officer who worked on Iran under Barack Obama echoed the point. "I think it is interesting that [Iran has taken] every opportunity to show that they're actually more responsible than the U.S. president in executing this conflict," this person said. "It boggles the mind to me that we are almost more concerned, I think, about our own president than we are about the way others may retaliate, which is really scary."

Diplomats I spoke with are clear-eyed in their belief that Iran's retaliation for Soleimani is not complete; they are bracing for—if not further military attacks—subsequent responses, such as cyberattacks or even kidnappings. To a fault, they, too, are not defending Iran's past malfeasance. And Trump's position on the wake of the attacks is welcomed by veterans of Foggy Bottom.

“President Trump made the right decision not to respond to Iran’s missile attacks. There were no American casualties and the Iranians are clearly signaling they don’t want a war,” Nicholas Burns, the former ambassador to NATO, told me. The problem is that Trump has thus far failed to chart a path forward with Iran. Instead, he has shuttled between slamming Iran, slighting his predecessor’s signature Iran nuclear deal, and patting himself on the back for the death of Soleimani and Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the former leader of the Islamic State whom the United States killed in October. “His speech was confusing about his strategy. It is not at all clear if he intends to contain Iran through deterrence or to weaken its government and seek regime change,” Burns added. “He owes the American public, the Congress, and our allies a much more specific and consistent game plan. Otherwise, it will be difficult for him to gain domestic and allied support.”

As I reported in the aftermath of the Soleimani’s killing last week, a chief concern within the diplomatic ranks was that the Trump administration, still lacking a coherent foreign policy, had failed to adequately contemplate and prepare for the international and Iranian response to the airstrike against the top Iranian general. Indeed, the Trump administration certainly appeared to be caught flat-footed when the Iraqi parliament voted to expel U.S. troops from the country over the weekend. While asserting that the killing of Soleimani left Americans safer, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo and Defense Secretary Mark Esper have yet to detail the imminent threat they claim the Iranian general posed to U.S. interests. And Trump’s remarks on Wednesday arguably raised more questions than they answered. As the former ambassador in the region put it, “There is no strategy. It is satisfying Trump’s ego at every step. It’s all it is for us, there is zero strategy and it’s all strategy on Iran’s side.”

Beyond his “America First” tagline, Trump has failed to formulate anything resembling a coherent foreign policy. Rather, he has a domestic policy that influences American posturing abroad. The clearest through line in Trump’s various foreign policy decisions can largely be summed up as “the opposite of what Obama did.” But this lack of coherence is particularly troubling in the Middle East and is amplified by the reality that he’s surrounded by hawks with hard-ons for toppling the Iranian regime, like Pompeo. “The most frustrating thing is that this is entirely of his own making. You think about where we were less than five years ago, when we got to the deal. Things certainly weren’t perfect by any means. They were still causing a lot of harm and doing things against our interests in the region, but compare that to where we are today and it is so entirely avoidable,” the former Foreign Service officer told me. “The lack of a strategy continues to be the most dangerous thing we can do in the Middle East.”

A former high-ranking State Department official expressed similar dismay. “Foreign policy isn’t well-done on impulse. Because so much is intertwined . . . It requires the ability to understand the trade-offs and possible longer-term impacts. Never easy. But this team has no ability to do that,” they told me. “If I were a military family member, I’d really worry that our troops are being sent out with no clear plan or mission. Not a comforting thought.”

If Trump really does have an appetite for diplomacy, that’s undeniably a positive development. Diplomats stress that now is the time for it, and the Iranians do seem to be signaling a desire deescalate. “Now we’re in

the time of intense diplomacy, where around the world leaders are figuring out, ‘If you do this, I do that’ and ‘What will be the response of X if we do Y,’” a former senior U.S. official told me. But, this person added, “The only ones not taking part are the Americans.” Instead, “America is content with a two-dimensional policy: We take this act, we stand still and watch what happens. The other countries are at least trying to be three-dimensional, adding the element of time, projecting to the not-too-distant future which advantages are to be gained.”

In an ideal world, Burns said, Trump would open a reliable diplomatic channel to Tehran. “We should want to be able to deliver tough and clear messages to its government. And it would be smart to offer Iran a diplomatic off-ramp so that we can end the possibility of a wider war that is in neither of our interests,” he said. “Trump’s disinterest in real diplomacy is a significant disadvantage for the U.S.”

Confronting a president who has repeatedly demonstrated a desire to dive into military conflict before diplomacy, Congress is grappling with how to restrain Trump. California congressman Ro Khanna told me the attacks on Tuesday increase “the urgency for Congress to act. We need to engage in de-escalation and a cease-fire to end the cycle of violence.” Currently on the table are a few measures House Democrats hope can curb Trump’s authority to attack Iran. Among them are a War Powers Resolution and a bill drafted by Khanna and Senator Bernie Sanders that would defund any offensive action in Iran and require any such action to have Congressional authorization.

Khanna told me that the Democratic caucus is unified and that he has been in talks with Speaker Nancy Pelosi about timing and process. The House is expected to vote on a War Powers Resolution, after which they would push his bill with Senator Sanders. Currently, House leadership is figuring how to craft a War Powers Resolution in a way that would prevent Republicans from attaching a Motion to Recommit, which could prevent it from reaching the Senate floor—as was the case with the War Powers Resolution on Yemen. “That is why it is taking some time,” Khanna explained. “It is taking time to figure out the procedural mechanisms with the parliamentarian in the House and the Senate so that what we send over to the Senate doesn’t lose its War Powers privileged status. If it loses its privileged status, then [Mitch] McConnell would never call it up.”

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentlewoman. I urge the gentlewoman, who read a couple of lines from the resolution, as I urge all of my colleagues, to read the entire resolution.

This is pretty simple. Basically, it says that if we go to war with Iran, Congress ought to have a say in it. Congress ought to do what the Constitution requires us to do.

I don’t know why that is a radical idea, but if my friends want to go to war with Iran, they have to have the guts to come to the floor to debate it and vote on it.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, the President cannot unilaterally go to war with Iran, nor are we safer since January 2, 2020, after having targeted

and killed the second-in-command of Iran. The American people, as well as our troops, are in more jeopardy.

In 2002, I was here, and I offer these words from my statement on the floor regarding President Bush. “Always a question of the greatest importance, our decision today,” in 2002, “is further weighted by the fact that we are being asked to sanction a new foreign policy doctrine that gives a President the power to launch a unilateral and preemptive first strike against Iraq before we have utilized our diplomatic options.”

I further went on to say that “our own intelligence agencies report that there is currently little chance of chemical and biological attack from Saddam Hussein on U.S. forces or territories.”

Proven right, endless war, continuous loss of life of our treasured young men and women and many injured—this resolution and rule are imperative to assert constitutional authority to ensure the protection of the American people.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), a valuable member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I join my colleagues in expressing the will to have an honest debate of the War Powers Act, should the majority party choose to do so.

Before I move any further, I submit for the RECORD a report from the Director of National Intelligence on Barack Obama’s use of drones, an average of 67 drone strikes a year over his first 7 years in office, killing an average of six enemy combatants a week, wherein the majority said absolutely nothing about it at the time.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION REGARDING U.S. COUNTERTERRORISM STRIKES OUTSIDE AREAS OF ACTIVE HOSTILITIES

In accordance with the President’s direction and consistent with the President’s commitment to providing as much information as possible to the American people about U.S. counterterrorism activities, the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) is releasing today a summary of information provided to the DNI about both the number of strikes taken by the U.S. Government against terrorist targets outside areas of active hostilities and the assessed number of combatant and non-combatant deaths resulting from those strikes. “Areas of active hostilities” currently include Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria.

SUMMARY OF U.S. COUNTERTERRORISM STRIKES OUTSIDE AREAS OF ACTIVE HOSTILITIES BETWEEN JANUARY 20, 2009 AND DECEMBER 31, 2015

Total number of strikes against terrorist targets outside areas of active hostilities: 473.

Combatant deaths: 2372–2581.

Non-combatant deaths: 64–116.

The assessed range of non-combatant deaths provided to the DNI reflects consideration of credible reports of non-combatant deaths drawn from all-source information, including reports from the media and non-

governmental organizations. The assessed range of non-combatant deaths includes deaths for which there is an insufficient basis for assessing that the deceased is a combatant.

U.S. GOVERNMENT POST-STRIKE REVIEW PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

The information that was provided to the DNI regarding combatant and non-combatant deaths is the result of processes that include careful reviews of all strikes after they are conducted to assess the effectiveness of operations. These review processes have evolved over time to ensure that they incorporate the best available all-source intelligence, media reporting, and other information and may result in reassessments of strikes if new information becomes available that alters the original judgment. The large volume of pre- and post-strike data available to the U.S. Government can enable analysts to distinguish combatants from non-combatants, conduct detailed battle damage assessments, and separate reliable reporting from terrorist propaganda or from media reports that may be based on inaccurate information.

DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN U.S. GOVERNMENT AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL ASSESSMENTS

In releasing these figures, the U.S. Government acknowledges that there are differences between U.S. Government assessments and reporting from non-governmental organizations. Reports from non-governmental organizations can include both aggregate data regarding non-combatant deaths as well as case studies addressing particular strikes, and generally rely on a combination of media reporting and, in some instances, field research conducted in areas of reported strikes. Although these organizations' reports of non-combatant deaths resulting from U.S. strikes against terrorist targets outside areas of active hostilities vary widely, such reporting generally estimates significantly higher figures for non-combatant deaths than is indicated by U.S. Government information. For instance, for the period between January 20, 2009 and December 31, 2015, non-governmental organizations' estimates range from more than 200 to slightly more than 900 possible non-combatant deaths outside areas of active hostilities.

Consistent with the requirements applicable to future reporting under Section 3(b) of the Executive Order "United States Policy on Pre- and Post-Strike Measures to Address Civilian Casualties in U.S. Operations Involving the Use of Force," the information we are releasing today addresses general reasons for discrepancies between post-strike assessments from the United States Government and credible reporting from non-governmental organizations regarding non-combatant deaths and does not address specific incidents. There are a number of possible reasons that these non-governmental organizations' reports of the number of non-combatants killed may differ from the U.S. Government assessments, based on the information provided to the DNI.

First, although there are inherent limitations on determining the precise number of combatant and non-combatant deaths, particularly when operating in non-permissive environments, the U.S. Government uses post-strike methodologies that have been refined and honed over the years and that use information that is generally unavailable to non-governmental organizations. The U.S. Government draws on all available information (including sensitive intelligence) to determine whether an individual is part of a belligerent party fighting against the United States in an armed conflict, taking a direct part in hostilities against the United States, or otherwise targetable in the exercise of na-

tional self-defense. Thus, the U.S. Government may have reliable information that certain individuals are combatants, but are being counted as non-combatants by non-governmental organizations. For example, further analysis of an individual's possible membership in an organized armed group may include, among other things: the extent to which an individual performs functions for the benefit of the group that are analogous to those traditionally performed by members of a country's armed forces; whether that person is carrying out or giving orders to others within the group; or whether that person has undertaken certain acts that reliably connote meaningful integration into the group.

Second, according to information provided to the DNI, U.S. Government post-strike reviews involve the collection and analysis of multiple sources of intelligence before, during, and after a strike, including video observations, human sources and assets, signals intelligence, geospatial intelligence, accounts from local officials on the ground, and open source reporting. Information collected before a strike is intended to provide clarity regarding the number of individuals at a strike location as well as whether the individuals are engaged in terrorist activity. Post-strike collection frequently enables U.S. Government analysts to confirm, among other things, the number of individuals killed as well as their combatant status. The information is then analyzed along with other all-source intelligence reporting. This combination of sources is unique and can provide insights that are likely unavailable to non-governmental organizations.

Finally, non-governmental organizations' reports of counterterrorism strikes attributed to the U.S. Government—particularly their identification of non-combatant deaths—may be further complicated by the deliberate spread of misinformation by some actors, including terrorist organizations, in local media reports on which some non-governmental estimates rely.

Although the U.S. Government has access to a wide range of information, the figures released today should be considered in light of the inherent limitations on the ability to determine the precise number of combatant and non-combatant deaths given the non-permissive environments in which these strikes often occur. The U.S. Government remains committed to considering new, credible information regarding non-combatant deaths that may emerge and revising previous assessments, as appropriate.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, if we want to have an honest debate about the War Powers Act, then let's have an honest debate about the War Powers Act.

Why didn't we hear anything from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle about Libya when President Barack Obama took action that led to the death of Muammar Qadhafi? Why not Syria? Why not Yemen? Why is Iran individually spelled out in this resolution?

The only reason Iran is singled out in this resolution is to take a political jab at President Trump for utilizing an airstrike to take out General Soleimani, a terrorist who was responsible for killing thousands of Americans, partner troops, and, yes, Iranians.

While our colleagues are upset with the use of airstrikes to kill General Soleimani, I remind them that the Obama administration, according to

their own Director of National Intelligence, conducted hundreds of airstrikes, averaging more than six kills a week between January 2009 and December 2015, and that was in areas of non-hostilities. That doesn't even include Iraq, Afghanistan, and Syria, which are classified numbers.

Let's just be honest about what this is. This is another partisan attack against the President of the United States for killing General Soleimani, who was a terrorist in an area where the President had the absolute legal authority to operate.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman from Georgia, who I have a great deal of respect for.

Let's be honest here. Many of us, contrary to what the gentleman just said, have been outspoken against unilateral interventions by the executive branch without notifying Congress, without seeking our approval on military authorization under Obama. I, for one, was critical of his drone attacks. I raised issues about our involvement in Syria.

I include in the RECORD a statement that I made, saying that Congress should reconvene and debate and vote on a resolution with regard to what the Obama administration was doing in Libya.

[Press Release, March 23, 2011]

CONGRESSMAN MCGOVERN STATEMENT ON LIBYA

WASHINGTON, DC.—For several weeks now I have been calling for an internationally-enforced no-fly-zone over Libya in order to prevent Colonel Qaddafi from slaughtering his own people. I agree with President Obama that U.S. ground troops should not be committed to this effort, and that our international partners should soon take the lead. Whether or not Qaddafi remains the leader of Libya must, in the end, be up to the Libyan people. I am troubled about pressure to expand the military operation and the many unanswered questions about Libyan opposition forces. I urge the House leadership to call the Congress back into session as soon as possible so that Congress can exercise its constitutional responsibility to clearly spell out the mission and limits of U.S. military engagement in Libya. And I urge the Obama Administration to consult with Congress and to engage us at every possible opportunity as this crisis continues to unfold.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, some of us have been consistent on this through Democratic and Republican administrations. I take great exception when anybody tries to say that we are raising this issue just purely for political purposes.

For me, it is not. For me, I have been consistent on this through Democratic and Republican administrations.

□ 1315

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Massachusetts setting the record straight. The war powers activity, the authorization

of military force has been an issue that a number of us have been concerned with, Republican and Democrat, going back to the Clinton administration and activity in the Balkans, but what my friend from Massachusetts pointed out is that this reckless act by the President of the United States actually makes us less safe.

With one act, he has been able to unite the opposition in Iran. Remember, they were demonstrating in the streets against the regime. And I have heard from friends of mine who have deep roots in Iran that this has probably set back the cause of reform years, if not decades, in Iran.

We are less safe, not more.

I strongly urge the approval of this resolution as a start to rein in the President's worst impulses, but we must also put in additional checks, by passing Representative KHANNA's legislation to ensure no funds are used for an unauthorized war with Iran and Representative LEE's legislation to repeal the 2002 AUMF.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, this is an opportunity for us to get it right. And to take our friend, Mr. COLE's, word, we can move this forward. I see this as a beginning, and we can build on it, but rein in this administration.

Send a strong signal. Approve this resolution.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire the amount of time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 13¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), a valuable member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is insincere and unserious. It is insincere because this is just: We don't like the President and he took action, and we can't stand it.

It is unserious, because if they really wanted to limit the actions of our government to defend our country and defend those in uniform, this wouldn't be a nonbinding resolution, they would limit it. If they want to limit it, go ahead and do it.

For the people in America that say, "Well, we don't know this Soleimani guy. How come we don't know him?" That is a great question. How come they don't know?

Well, let me introduce folks to him. He got busy with his work as a terrorist in Beirut, killing 241 marines; the Khobar Towers, killing Americans; hundreds of American personnel wearing uniforms dead by EFPs, explosively

formed penetrators; and thousands maimed walking around the United States, walking around the Halls of this Congress. That is Soleimani.

But they don't know him because this body, the executive branch, Republicans and Democrats, have sent their young men and women to war without dealing with this killer, this terrorist, because it was too hard, too hard in Iraq to deal with Iran, because it might make them mad, they might do something about it.

Our colleagues say that the President is reckless, without a plan.

Here is what is reckless: appeasement. Appeasement has gotten Americans killed, has gotten people around the globe killed because of this guy. What is the point of designating him a terrorist if you are not going to do anything about it?

Doing the bidding of Iran on this floor is unacceptable. We don't want to be in a war, that is true, nobody wants to be in a war, but I have got a news flash for everybody: Iran slapped us in the face in 1979 and they have been fighting with us ever since.

Us saying we are not going to defend ourselves does not stop Iran from fighting the war that they have with us. Appeasing Iran will only kill more Americans. It hasn't worked.

That is what is happening here today, Madam Speaker: the defense of the appeasement strategy of the last administration and administrations in the past.

We cannot allow this strategy to continue and Americans to be killed or Iran to have a nuclear weapon.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would just urge my colleagues to read the resolution. This is about the future and it is about whether or not, if we go to war with Iran, whether or not Congress upholds its constitutional responsibility.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The President's policy towards Iran is to tear up diplomacy and embrace so-called maximum pressure.

The most recent strike, far from making us safer, is making us more insecure.

Think about the deliberate consequences from that act:

One, the Iraqi street is demonstrating against the U.S., not against Iran, as they were before;

Two, the Iranian street is demonstrating with the mullahs against the U.S. instead of against their own government;

Three, the Iraqi parliament voted to expel the United States from Iraq, jeopardizing our anti-ISIS mission;

Number four, our military has suspended training for anti-ISIS activities in Iraq because of this strike;

Number five, the Iran nuclear deal that the President tore up that Iranians complied with, they are now re-

nouncing, so we are closer to a nuclear Iran than we were before.

All of this has happened when the likelihood of Iran's further responding is grave.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, the gun is cocked and loaded.

We cannot go to war without Congress being involved in the debate and the President telling us what his policy is going to be.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for immediate consideration of H. Res. 783, honoring the members of the military and intelligence community for carrying out the mission that killed General Soleimani.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment into the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW), my good friend, to explain the resolution.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to urge defeat of the previous question so that we can immediately consider my resolution to honor the hard work and dedication of the men and women who made the precision strike on Qasem Soleimani possible.

This is an interesting crossroads we find ourselves in. After the successful response by the United States against the escalating aggression from the world's most active and deadly terrorist, Qasem Soleimani, our great country has found itself divided and unsure of itself.

Instead of unity and resolve in the face of a clear and common enemy, we have division and self-doubt. What is worse, that division has been sourced from the leadership in this very body.

While legitimate questions were raised—what authority was used, what was the reasoning, what sort of intelligence backed this decision—those questions have long been answered clearly and convincingly.

The President has clear authority, a duty in fact, to respond to attacks against American citizens and U.S. forces. That isn't my opinion; that is clear from Article II of the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution.

The case is made even stronger when you consider this occurred entirely within Iraq, a place where we already have a lawful military operational footprint.

The reasoning is quite simple as well: We must make clear that the U.S. will not be attacked indefinitely, that we will respond, and that response will make you regret ever having hit us in the first place.

The long history of General Soleimani's actions against the United States throughout the region, and the killing and maiming of thousands of America's sons and daughters, and indications of his future actions make this point even stronger.

As to the intelligence, our CIA, our Director of National Intelligence, our Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have repeatedly told us that this intelligence was some of the best they had ever seen, and it removed all doubt that Soleimani was planning large scale imminent attacks.

These questions have been answered over and over and over, and yet my colleagues pretend not to hear those answers. After all, the mere thought of agreeing with and supporting our President is repugnant to them even when it is the right thing to do.

So instead of applauding these actions that restored American deterrence, delivered justice to hundreds of dead American soldiers and their families, and severely weakened the terrorist organization IRGC Quds Force, my colleagues wring their hands and express regret and disappointment.

Instead of applauding the men and women of our military standing in harm's way, instead of recognizing the tireless vigilance of our intelligence community, instead of acknowledging those who have spent years confronting the Iranian threat network directly, my colleagues in this Congress seek to undermine them.

I take this personally, since I was one of those servicemembers for so many years.

This threat is not new to us, though it may be new to those politicians who have lived comfortably and safely back home, now casting stones from ivory towers, relying on disingenuous judgments and false premises to make a false, politically-driven case to the American people.

So I offer this resolution today in order to right that wrong. I offer this to demonstrate to the American people and our servicemembers and members of the intelligence community that this Congress does indeed stand by the decision to rid the world of America's enemies and those who seek to do us harm and stands by those who made justice possible.

This resolution simply states the obvious: that General Soleimani was head of one of the most sophisticated terrorist organizations in the world that already committed numerous attacks against the United States and planned to carry out many more within days.

This resolution rightfully congratulates our men and women who disrupted this evil chain of attacks, instead of wrongly suggesting to them that their actions were unauthorized and even immoral.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution and put to rest once and for all the false implication that America cannot defend herself when necessary.

Madam Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, late last week, President Trump ordered the assassination of a high-ranking Iranian official while he was in Iraq.

This action threatens to cascade the United States into an ill-advised, not authorized war with Iran, and is already setting into motion a series of disastrous unintended consequences for American security and interests in the Middle East.

The President trashed the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, which Iran was following and that put in place the first real restraints on Iran's nuclear program. The world and America were safer under the JCPOA framework, period.

Enter Trump, and now we see Iranian rockets firing, U.S. forces being pushed out of Iraq, and alliances strained as we all await further retaliations.

Oh, history is replete with the misery befalling those poor empires who first fight and mistake that for might.

This escalation with Iran must end, Congress must reassert its war powers authority, and I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Committee on Armed Forces.

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Sometimes when I watch the debate, I wonder what happened to the confident America that I remember; that when a failing country threatens us, we actually respond with force instead of fear and run away.

That said, this process argument that we are having is interesting, but as my colleague said earlier, maybe they forgot something.

So I am going to urge defeat of the previous question, because I think in this resolution, something major was forgotten, maybe they can re-craft it, bring it back later, but that is this: I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle say that Mr. Soleimani was a bad guy and they are glad he is dead. However—process argument follows—I think something has been left out of this.

When I was in Iraq in 2008 and 2009, I operated mostly against terrorist networks of a different nature, but about a quarter of my operations were against terrorist networks from Mr. Soleimani.

So these attacks against Americans, we talked about the dead Americans from Iraq, these have been going on for a very long time, and I was part of the response to that.

One of the most important things we can do, if we are going to have this process argument, is appreciate the men and women, not just of the military, but of the intelligence community, of the State Department, of everywhere that has worked to bring the intelligence to bring this evil man to justice.

I heard somebody earlier say we should have just captured him. Well, think of the risk that would have put to our military. So maybe we should at least appreciate the job that they are willing to do. That is going to be essential.

I often hear my friends talk about keeping the military safe, as if that is the end state of the military.

The military's job that they volunteer for every day is to keep the American people safe, and that is exactly what was done a week ago in the death of Soleimani.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can give them an opportunity and pass this resolution appreciating the men and women of the intelligence community and the military. That is the least we can do after this debate on the floor.

□ 1330

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I take my duty to protect and defend our Nation's interests very seriously. The President's reckless and irresponsible actions toward Iran have endangered our servicemembers, diplomats, and allies, and they have worked counter to American security interests. Those include dangerous decisions to pull out of the successful Iran deal and kill Commander Soleimani, drastically ratcheting up tensions in the region.

In the context of the administration's failure to demonstrate an imminent threat to our Nation, there is no authority for such an action without authorization from Congress. What makes this even more dangerous is that the President has no clear strategy.

Under the Constitution, President Trump does not have the authority to unilaterally wage war. That is why, today, I support this rule and the underlying resolution, which directs the President to end hostilities with Iran and to keep our troops in America safe.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ).

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, Qasem Soleimani, as we have discussed, many of us have discussed here today, was a

terrorist and a terrorist supporter, and hundreds of American troops were killed because of him. Many of them are scarred for life.

I don't think we can overstate, in this body, how gruesome, how advanced, how effective the explosive devices that he poured into his militias were. They were deadly. They were manufactured in Iran. They were put in place by Iran. They were trained by Iran. They had the capability to completely penetrate our armored vehicles.

Soleimani worked hand in hand, in addition to this, with Assad in Syria, a serial human rights abuser, and waged even chemical warfare on his own people, literally killing tens of thousands. And because of him, today, hundreds, if not thousands, of families, including Gold Star families, just this past holiday, couldn't open up presents with their loved ones. No longer will they celebrate birthdays or holidays because of this one evil man.

This terrorist, because of his savage actions, I, as a former Green Beret who operated against these thugs for years, am grateful to the intelligence officer, as my colleague Mr. KINZINGER just mentioned, to the members of the military who carried out this mission to prevent more lives from being lost.

Soleimani was actively planning attacks in the coming weeks, in the coming days, in the coming months. According to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, these attacks were imminent, they were clear, and they were a present danger for our troops, to our allies, and to our interests.

From an oversight perspective, the President had a duty to act; and I, for one, would be screaming from the rooftops if he had not taken appropriate action.

So, again, Madam Speaker, I am thankful for his leadership taking this monster out. Frankly, this should have been done a long, long time ago, years ago, by multiple previous administrations. It astounds me that this is up for debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. WALTZ. For those of you saying actions have consequences, let me remind you that inaction has consequences. Go to Walter Reed or Arlington, or go visit the American contractor, as though that is some kind of term, the American that was killed just last week. His name was Nawres Waleed Hamid. He is from Sacramento. He is from California, and he was just buried.

I think the answer for most Americans is this was warranted. It certainly was for me.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question and consider this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, the War Powers Resolution simply requires the President to consult with the Congress and with the American public before going to war with Iran.

Our constituents held their breath on Tuesday. Thankfully, no lives were lost in Iran's retaliatory attack, but serious concerns remain about the rationale and the ramifications.

We do not mourn the loss of Qasem Soleimani. He was responsible for actions that harmed and killed American personnel and allies, and I condemn that. But any U.S. military action, especially one that could spark catastrophic consequences, needs to be carefully considered, fully justified within the law.

President Trump failed to consult the Congress, failed to secure specific authorization, failed to cite with specificity the imminent threat. In a classified briefing for Members of Congress, the administration would not, could not provide any specifics about what constituted an imminent threat. They couldn't tell us what the targets were, nor would they divulge any of the timelines for the attack.

It is unprecedented the level at which this administration is seeking to obscure the facts from the Congress and the American people. The rationale is in doubt, the ramifications as well: The U.S. announced it will suspend our fight against ISIS; Iraq's Prime Minister and the legislature moved to expel our troops; the Iranian leaders announced they would no longer abide by the 2015 nuclear deal.

President Trump's actions have dramatically increased the possibility of war with Iran and Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon. Today, America and our allies are less safe as a result of the administration's actions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Let us reassert the Congress' role to ensure that the President—any President—is complying with the law and is not conducting lengthy military actions without congressional approval.

Let us prevent another unnecessary war. Let us vote for this rule and this resolution.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, the Constitution gave Congress the power to declare war. The Constitution gave Congress the power appropriate money

for war. The Constitution gave us the power to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a Navy.

Why? Why didn't the Framers just give the President the power to declare and wage war? After all, the President is made Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and militias when called into the actual service of the United States. It would have been a lot simpler to say let the President go to war whenever he wants. Why didn't they do that?

Well, the Framers acted against a background of kings and princes plunging their populations into wars of vanity and political advantage to distract their people at home from the political problems of the kingdom, of the monarchy. And our Framers were emphatic that the awesome power of war, the power over life and death of our sons and daughters, the power over our national treasure not be vested in one man alone but, rather, in American democracy itself.

The representatives of the people, the people of Maryland and Virginia and Florida and California and Idaho and Pennsylvania and Michigan and Alaska and Hawaii, that is who the Framers vested the power of war in: the Congress of the United States.

Now, the structural problem is that, if the Nation is actually attacked or there is an imminent attack coming, the President may need to respond in self-defense. Madison anticipated that, and Madison said that might happen.

The Supreme Court, in 1863, in the middle of the Civil War, in the Prize Cases, said that the President can act in those situations. Lincoln embargoed and blockaded the Southern States, and that was attacked as unconstitutional. They said, well, he was acting against a real, imminent threat to the land and the people of the country.

Now, after the Vietnam war, Congress passed the War Powers Resolution in 1973, providing the President may engage our forces in hostilities only with a declaration of war, a statutory authorization, or a national emergency created by an attack upon our people or our Armed Forces.

Now, under the War Powers Act, the President must consult Congress if he thinks that he is acting in imminent self-defense of the country. The President didn't do that. He talked to some other people at Mar-a-Lago. He never talked to the Congress of the United States officially, neither the Republicans nor the Democrats. He didn't contact the so-called Gang of Eight of our top leadership in the intelligence and security field.

He did notify us, in fairness to the President, within 48 hours of his targeted killing, which many see, under international law, as an act of war.

At this point, though, whether you think there was truly an imminent crisis and this was something like Pearl Harbor or you think that the President still has not given us a single compelling justification for why he did it in

acting under imminent self-defense, you think it is more like Gulf of Tonkin, it doesn't make any difference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RASKIN. All of us, everybody in this Chamber at this point should say that whatever imminent threat existed, whatever emergency there was is gone, and now this country should not go to war without a declaration of war by this Congress or statutory authorization, unless we are attacked in the meantime.

That is the whole point of the War Powers Resolution, to enforce the powers of Congress. We represent the people. We should not be going to war in the name of the United States based on the word of one man. That is not the constitutional design. It must be the Congress itself.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a January 3 CNN article, entitled, "Trump's Huge Iran Gamble Will Have Lasting Impact."

[From CNN, Jan. 3, 2020]

TRUMP'S HUGE IRAN GAMBLE WILL HAVE
LASTING IMPACT

(By Stephen Collinson)

(CNN) President Donald Trump's targeted killing of Iran's ruthless military and intelligence chief adds up to his most dangerous gamble yet with other peoples' lives and his own political fate.

By killing Qasem Soleimani in Iraq, Trump committed the United States to a risky open conflict that at best could stop short of all-out war with Iran that could cause national security and economic shocks in the United States and across the globe.

The administration argues that it has taken one of the world's worst mass murderers and terrorists off the battlefield. But given Iran's easy access to soft targets, the Middle East and even Europe suddenly look a lot less safe for Americans, including US troops Trump may be even more tempted to haul home.

Two days into his re-election year, Trump—who rails against Middle Eastern entanglements—has plunged the United States into another one, with vast and unknown consequences. It challenges a presidency that is already alienating half of his country, following his impeachment and unrestrained behavior in office. Trump may find it impossible to rally the nation behind him to weather the crisis. He has also scrambled strategic and moral expectations of the United States—ordering the killing of a senior foreign leader of a nation with whom the US is not formally at war—albeit an official regarded by Washington as a terrorist.

Reflecting the strike's potential for escalation, a US defense official said the administration would deploy a further 3,000 troops to the Middle East, including 750 who have already deployed to protect the US embassy in Baghdad.

The reverberations of his act on Thursday will last for years.

"Iran never won a war, but never lost a negotiation!" Trump wrote on Friday morning in a tweet that will do nothing to calm critics who worry about the depth of his strategic thinking.

It is too early to know whether Soleimani's death will significantly weaken

Iran and improve the US strategic position, whether it will ignite a regional conflagration and how it will eventually affect Trump's political prospects and legacy. It is also unclear how it will change the political position inside Iran where the regime is besieged by an economic crisis and recently crushed mass protests.

But Iran will surely regard the killing of one of its most significant political leaders as an act of war, so its revenge is likely to be serious and long lasting.

"There are definitely going to be unintended consequences, and for starters I think we better have our embassies pretty well buttoned down," former US Ambassador to Iraq Christopher Hill told CNN.

"Iran simply cannot sit on its hands on this one. I think there will be a reaction and I'm afraid it could get bloody in places."

Trump supporters are celebrating their hard man commander-in-chief. They note that Soleimani orchestrated the deaths of hundreds of US soldiers in militia attacks during the Iraq War. But recent history is marked by spectacular US shock-and-awe opening acts of conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan that cause short-term gloating and long term military and political disasters. A full-on conflict with Iran would be far more complicated than those two wars.

Trump's strike may be the most significant calculated US act in a 40-year Cold War with revolutionary Iran. It's the biggest US foreign policy bet since the invasion of Iraq.

Secretary of State Mike Pompeo told CNN's "New Day" that killing Soleimani "saved American lives" and was based on "imminent" threat intelligence about an attack in the region. Trump echoed his secretary of state later Friday morning, tweeting that Soleimani "was plotting to kill many more" Americans.

But Pompeo refused to give further details. The political bar for an administration that has made a habit of disinformation and lying is going to be far higher than that in such a grave crisis. Eliminating the most powerful political force in Iran short of Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei also destroys the chimera that this White House is not committed to a regime change strategy.

Given Soleimani's frequent travels to Iraq, Syria and other areas in the Middle East this is not the first time that he will have been in US crosshairs. But previous presidents, perhaps cognizant of the inflammatory consequences, chose not to take the shot. In the coming days, the administration will have to explain why it acted now.

The act also likely eliminates possibly for a generation, any hope that the United States and Iran can settle their differences by talking. There will be no desire nor political capital for even Iranian officials often misleadingly described as moderates to sit down with US counterparts.

When Trump took office, there was no immediate crisis with Iran. The Islamic Republic was honoring the Obama administration's nuclear deal though it had not stepped back from its missile development and what the US says is malignant activity in its own neighborhood.

But by ripping up the deal, strangling the Iranian economy and now killing Soleimani, Trump now owns however the confrontation turns out. It's a huge gamble because history suggests that Presidents who bet their careers on the jungle of Middle East politics always lose.

The strike displays Trump's growing infatuation with wielding military power, exacerbates a trend of unchecked presidential authority and forges the kind of ruthless vigilante image he adores.

The question is now whether Trump—an erratic, inexperienced leader who abhors ad-

vice and rarely thinks more than one step ahead—is equipped to handle such a perilous, enduring crisis.

And is his administration, which seems bent on toppling Iran's regime but cannot publicly come up with a plan for the aftermath, ready to handle an Iranian backlash in the region and beyond?

Trump's hubristic tweeting of a US flag following Soleimani's death in a drone strike in Iraq but failure to explain to Americans what is going on may be a bad sign in this regard.

But despite a stream of instant Twitter analysis from pundits suddenly expert in Iranian affairs, no one can be sure what will happen next. That's what makes Trump's strike so unpredictable and potentially dicey.

With the vast network of proxies from Hezbollah to Hamas, Iran has the capacity to strike fast and hard against US allies like Israel and Saudi Arabia and US assets and personnel in its region. It could hammer the global economy by attacking oil tankers in the Strait of Hormuz. US officials and top military officers may be more exposed when they travel abroad. Iran could explode Lebanon's fragile political compact and causes region-wide shocks.

US troops in Iraq, Syria and Afghanistan look especially vulnerable to action by Iranian-allied forces. Politically, the Baghdad government may have no choice but to ask American forces to leave after the attack in a scenario that could effectively deliver the country to Iran's influence or retrigger its terrible civil war.

The killing of Soleimani is a massive symbolic blow to Iran. He was the Godfather of the Middle East who masterminded the country's huge regional influence.

Pompeo claimed that his demise will be greeted by Iraqis and Iranians as a blow for freedom and a sign the United States is on their side. But developments in Middle Eastern politics rarely mirror the optimistic pronouncements of US officials.

DID THE US INFLICT A SERIOUS STRATEGIC BLOW
ON IRAN?

Analysts will be looking to see whether the death of Soleimani robs the Quds force of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps of its coherence and dims its regional power at least at first.

Tehran's strategic response is unclear. While it could lash out, a wave of attacks against US soldiers or terrorist strikes elsewhere may draw it into a direct conflict with a more powerful rival, the United States that it does not seek.

It is not certain that it will strike back quickly. It may have more to gain from making life intolerable for the United States and its citizens in the region in a slow burn approach.

Trump could be especially exposed to a such a military or economic backlash by Iran that casts doubt on his judgment given his quickening reelection race.

His move against Iran could also reshape the dynamics of the presidential election race at home, by opening a lane for Democrats to run as anti-war candidates against him—a position that helped the last two presidents—Trump and Barack Obama—get elected.

Democratic candidate Bernie Sanders on Friday released a video vowing to do everything he can "to prevent a war with Iran."

"Because if you think the war in Iraq was a disaster, my guess is that the war in Iran would be even worse," the Vermont senator said.

And Democratic front-runner Joe Biden immediately swung into sober commander-in-chief mode, positioning himself to profit politically if Trump's Iran venture backfires.

The former vice president offered testimony to Soleimani's record of fomenting bloodshed and instability but added: "President Trump just tossed a stick of dynamite into a tinderbox."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 83.

Our single greatest responsibility is the safety and security of the American people; and as the elected representatives of the American people, it is our solemn duty to ensure that our country only engages in armed conflict that is necessary and that, when we do, there are clear objectives and a strategy for achieving those objectives.

The Trump administration has presented neither evidence that military action is necessary nor a clear outline of their goals and a strategy with respect to Iran.

Any decision to put American troops in harm's way should be debated openly and honestly so that the American people have a say in their future. Nothing in this resolution prevents the administration from seeking authorization for future actions, but it does guarantee, as the Constitution requires, that the American people, through their elected representatives, have a voice in that decision.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I was in the class of Congress that was elected right after September 11, 2001, that came into office in 2003.

After coming to office, through press reports and information in various congressional hearings, we got information that Osama bin Laden had declared war on the United States in 1997—I did not know that—and that there had been actionable intelligence and Osama bin Laden could have been taken out prior to the attack of September 11, 2001, but the administration in the 1990s decided not to do so.

Now, yesterday, fast-forwarding to present time, we heard from General Mark Milley clear, unambiguous intelligence indicating a significant campaign of violence against the United States in the days, weeks, and months that the administration would have been culpably negligent if it did not act, all in regards to the killing of General Soleimani.

□ 1345

The President wants to keep the country safe. The President showed remarkable restraint, I thought, yesterday, and I thought the tone in his address to the Nation yesterday was precisely the right tone.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H. CON. RES. 83—DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT PURSUANT TO SECTION 5(C) OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION TO TERMINATE THE USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES TO ENGAGE IN HOSTILITIES IN OR AGAINST IRAN—REP. SLOTKIN, D-MI, AND 134 COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly opposes passage of H. Con. Res. 83, which purports to direct the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces engaged in hostilities in or against Iran or any part of its government or military unless authorized by Congress.

At the President's direction, on January 2, the United States military successfully executed a strike in Iraq that killed Qassem Soleimani, the Commander of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps-Qods Force, a designated foreign terrorist organization. Soleimani was personally responsible for terrible atrocities. He trained terrorist armies, including Hezbollah, launching terror strikes against civilian targets. He fueled bloody civil wars all across the region. He directed and facilitated actions that viciously wounded and murdered thousands of United States troops, including by planting bombs that maim and dismember their victims. In eliminating Soleimani from the battlefield, the President took action to stop a war, not to start a war. He took action to protect our diplomats, our service members, our allies, and all Americans.

Although concurrent resolutions like H. Con. Res. 83 lack the force of law under controlling Supreme Court precedent, *I.N.S. v. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919 (1983), it is nevertheless important to highlight some of its deficiencies.

First, H. Con. Res. 83 is unnecessary because the military actions to which it applies are already authorized by law, including the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243) ("2002 AUMF"). The 2002 AUMF provides specific statutory authorization to engage in military action to "defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq." Public Law 107-243, §3(a)(1). The United States forces that have been threatened by Iranian and Iran-backed attacks in Iraq are there to combat terrorist groups—such as ISIS. Thus, in addition to acting in accordance with his Constitutional authorities as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive, the President also acted against Soleimani pursuant to existing statutory authorization. The 2002 AUMF has always been understood to authorize the use of force for, among other purposes, addressing terrorist threats—like Soleimani and the attacks he was planning and facilitating—emanating from Iraq. This is consistent with actions taken by previous Presidents pursuant to the 2002 AUMF. For example, during the last administration, United States forces frequently conducted operations in response to attacks and threats by Iran-backed militias in Iraq under the authority conferred by the 2002 AUMF. Moreover, the Administration's engagement with Congress on this strike has been fully in accordance with past precedent, including by providing notification consistent with the War Powers Resolution and by briefing Congressional leadership, the full membership of the House and Senate, and appropriate staff.

Second, were provisions like those included in H. Con. Res. 83 to become law, they could undermine the President's ability to defend United States forces and interests in the region against ongoing threats from Iran and its proxies. Iran has a long history of attacking United States and coalition forces both directly and through its proxies, including, most recently, by means of a January 7

missile attack from Iran against United States forces stationed at two bases in Iraq. Over the last several months, Soleimani planned and supported these escalating attacks by Iranian-directed Shia militia groups on coalition bases throughout Iraq. He orchestrated the December 27, 2019 attack on an Iraqi military base, which resulted in the death of a United States citizen and badly wounded four United States service members. Soleimani also approved the subsequent attack later that month on the United States Embassy in Baghdad, which turned violent and damaged the Embassy facility. At the time of the January 2 strike, Soleimani was in Iraq in violation of a United Nations Security Council travel ban and was actively developing plans to imminently attack United States diplomats and service members in Iraq and throughout the region. Subsequently, Iran launched an attack against the United States. Were Congress to attempt to compel the President to adhere to a resolution like H. Con. Res. 83, it could hinder the President's ability to protect United States forces and interests in the region from the continued threat posed by Iran and its proxies.

This concurrent resolution is misguided, and its adoption by Congress could undermine the ability of the United States to protect American citizens whom Iran continues to seek to harm.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, "no" vote on the rule, the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I think what the President did was a grave miscalculation, but we can't change the past. We can only shape the future.

I have raised concerns about executive overreach during the Bush administration; I raised them during the Obama administration; and today, I am here to raise those concerns about the Trump administration.

I hope there is no war with Iran, but we have seen that developments can change day by day, hour by hour. Should tensions escalate again, Congress should have a say before hostilities are launched. It is really that simple.

This should be the easiest vote in the world for Members of Congress. Regardless of what you think about what the President has done, regardless whether you agree with his policies or not, and regardless of your political affiliation, this is about ensuring that we have a say about what may come next.

There is nothing radical about this. The Constitution gives only Congress the ability to declare war. Let's reclaim our power and let's do our jobs.

My friends say they want to honor our troops. Well, talk is cheap. How about honoring our troops by doing our job, by living up to our constitutional responsibilities. War is a big deal. We ought to take it seriously here. I and some of my Republican friends over the years have raised issues with Democratic and Republican administrations about the ease in which they commit our troops to hostilities. Enough is enough.

No more endless wars. Congress has to live up to its constitutional responsibility. Let's reclaim our power. Let's do our job.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the House Committees on the Judiciary and on Homeland Security, as a member serving in this body on September 11, 2001 and throughout the fateful and tragic war in Iraq, and as an original cosponsor, I rise in strong support of the rule governing debate of H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution directing the President to terminate the engagement of United States Armed Forces in hostilities in or against Iran, as well as the underlying legislation.

I thank the gentlelady from Michigan, Congresswoman ELISSA SLOTKIN, for introducing this resolution and Foreign Affairs Committee Chair ELIOT ENGEL for his work on this important resolution.

I also thank Speaker PELOSI for taking swift action to afford the House the opportunity to honor its constitutional duty to keep the American people safe by limiting the President from taking further precipitous military actions regarding Iran.

We know from bitter and heart-breaking experience the truth that while dangerous and bloody battles are fought by the military, it is the nation that goes to war.

And that is why the Framers lodged the awesome power to declare and take the nation to war not in the hands of a single individual, but through Article I, Section, clause 11 in the collective judgment of Congress, the representatives of the American people.

It is true of course that the United States has an inherent right to self-defense against imminent armed attacks and that it maintains the right to ensure the safety of diplomatic personnel serving abroad.

But in matters of imminent armed attacks, the executive branch must inform Congress as to why military action was necessary within a certain window of opportunity, the possible harm that missing the window would cause, and why the action was likely to prevent future disastrous attacks against the United States.

Only after being fully briefed and informed is the Congress in a position to validate and ratify or disapprove and terminate the action.

Madam Speaker, Section 5(c) of the 1973 War Power Resolution, Pub. L. 93-148, provides that whenever "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 by concurrent resolution."

The military action ordered on Friday, January 3, 2020 by the President to kill Major General Qasem Soleimani, the head of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, may have rid the world of a major architect of terror but leaves unanswered the critically important question of why the action was taken at that time.

Even at this late hour, members of Congress have not been briefed or been shown compelling evidence by the Administration that the action was necessary to repel a credible, certain, and imminent attack on the United States, its allies, or American civilians or military personnel.

The Administration has yet to provide proof or assuage the concerns of most member of

Congress, and of the American people, that the killing of Major General Soleimani was a necessary action that was the product of a carefully crafted geopolitical strategy developed after extensive discussion within the national security apparatus regarding the short and long-term consequences for the security of the region and our nation and its people.

Similarly, we do not know whether the decision to engage in the hostile action against Iran was made by the President in consultation and agreement with our regional and international allies and whether there is now in place a strategy to ensure that the action taken does not lead to a greater escalation of tensions between Iran and the United States or in the worst case, another war in the Middle East placing at risk the lives and safety of millions of persons.

Madam Speaker, Major General Soleimani was the long-time chief of the Quds Force, the elite special forces battalion of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC), assisted Syrian strongman Bashar al Assad slaughter hundreds of thousands of his own people in the Syrian civil war, helped incite the Houthis in Yemen's civil war, and oversaw the brutal killing of hundreds of Iraqi protesters recently demonstrating against Iranian influence in their country.

Iran's Quds Force, under Soleimani's leadership, has long been suspected by the U.S. Government of involvement in a 2011 plot to assassinate the Saudi ambassador to the United States and bore responsibility for the deaths of more than 600 Americans killed by Iranian proxies since the 2003 inception of the war in Iraq.

Over the past eight months, in response to rising tensions with Iran, the United States has introduced over 15,000 additional forces into the Middle East.

But Major General Soleimani was more than a military leader, he was a high-ranking political leader, second only in power and influence to the Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei.

In fact, Soleimani was regarded by many as a future president of Iran.

It was foreseeable therefore that the killing of Soleimani by American forces was likely to invite retaliation by Iran putting at risk American military and civilian personnel, as well as its allies in the region and across the globe.

It must be remembered, Madam Speaker, the United States has national interests in preserving its partnership with Iraq and other countries in the region, including by combating terrorists, including the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS); preventing Iran from achieving a nuclear weapons capability; and supporting the people of Iraq, Iran, and other countries throughout the Middle East who demand an end to government corruption and violations of basic human rights.

For these reasons it is essential that the Administration have in place a sound, well-considered, and meticulously developed strategy for managing disputes with Iran.

That does not appear to be the case.

There is no evidence that the Administration consulted with Congress or the Gang of 8, no evidence that it enlisted or even consulted our allies in NATO or the region, no evidence that the Administration has a working and well-functioning national security council apparatus.

This is a critical Pottery Barn failure in dealing with the Middle East for as former Sec-

retary of State Colin Powell stated before the Iraq War, "If you break it, you bought it."

Iran Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei has vowed that a "harsh retaliation is waiting" for the United States as a consequence of the action taken by the Administration.

It is imperative that the Administration have in place a strategy to counter and deescalate any Iranian response and have in place measure to protect the safety of Americans residing or travelling abroad and to protect the security of the homeland.

The deliberate and targeted killing of Major General Soleimani has the potential to be the most consequential assassination of a political leader since World War I was started by the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand Carl Ludwig Joseph Maria of Austria, the heir presumptive of the throne of Austria-Hungary in 1914.

One of the enduring lessons of the Great War too often forgotten but so well documented in Barbara Tuchman's prize-winning history, "The Guns of August," is that misconceptions, miscalculations, and mistakes result in the tragedy of horrific warfare; among them are overestimating the value of one's economic power, harboring an ill-founded belief in quick victory, and a failure to consider political backlash warfare.

Madam Speaker, the decision to send American men and women into harm's way is the most consequential decision the Constitution vests in the Congress and the President.

Members of Congress must be apprised of all facts material to the decision and have access to relevant documentation, classified and otherwise, and afforded the opportunity to meet in small groups and in secure locations with senior members of the Administration's national security team who can answer detailed and pointed questions and provide requested information.

The Constitution wisely divides the responsibility of deciding when to use military force to protect the nation and its interests between the President and the Congress, the representatives of the American people.

The United States' military involvement in Iraq begun in March 2003 and continuing to this day has taught this nation the importance of having accurate and reliable information when deciding whether to use military force and the painful costs in lives and treasure of acting precipitously or unwisely.

We cannot and dare not repeat that mistake.

That is why I am proud to support and cosponsor H. Con. Res. 83, the concurrent resolution before us, which directs the President to terminate immediately the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities in or against Iran or any part of its government or military, unless Congress has declared war or enacted specific statutory authorization for such use of the Armed Forces; or the use of the Armed Forces is necessary and appropriate to defend against an imminent armed attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces, consistent with the requirements of the War Powers Resolution.

Our constituents, all Americans across the country, and the people of the globe are looking to us to ensure that tensions between the United States and Iran are deescalated, that smart power and diplomacy be employed, and every effort be made to ensure the peace and

safety in America and the region, and the lives of the innocent not be placed at risk.

The material previously referred to by Mr. BURGESS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 781

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 783) honoring the members of the military and intelligence community who carried out the mission that killed Qasem Soleimani, and for other purposes. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 783.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by a 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 191, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—227

Adams	Clyburn	Fletcher
Aguilar	Cohen	Foster
Allred	Connolly	Frankel
Axne	Cooper	Fudge
Barragán	Correa	Gabbard
Bass	Costa	Gaetz
Beatty	Courtney	Gallogo
Bera	Cox (CA)	Garamendi
Beyer	Craig	Garcia (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Crist	Garcia (TX)
Blumenauer	Crow	Golden
Blunt Rochester	Cuellar	Gomez
Bonamici	Cunningham	Gonzalez (TX)
Boyle, Brendan	Davids (KS)	Gottheimer
F.	Davis (CA)	Green, Al (TX)
Brindisi	Davis, Danny K.	Grijalva
Brown (MD)	Dean	Haaland
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Harder (CA)
Bustos	DeGette	Hastings
Butterfield	DeLauro	Hayes
Carbajal	DelBene	Heck
Cárdenas	Delgado	Higgins (NY)
Carson (IN)	Demings	Himes
Cartwright	DeSaulnier	Horn, Kendra S.
Case	Deutch	Horsford
Casten (IL)	Dingell	Houlihan
Castor (FL)	Doggett	Hoyer
Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael	Huffman
Chu, Judy	F.	Jackson Lee
Cicilline	Engel	Jayapal
Cisneros	Escobar	Jeffries
Clark (MA)	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Clarke (NY)	Españillat	Johnson (TX)
Clay	Evans	Kaptur
Cleaver	Finkenauer	Keating

Kelly (IL)	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David	Stivers	Walberg	Williams
Kennedy	Nadler	Sewell (AL)	Taylor	Walden	Wilson (SC)
Khanna	Napolitano	Shalala	Thompson (PA)	Walker	Wittman
Kildee	Neal	Sherman	Thornberry	Walorski	Womack
Kilmer	Neguse	Sherrill	Timmons	Waltz	Woodall
Kim	Norcross	Sires	Tipton	Watkins	Wright
Krishnamoorthi	O'Halleran	Slotkin	Turner	Weber (TX)	Yoho
Kuster (NH)	Ocasio-Cortez	Smith (WA)	Upton	Webster (FL)	Young
Lamb	Omar	Soto	Van Drew	Wenstrup	Zeldin
Langevin	Pallone	Spanberger	Wagner	Westerman	
Larsen (WA)	Panetta	Speier			
Larson (CT)	Pappas	Stanton			
Lawrence	Pascrell	Stevens	Buchanan	Hunter	Loudermilk
Lawson (FL)	Payne	Suozzi	Crawford	Kind	McEachin
Lee (CA)	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Kirkpatrick	Serrano
Lee (NV)	Peters	Takano	Fitzpatrick	Lewis	Simpson
Levin (CA)	Peterson	Thompson (CA)			
Levin (MI)	Phillips	Thompson (MS)			
Lieu, Ted	Pingree	Titus			
Lipinski	Pocan	Tlaib			
Loeb sack	Porter	Tonko			
Lofgren	Pressley	Torres (CA)			
Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Torres Small			
Lowe y	Quigley	(NM)			
Luján	Raskin	Trahan			
Luria	Rice (NY)	Trone			
Lynch	Richmond	Underwood			
Malinowski	Rose (NY)	Vargas			
Maloney,	Rouda	Veasey			
Carolyn B.	Roybal-Allard	Ruiz			
Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger	Vela			
Matsui	Rush	Velázquez			
McAdams	Ryan	Visclosky			
McBath	Sánchez	Wasserman			
McCollum	Sarbanes	Schultz			
McGovern	Scanlon	Waters			
McNerney	Schakowsky	Watson Coleman			
Meeks	Schiff	Welch			
Meng	Schneider	Wexton			
Moore	Schrader	Wild			
Morelle	Schrier	Wilson (FL)			
Moulton	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth			
Mucarsel-Powell					

NAYS—191

Abraham	Fulcher	Massie
Aderholt	Gallagher	Mast
Allen	Gianforte	McCarthy
Amash	Gibbs	McCaul
Amodei	Gohmert	McClintock
Armstrong	Gonzalez (OH)	McHenry
Arrington	Gooden	McKinley
Babin	Gosar	Meadows
Bacon	Granger	Meuser
Baird	Graves (GA)	Miller
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Mitchell
Banks	Graves (MO)	Moolenaar
Barr	Green (TN)	Mooney (WV)
Bergman	Griffith	Mullin
Biggs	Grothman	Murphy (NC)
Bilirakis	Guest	Newhouse
Bishop (NC)	Guthrie	Norman
Bishop (UT)	Hagedorn	Nunes
Bost	Harris	Olson
Brady	Hartzler	Palazzo
Brooks (AL)	Hern, Kevin	Palmer
Brooks (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Pence
Buck	Hice (GA)	Perry
Bucshon	Higgins (LA)	Posey
Budd	Hill (AR)	Ratcliffe
Burchett	Holding	Reed
Burgess	Hollingsworth	Reschenthaler
Byrne	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Calvert	Huizenga	Riggleman
Carter (GA)	Hurd (TX)	Roby
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Roe, David P.
Cheney	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (AL)
Cline	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Cloud	Joyce (OH)	Rooney (FL)
Cole	Joyce (PA)	Rose, John W.
Collins (GA)	Katko	Rouzer
Comer	Keller	Roy
Conaway	Kelly (MS)	Rutherford
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Schweikert
Curtis	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Davidson (OH)	Kinzinger	Sensenbrenner
Davis, Rodney	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus
DesJarlais	LaHood	Smith (MO)
Duncan	LaMalfa	Smith (NE)
Dunn	Lamborn	Smith (NJ)
Emmer	Latta	Smucker
Estes	Lesko	Spano
Ferguson	Long	Staubert
Fleischmann	Lucas	Stefanik
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Steil
Fortenberry	Marchant	Steube
Foxx (NC)	Marshall	Stewart

Stivers	Walberg	Williams
Taylor	Walden	Wilson (SC)
Thompson (PA)	Walker	Wittman
Thornberry	Walorski	Womack
Timmons	Waltz	Woodall
Tipton	Watkins	Wright
Turner	Weber (TX)	Yoho
Upton	Webster (FL)	Young
Van Drew	Wenstrup	Zeldin
Wagner	Westerman	

NOT VOTING—12

Buchanan	Hunter	Loudermilk
Crawford	Kind	McEachin
Diaz-Balart	Kirkpatrick	Serrano
Fitzpatrick	Lewis	Simpson

□ 1413

Mrs. HARTZLER changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 5.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DELBENE). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam 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 226, nays 193, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—226

Adams	Davis (CA)	Huffman
Aguilar	Davis, Danny K.	Jackson Lee
Allred	Dean	Jayapal
Axne	DeFazio	Jeffries
Barragán	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Bass	DeLauro	Johnson (TX)
Beatty	DelBene	Kaptur
Bera	Delgado	Keating
Beyer	Demings	Kelly (IL)
Bishop (GA)	DeSaulnier	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Deutch	Khanna
Blunt Rochester	Dingell	Kildee
Bonamici	Doggett	Kilmer
Boyle, Brendan	Doyle, Michael	Kim
F.	F.	Krishnamoorthi
Brindisi	Engel	Kuster (NH)
Brown (MD)	Escobar	Lamb
Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Langevin
Bustos	Españillat	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Evans	Larson (CT)
Carbajal	Finkenauer	Lawrence
Cárdenas	Fletcher	Lawson (FL)
Carson (IN)	Foster	Lee (CA)
Cartwright	Frankel	Lee (NV)
Case	Fudge	Levin (CA)
Casten (IL)	Gabbard	Levin (MI)
Castor (FL)	Gaetz	Lieu, Ted
Castro (TX)	Gallogo	Lipinski
Chu, Judy	Garamendi	Loeb sack
Cicilline	Garcia (IL)	Lofgren
Cisneros	Garcia (TX)	Lowenthal
Clark (MA)	Hayes	Golden
Clarke (NY)	Gomez	Luján
Clay	Gonzalez (TX)	Luria
Cleaver	Gottheimer	Lynch
Clyburn	Green, Al (TX)	Malinowski
Cohen	Grijalva	Maloney,
Connolly	Haaland	Carolyn B.
Cooper	Harder (CA)	Maloney, Sean
Correa	Hastings	Matsui
Costa	Hayes	McAdams
Courtney	Heck	McBath
Cox (CA)	Higgins (NY)	McCollum
Crist	Himes	McGovern
Crow	Horn, Kendra S.	McNerney
Cuellar	Horsford	Meeks
Davids (KS)	Houlihan	Meng
	Hoyer	Moore

Morelle	Richmond	Stevens
Moulton	Rose (NY)	Suozzi
Mucarsel-Powell	Rouda	Swalwell (CA)
Murphy (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Takano
Nadler	Ruppertsberger	Ruiz
Napolitano	Rush	Thompson (CA)
Neal	Ryan	Thompson (MS)
Neguse	Sánchez	Titus
Norcross	Sarbanes	Tlaib
O'Halleran	Scanlon	Tonko
Ocasio-Cortez	Schakowsky	Torres (CA)
Omar	Schiff	Torres Small
Pallone	Schneider	(NM)
Panetta	Schrader	Trahan
Pappas	Schrier	Trone
Pascarell	Scott (VA)	Underwood
Payne	Scott, David	Vargas
Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)	Veasey
Peters	Shalala	Vela
Peterson	Sherman	Velázquez
Phillips	Sherrill	Visclosky
Pingree	Sires	Wasserman
Pocan	Slotkin	Schultz
Porter	Smith (WA)	Waters
Pressley	Soto	Watson Coleman
Price (NC)	Spanberger	Welch
Quigley	Speier	Wexton
Raskin	Stanton	Wild
Rice (NY)		Wilson (FL)
		Yarmuth

NAYS—193

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

NOT VOTING—11

Buchanan	Kind	McEachin
Crawford	Kirkpatrick	Serrano
Fitzpatrick	Lewis	Simpson
Hunter	Loudermilk	

□ 1422

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

IRAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 781, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities in or against Iran, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 781, the amendment printed in House Report 116-371 is adopted, and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 83

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. TERMINATION OF USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES TO ENGAGE IN HOSTILITIES IN OR AGAINST IRAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Government of Iran is a leading state sponsor of terrorism and engages in a range of destabilizing activities across the Middle East. Iranian General Qassem Soleimani was the lead architect of much of Iran's destabilizing activities throughout the world.

(2) The United States has an inherent right to self-defense against imminent armed attacks. The United States maintains the right to ensure the safety of diplomatic personnel serving abroad.

(3) In matters of imminent armed attacks, the executive branch should indicate to Congress why military action was necessary within a certain window of opportunity, the possible harm that missing the window would cause, and why the action was likely to prevent future disastrous attacks against the United States.

(4) The United States has national interests in preserving its partnership with Iraq and other countries in the region, including by—

(A) combating terrorists, including the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS);

(B) preventing Iran from achieving a nuclear weapons capability; and

(C) supporting the people of Iraq, Iran, and other countries throughout the Middle East who demand an end to government corruption and violations of basic human rights.

(5) Over the past eight months, in response to rising tensions with Iran, the United States has introduced over 15,000 additional forces into the Middle East.

(6) When the United States uses military force, the American people and members of the United States Armed Forces deserve a credible explanation regarding such use of military force.

(7) The War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.) requires the President to consult with Congress "in every possible instance" before introducing United States Armed Forces into hostilities.

(8) Congress has not authorized the President to use military force against Iran.

(b) TERMINATION.—Pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)), Congress hereby directs the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities in or against Iran or any part of its government or military, unless—

(1) Congress has declared war or enacted specific statutory authorization for such use of the Armed Forces; or

(2) such use of the Armed Forces is necessary and appropriate to defend against an imminent armed attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces, consistent with the requirements of the War Powers Resolution.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed—

(1) to prevent the President from using military force against al Qaeda or associated forces;

(2) to limit the obligations of the executive branch set forth in the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.);

(3) to affect the provisions of an Act or joint resolution of Congress specifically authorizing the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities against Iran or any part of its government or military that is enacted after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution;

(4) to prevent the use of necessary and appropriate military force to defend United States allies and partners if authorized by Congress consistent with the requirements of the War Powers Resolution; or

(5) to authorize the use of military force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be debatable for 2 hours, 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 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 83, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

We are here this afternoon so that this body can exercise one of its most

important constitutional responsibilities, deciding on whether or not this country will wage war, whether or not we will check an executive that has brought our country to a dangerous brink.

In recent months, tensions between the United States and Iran have ticked up, bit by bit, until this last week, when we found ourselves in a crisis like we haven't seen in decades.

Let's be clear: The Iranians are responsible for their own harmful behavior. We know this is a regime that underwrites terrorism, that tries to strengthen its own position by fomenting instability and provocation. We know that about Iran. No one expects Iran to be the adult in the room when it comes to global affairs.

What we do expect is that American leadership and American policy will be the moderating force.

So the world was stunned last week when the Trump administration chose, instead, the path towards escalation with the killing of Qasem Soleimani.

We need to be honest about Soleimani. He was a bad guy. He had masterminded attacks and campaigns that cost thousands of innocent lives. In the places where we have seen Iran's most harmful activity, Soleimani's fingerprints were everywhere. He had American blood on his hands, and the world is better off without him.

But are we really safer today, as the administration claims, with American citizens told to get out of Iraq as fast as they can; thousands of troops deploying to the Middle East; an eviction notice from the Iraqi Government, whose partnership we depend on in the fight against ISIS; Iranian missiles endangering American personnel?

It certainly doesn't feel like we are safer, and a poll out today shows that the American people agree.

In foreign policy, you have to weigh decisions like this. As awful as Soleimani was, this action has endangered American lives and American security.

The President and his advisers say they had no choice; that there was imminent threat. Then they said, well, he had done bad things in the past and was going to do more bad things in the future. When they sent a report on the strike to Congress, the administration took the highly unusual step of classifying it.

And then yesterday, in a classified briefing, when Members demanded to see the evidence that justified the strike, the message from the administration essentially boiled down to this: Trust us. When we asked, What is the plan going forward? The administration essentially told Members: Trust us.

Trust us is not good enough, Madam Speaker, not for me, and not for the American people.

Madam Speaker, if they are going to send our men and women in uniform into harm's way, they shouldn't hide the facts.

First of all, this administration hasn't given us any reason to believe that this is a fact. The foreign policy of this administration has undermined American leadership, cut our diplomats off at the knees, alienated our allies, and walked away from our obligations. We have lurched from crisis to crisis, each time hoping that the situation won't spin out of control.

I call it fly-by-the-seat-of-your-pants foreign policy, and it is no way to advance American interests and values on the global stage.

But beyond that, beyond the way this administration has acted, it is not the job of Congress to give any administration its blind trust. It is why we have separation of powers. It is why the Constitution entrusts war powers to Congress.

Let me say that again. It is why the Constitution entrusts war powers to Congress. We haven't had a declared war in this country since World War II. It is not the way it should happen.

So it is a relief that both the administration and the Iranians have, for the moment, opted to de-escalate. But we would be foolish to think this crisis is over. It could flame up again in the blink of an eye, and I worry that another misstep on either side could be what plunges our country into another ill-advised war in the Middle East.

I will say it very plainly: The American people do not want war with Iran. With the measure before us today, we are denying the President the authority to wage such a war.

This would direct the President to terminate the use of armed force against Iran without congressional authorization unless it is necessary to respond to an imminent armed attack against the United States.

The President always has the power to defend America. No one denies that. This resolution explicitly preserves this right, but that is a limited exception. The President shouldn't abuse it.

Now, we have heard the argument that the 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force, the Iraq war authorization, would justify military action against Iran. That is just wrong. It is not what Congress intended when it passed that resolution. I was here. I remember it. It should be repealed, not used to launch more military action.

If the President wants to use military force against Iran, he has to come to Congress. Any President has to come to Congress. We are not making rules only for this President. We are making rules for the President, any President, vis-a-vis, Congress' constitutional powers.

The President has to make the case first, first, not after he launches an ill-advised attack, then after the fact, comes up with a reason why it was necessary and why it was legal. That is not the way our system works.

Today, I have heard the myth floating around that this resolution is non-binding; that it is just symbolic. So let me quote from the War Powers Act to prove that untrue.

The War Powers law says: "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 by concurrent resolution." Again, by concurrent resolution. That is what the War Powers Act states that we need do. That is what we are doing today.

This is the House of Representatives exercising its Article I authority. We don't get authority over war powers just because—if the President says so. We get authority over war powers, period. That is our authority. So let's put that fiction to rest.

And one final point, Madam Speaker, about the tone of this debate. Yesterday, a Member of this body went on television and said that Democrats "are in love with terrorists. They mourn Soleimani more than they mourn our Gold Star families."

Another Member labeled a group of colleagues "Ayatollah sympathizers."

At a time when we are talking about policy that will have direct bearing on American men and women, servicemembers and diplomats in harm's way, comments like that reflect very poorly on this body. And I remind the House that all Members, in both parties, regardless of party, love this country. These words have no place in this debate.

On the Foreign Affairs Committee, we take pride in debating issues, even the toughest issues, on the merits and on the facts. I salute my friend, the ranking member, Mr. MCCAUL, for working so closely with me to make sure we do so. That is one of the keys of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I strongly encourage all Members on both sides to bear that in mind during this debate. We all take the same oath. We can argue about this resolution without questioning one another's motives or one another's patriotism.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 83.

When President Obama took down Osama Bin Laden, the Republican Members joined with Democrats, as Americans, to praise the President. Unfortunately, today, Democrats are incapable of giving this President credit where credit is due, which only emboldens Iran.

I am surprised to be faced with this partisan resolution today. We should be standing together, as the chairman mentioned, as a Nation. Instead, this resolution plays politics with national security.

Yesterday, the President laid out a measured response to Iran's ballistic missile attacks. Let me be clear. The President is not seeking war with Iran. The President has shown, if anything,

great restraint regarding Iran, including after Iran's downing of a U.S. drone, a U.S. military asset.

But in their blind contempt for the President, my colleagues are ignoring the assessments of career intelligence and military professionals.

□ 1445

Our colleagues on the other side are downplaying the murderous evil of Soleimani, the mastermind of terror in the Middle East for over two decades.

Soleimani was designated as a terrorist by the Obama administration. He was responsible for the deaths of more than 600 Americans and wounded thousands more.

Soleimani was involved in the Iranian plot to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador to the United States on American soil in Georgetown, right in this city. Soleimani oversaw Iran's support for Assad in Syria, including convincing Russia to fight for Assad, killing hundreds of thousands. This year, Soleimani played a key role in the crackdown on protestors in Iraq that killed hundreds of Iraqis.

It should be clear to any reasonable person that Soleimani posed a long-term threat to the United States and to innocent civilians in the Middle East and across the globe. We don't need to get into classified details to see Soleimani's clear threat.

According to the Department of Defense, in the last 2 months, Soleimani and his proxies launched 12 attacks against U.S. forces and facilities in Iraq. On December 27, Soleimani's Iranian proxies killed an American and injured four U.S. servicemembers near Kirkuk. On December 31, Soleimani's Iranian proxies launched an assault on the United States Embassy in Baghdad.

But Soleimani was not done. Secretary Pompeo said that Soleimani was "actively plotting" to take "big action" that would "put dozens if not hundreds of American lives at risk," which DOD said targeted American diplomats and servicemembers in Iraq and throughout the region.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Milley, said that the administration would have been "culpably negligent," given the evidence and intelligence they had, had they not acted.

The President possessed the legal authority for this strike and complied with his obligation to report it to Congress within 48 hours under the War Powers Resolution. The President has inherent Article II authority as Commander in Chief to defend United States personnel from attacks that Soleimani was carrying out and plotting against Americans. It is an act of self-defense.

This is not just a partisan analysis. Jeh Johnson, President Obama's general counsel at the Department of Defense and former Secretary of Homeland Security, approved the airstrikes during the Obama administration. He stated that Soleimani "was a lawful military objective, and the President,

under his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief, had ample domestic legal authority to take him out without an additional congressional authorization." That was President Obama's Secretary of Homeland Security.

As a second authority, the National Security Adviser cited the 2002 AUMF that authorized the use of force "to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq." That authorization has been used previously to address terrorist threats to U.S. personnel inside Iraq, including by President Obama to go after ISIS terrorist forces in Iraq.

The dangerously partisan reactions to last week's strike in defense of Americans are even more apparent when compared to Democratic reactions to Obama's thousands of unauthorized airstrikes in defense of Libyans inside Libya in 2011.

Back in June 2011, then-Leader PELOSI was asked about the Obama administration's months of airstrikes inside Libya, dropping hundreds of millions of dollars in U.S. munitions without congressional authorization. Leader PELOSI was asked: "Madam Leader, you are saying that the President did not need authorization initially and still does not need any authorization from Congress on Libya?" Her answer was, "Yes."

She said: "I believe the limited nature of this engagement allows the President to go forward. . . . I am satisfied that the President has the authority he needs to go ahead."

That logic should apply far more in the strike against Soleimani to protect Americans.

I am pleased the administration did not hesitate to take bold action, given the high threat level. Soleimani showed us through the embassy attack and the attacks on U.S. forces that he was serious about hurting Americans.

Our intelligence community saw his next plan coming together, and our military, under direction from our Commander in Chief, acted. They saw the storm coming, and they stopped it.

I thank the President and the men and women of our intelligence community and the military for upholding their responsibility to protect American lives. Instead of supporting the President, unfortunately, my Democratic colleagues are dividing Americans at a critical time, weakening our leverage overseas and emboldening our enemy, the largest state sponsor of terror in the world.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this resolution, which seeks to tie the President's hands as he continues to defend Americans in the Middle East.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN), the author of this important resolution.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, a War Pow-

ers Resolution that states that the President of the United States must consult Congress before going to war with Iran. This is simply what our Constitution requires.

For me, this is not a theoretical exercise. My husband spent 30 years in the Army and retired as a colonel. We actually met on my third tour in Iraq, when I was a CIA officer. My stepdaughter is a brand-new Army officer. My son-in-law's unit is stationed at Al Asad Air Base, which was just targeted by ballistic missiles this week.

If our loved ones are going to be sent to fight in any protracted war, the President owes the American public a conversation. The resolution we will be voting on today allows us to start that debate, as our Founders intended.

Let me be clear: The Government of Iran is a leading state sponsor of terrorism and engages in a range of destabilizing activities across the Middle East. I have experienced these personally as a former CIA analyst. I served multiple tours in Iraq, three tours. My specialty is Iranian-backed Shia militias.

I have followed Iran's destabilizing activity in Iraq up close for my entire professional career. I have watched friends and colleagues hurt or killed by Iranian rockets, mortars, and explosive devices. Iranian General Qasem Soleimani was the lead architect of much of Iran's destabilizing activities in the Middle East and throughout the world.

To that end, with Iran or with any other adversary, the United States always has the inherent right and obligation to self-defense against imminent armed attacks—always. The United States always maintains the right and the responsibility to ensure the safety of our diplomatic personnel and our Armed Forces serving abroad.

When it comes to the matter of longer term war either as something that we choose as a Nation or as something that we find ourselves in, as Members of this body, we have a constitutional responsibility to authorize the use of military force.

The Framers of our Constitution rightly believed that the power to declare war belongs in the Congress because this would ensure that the American people, through the legislators they elected, weigh the most significant decision a government can make.

To this end, the resolution does a few simple things.

First, it states that the President does not currently have authorization for war against Iran, which his own Secretary of Defense acknowledged in a congressional hearing last month.

Second, it requires the President to get congressional authorization if he wants to conduct a protracted war with Iran.

Third, it makes clear that the President maintains the authority to use force to prevent imminent attacks against the United States or our forces. As someone who has spent her career

in national security, it is extremely important to me that this resolution in no way ties the President's hands or takes away any capabilities from our military commanders to respond in self-defense for ourselves and our allies.

We have been at war for nearly two decades, which has spanned both Republican and Democratic administrations, as my colleague pointed out. In that time, Congress has voted only twice to authorize the use of military force, in 2001 and 2002.

Congress has long abdicated its responsibility as laid out in the Constitution to make the hard decisions we owe our troops when it comes to authorizing war. We owe it to our military and to ourselves as a Nation to open this conversation on the authorization of military force, to provide our troops that clarity, and to abide by the Constitution that we have all sworn to protect.

I urge my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to support this resolution. I know it is a political time, but my attempt was to hew exactly to what our Founders intended.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished Republican leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The United States and our allies are safer with Qasem Soleimani gone. President Trump's decisive leadership was justified, and it was right.

Soleimani had the blood of over 600 American servicemembers on his hands. For more than 20 years, he attacked our troops, established a brutal reign of terror across the Middle East, and was directly responsible for the death of thousands of innocent civilians, including in his own country. And he had more terror planned.

As President Trump said, this strike was done to prevent a war, not start one. In yesterday's address, he was true to his word. He was confident and restrained. Even as he underscored our strength and resolve, he extended the people of Iran our hand in peace and friendship. President Trump's decision to embrace the Reagan doctrine of peace through strength in dealing with Iran has worked.

Those who criticize President Trump for Iran's dangerous foreign policy should actually spend a few moments to review their history. It is Iran that is responsible for escalating tensions by creating chaos to spread fear and accumulate power.

In the decades since 1979's revolution, Iran has become the number one state sponsor of terrorism in the world. More recently, it shot down an American military drone and seized a British oil tanker.

On December 27, Iranian proxies crossed the line by killing an American. For the first time since 1988, we have an administration willing to strike back. From most of the media

reports, many may know him only as an unnamed U.S. contractor killed in Iraq, but he was more than that. His name was Nawres Hamid. He was a husband. He was the father of two young sons. He was a resident of California.

Before Nawres became a citizen, he was valiantly serving alongside our troops as a linguist. All of our hearts break for his wife and children, who are left mourning his death.

There are some in this Chamber who seem to be downplaying his death, but his death matters. It matters to his family. It matters to his countrymen. It matters to the President. It matters to me. His death was unnecessary, unprovoked, and it deserved justice.

That is why my next statement carries even more meaning. Red lines should mean something. In this administration, they do. Killing Nawres was a red line. Planning to kill Americans is a red line.

I am confident that the right decision was to take out the man responsible for Nawres' death and the death of hundreds of other Americans.

Iran responded earlier this week by sending missiles to U.S. bases in Iraq. I believe we are all relieved and grateful that there were no American casualties. Iran appears to be pulling back from its strategy of provocation in the face of firm American determination. Iran seems to understand that deescalation is right for them and the world.

Now is the time for our country to come together and speak with one voice, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans.

□ 1500

Instead of working with this administration to continue to work toward shared goals, Democrats are using this moment to continue their hatred toward the President.

As my colleague and former CIA officer WILL HURD said, he never thought he would see the day that the Iranian Government would be able to manipulate Members of Congress, Democratic Presidential candidates, and the Western media, yet here we are on this floor today.

If President Trump's instinct is to put America first, his critics' instinct is to blame America first.

The words of my Democratic colleagues, including the Speaker of the House, blame the United States for attacks Iran has been initiating for the past four decades. Now, they want to limit the President's ability to defend America. That is just dangerous.

I want to clear up some news, Madam Speaker, that I actually even recently heard on this floor. I would probably consider it fake news that Democrats have told the American people.

Contrary to their claim, the resolution before the House today is non-binding. It is called a concurrent resolution. This resolution, if passed, won't go to the President's desk for signature. It won't have the power of law.

Madam Speaker, I heard the chairman try to claim that this had power.

I know we have three coequal branches of government.

Madam Speaker, I think the chairman should actually look at what the Supreme Court ruled in the Chadha case, that concurrent resolutions are unconstitutional as a means to limit the executive branch. I think I may need to read it twice, so let's do that.

In fact, the Supreme Court ruled in the Chadha case that concurrent resolutions are unconstitutional as a means to limit the executive branch. The purpose of a concurrent resolution is to deal with mundane housekeeping matters in Congress.

Now, I want everybody to know and understand what we have used concurrent resolutions for—it is very important: to authorize the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Soap Box Derby, to use the rotunda to present a congressional medal to Jack Nicklaus, and to host a birthday party in the Capitol Visitor Center. But the new majority decided to use it for something different.

For a party that wants to claim they care about the Constitution, Madam Speaker, Democrats may want to brush up on their facts. If they did, they would realize their actions today are shameful and embarrassing, even by the low standards they set in their impeachment inquiry.

They seem to have forgotten that we are not the House of Resolutions. We are, actually, the U.S. House of Representatives. Our job isn't to debate feelings. Our job isn't to make recommendations. We are, actually, elected to make law.

But that is not how we are spending our time today. This resolution has as much force of law as a new year's resolution. It is nothing more than a press release to appease their socialist base.

What message is it sending to Iran? That we are strong, determined, and united as a country, or that we are divided, shortsighted, and weak?

Madam Speaker, "In war, resolution," and, "in peace, goodwill." Winston Churchill wrote those words after he led Britain to victory in the Second World War. They describe what he believed were the right actions for great leaders to take at history's defining moment.

We should keep Churchill's words in mind today. President Trump clearly has. Because of President Trump's leadership, the United States and our allies are safer today than we were exactly 1 week ago.

Petty politics are wrong for the country, especially now. Not liking President Trump is not an excuse for failing to see that the President and his administration have a sensible and deeply American strategy for dealing with Iran.

Madam Speaker, I imagine we will continue to hear from other Democrats defending Iran for their escalation and the death of an American. Madam Speaker, I imagine that the Democrats will try to claim a concurrent resolution is more than a Soap Box Derby, but the Supreme Court says otherwise.

Madam Speaker, I imagine I will hear a lot from the Democrats today. I would like to hear a Democrat speak to the 600 Gold Star families whose loved ones were killed by Soleimani. I would like to hear them defend that.

I would like to hear them defend Iran and their actions of burning an embassy, of killing an American, of killing thousands of civilians even in their own country. But they are going to take our time today with something that means nothing.

Yes, they will run to the mikes. They will get on TV. They will tell a little more fake news, that it meant something today.

The only thing that will happen today is it will make Iran believe they are stronger. It will make Iran believe they have allies in the House of Representatives.

Today is a day that we will not be proud of.

Madam Speaker, in light of the information that we have coming out of Iran, if it is true, of why an airliner was shot down, if that was the case, I would like to see a Democrat move to the floor and pull this concurrent resolution. If it means nothing else, I think we should have all the facts.

I look forward to listening, Madam Speaker, to any Democrat who wants to speak to the Gold Star families about why they want to have a debate today and tell them that "Soleimani is bad, but." It is not "but"; it is "because," because he killed Americans, because he killed thousands of civilians. That is why he was taken out, and the world is safer because of it.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to hearing the defense from the other side.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I am sorry that the Republican leader is casting aspersions. I think everyone on both sides of the aisle takes this seriously and has reasons for what we are voting on.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), a gentleman who has been very involved in these issues for a long, long time and has been a real leader in these issues.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman ENGEL for yielding and for his leadership.

I rise today not as a partisan but as someone concerned about America's future.

We have worked across the aisle with people like Representative MEADOWS and others to stop our country from getting into endless wars. There is not one party that wants to stop these wars; this is in our national interest.

Now, let's be very clear. Soleimani had blood on his hands. Soleimani was a bad actor. Soleimani killed Americans. That is not the debate.

The debate is whether America should get into another war in the Middle East or whether we should be focused on our real competition, which is China.

We are 21 percent of the world's GDP. China, our competition for the 21st century, is 15 percent. Iran is 0.44 percent of GDP.

China hasn't been in a war since 1979. We are in 40 conflicts.

Future historians will ask why we were so obsessed with a region, the Middle East, with 3.5 percent of GDP, when we should have been focused on investing in our country to build the future, to win the 21st century.

I don't think staying out of bad wars that cost this country trillions of dollars is a Democratic issue or a Republican issue. Frankly, the President ran on this.

I know Leader MCCARTHY says this is a formality. Under the War Powers Act, you are supposed to have a concurrent resolution.

My hope is the President will agree with this and not get us into a war with Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I will make my final point. This shouldn't be partisan.

Here is what I would love to see, that the President says, in the future action, he is not going to get into a war and that he agrees with the concurrent resolution that this body passes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution, which curtails the President's authority to protect American interests in the Middle East.

Two weeks ago, Iranian proxies launched a missile attack on American forces in Iraq. This was the 11th such rocket attack by the Iranians in recent months. This time, as our leader said, it killed Nawres Hamid, who was a husband, a father, a contractor, and an American citizen.

The man behind this attack and additional attacks that were being planned and that were imminent was the terrorist mastermind Qasem Soleimani, who was responsible for the deaths, as we have heard, of at least 600, probably many more, Americans and for thousands of others in that part of the world, and for causing destabilization throughout the entire region.

For years now, Soleimani had been leading Iran's shadow war against us and against our allies. In targeting Soleimani, President Trump took bold, long-overdue action, and he ought to be supported for this decision, not criticized.

This resolution, by condemning even limited military force and limited action, would essentially tie the President's hands behind his back as he tries to counter Iran's shadow campaign against us.

Madam Speaker, it makes no sense, this resolution, and I strongly urge my

colleagues to oppose it and vote against it.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, America is not safe or safer because of the acts that occurred local time on January 3, 2020.

America is in more jeopardy, as are our brave men and women in the United States military, whom we hold in the highest esteem and say to their families: We are obligated and committed to honoring and thanking you, but to also recognizing, when we send you into battle, there would and should be the consultation, the engagement, the understanding of the intelligence and the work between Article I, the United States Congress, and Article II, the President of the United States.

I will not allow any Member of Congress to malign my Gold Star families or to suggest that any Member here does not respect the ultimate sacrifice that their family members took. Family members who are Gold Star should not be used in a political debate. They should only be honored.

And I will not accept anyone describing Democrats as mourning terrorists.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, what I will say is that nothing in this resolution speaks to any named person. It says that this body, this Congress, must adhere to its duty to be able to ensure that the President of the United States does not unilaterally take us into war with Iran. We will not stand for it.

It does, as well, say that my resolution in 2002 indicated that we should not have gone to war in Iraq.

Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the House Committees on the Judiciary and on Homeland Security, as a member serving in this body on September 11, 2001 and throughout the fateful and tragic war in Iraq, and as an original cosponsor, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution directing the President to terminate the engagement of United States Armed Forces in hostilities in or against Iran.

I thank the gentlelady from Michigan, Congresswoman ELISSA SLOTKIN, for introducing this resolution and Foreign Affairs Committee Chair ELIOT ENGEL for his work on this important resolution.

I also thank Speaker PELOSI for taking swift action to afford the House the opportunity to honor its constitutional duty to keep the American people safe by limiting the President from taking further precipitous military actions regarding Iran.

We know from bitter and heart-breaking experience the truth that while dangerous and bloody battles are fought by the military, it is the nation that goes to war.

And that is why the Framers lodged the awesome power to declare and take the nation to war not in the hands of a single individual, but through Article I, Section, clause 11

in the collective judgment of Congress, the representatives of the American people.

It is true of course that the United States has an inherent right to self-defense against imminent armed attacks and that it maintains the right to ensure the safety of diplomatic personnel serving abroad.

But in matters of imminent armed attacks, the executive branch must inform Congress as to why military action was necessary within a certain window of opportunity, the possible harm that missing the window would cause, and why the action was likely to prevent future disastrous attacks against the United States.

Only after being fully briefed and informed is the Congress in a position to validate and ratify or disapprove and terminate the action.

Madam Speaker, Section 5(c) of the 1973 War Power Resolution, Pub. L. 93-148, provides that whenever "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 by concurrent resolution."

The military action ordered on Friday, January 3, 2020, local time by the President to kill Major General Qasem Soleimani, the head of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, may have rid the world of a major architect of terror but leaves unanswered the critically important question of why the action was taken at that time.

Even at this late hour, members of Congress have not been briefed or been shown compelling evidence by the Administration that the action was necessary to repel a credible, certain, and imminent attack on the United States, its allies, or American civilians or military personnel.

The Administration has yet to provide proof or assuage the concerns of most member of Congress, and of the American people, that the killing of Major General Soleimani was a necessary action that was the product of a carefully crafted geopolitical strategy developed after extensive discussion within the national security apparatus regarding the short and long-term consequences for the security of the region and our nation and its people.

Similarly, we do not know whether the decision to engage in the hostile action against Iran was made by the President in consultation and agreement with our regional and international allies and whether there is now in place a strategy to ensure that the action taken does not lead to a greater escalation of tensions between Iran and the United States or in the worst case, another war in the Middle East placing at risk the lives and safety of millions of persons.

Madam Speaker, Major General Soleimani was the long-time chief of the Quds Force, the elite special forces battalion of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC), assisted Syrian strongman Bashar al Assad slaughter hundreds of thousands of his own people in the Syrian civil war, helped incite the Houthis in Yemen's civil war, and oversaw the brutal killing of hundreds of Iraqi protesters recently demonstrating against Iranian influence in their country.

Iran's Quds Force, under Soleimani's leadership, has long been suspected by the U.S. Government of involvement in a 2011 plot to assassinate the Saudi ambassador to the United States and bore responsibility for the

deaths of more than 600 Americans killed by Iranian proxies since the 2003 inception of the war in Iraq.

Over the past eight months, in response to rising tensions with Iran, the United States has introduced over 15,000 additional forces into the Middle East.

But Major General Soleimani was more than a military leader, he was a high-ranking political leader, second only in power and influence to the Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei.

In fact, Soleimani was regarded by many as a future president of Iran.

It was foreseeable therefore that the killing of Soleimani by American forces was likely to invite retaliation by Iran putting at risk American military and civilian personnel, as well as its allies in the region and across the globe.

It must be remembered that the United States has national interests in preserving its partnership with Iraq and other countries in the region, including by combating terrorists, including the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS); preventing Iran from achieving a nuclear weapons capability; and supporting the people of Iraq, Iran, and other countries throughout the Middle East who demand an end to government corruption and violations of basic human rights.

For these reasons it is essential that the Administration have in place a sound, well-considered, and meticulously developed strategy for managing disputes with Iran.

That does not appear to be the case.

There is no evidence that the Administration consulted with Congress or the Gang of 8, no evidence that it enlisted or even consulted our allies in NATO or the region, no evidence that the Administration has a working and well-functioning national security council apparatus.

This is a critical Pottery Barn failure in dealing with the Middle East for as former Secretary of State Colin Powell stated before the Iraq War, "If you break it, you bought it."

Iran Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei has vowed that a "harsh retaliation is waiting" for the United States as a consequence of the action taken by the Administration.

It is imperative that the Administration have in place a strategy to counter and deescalate any Iranian response and have in place measure to protect the safety of Americans residing or travelling abroad and to protect the security of the homeland.

The deliberate and targeted killing of Major General Soleimani has the potential to be the most consequential assassination of a political leader since World War I was started by the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand Carl Ludwig Joseph Maria of Austria, the heir presumptive of the throne of Austria-Hungary in 1914.

One of the enduring lessons of the Great War too often forgotten but so well documented in Barbara Tuchman's prize-winning history, "The Guns of August," is that misconceptions, miscalculations, and mistakes result in the tragedy of horrific warfare; among them are overestimating the value of one's economic power, harboring an ill-founded belief in quick victory, and a failure to consider political backlash warfare.

Madam Speaker, the decision to send American men and women into harm's way is the most consequential decision the Constitution vests in the Congress and the President.

Members of Congress must be apprised of all facts material to the decision and have ac-

cess to relevant documentation, classified and otherwise, and afforded the opportunity to meet in small groups and in secure locations with senior members of the Administration's national security team who can answer detailed and pointed questions and provide requested information.

The Constitution wisely divides the responsibility of deciding when to use military force to protect the Nation and its interests between the President and the Congress, the representatives of the American people.

The United States' military involvement in Iraq begun in March 2003 and continuing to this day has taught this Nation the importance of having accurate and reliable information when deciding whether to use military force and the painful costs in lives and treasure of acting precipitously or unwisely.

We cannot and dare not repeat that mistake.

That is why I am proud to support and co-sponsor H. Con. Res. 83, the concurrent resolution before us, which directs the President to terminate immediately the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities in or against Iran or any part of its government or military, unless Congress has declared war or enacted specific statutory authorization for such use of the Armed Forces; or the use of the Armed Forces is necessary and appropriate to defend against an imminent armed attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces, consistent with the requirements of the War Powers Resolution.

Our constituents, all Americans across the country, and the people of the globe are looking to us to ensure that tensions between the United States and Iran are deescalated, that smart power and diplomacy be employed, and every effort be made to ensure the peace and safety in America and the region, and the lives of the innocent not be placed at risk.

Madam Speaker, today our Nation is debating the very profound question of war and peace and the structure and nature of international relations in the 21st century. Before us today is the serious and fundamental question of life and death: whether or not this Congress will give the President authority to commit this Nation to war.

Always a question of the greatest importance, our decision today is further weighted by the fact that we are being asked to sanction a new foreign policy doctrine that gives the President the power to launch a unilateral and preemptive first strike against Iraq before we have utilized our diplomatic options.

My amendment provides an option and the time to pursue it. Its goal is to give the United Nations inspections process a chance to work. It provides an option short of war with the objective of protecting the American people and the world from any threat posed by Iraqi weapons of mass destruction.

The amendment urges the United States to reengage the diplomatic process, and it stresses our government's commitment to eliminating any Iraqi weapons of mass destruction through United Nations inspections and enhanced containment.

It emphasizes the potentially dangerous and disastrous long-term consequences for the United States of codifying the President's announced doctrine of preemption.

The administration's resolution forecloses alternatives to war before we have even tried to pursue them.

We do not need to rush to war, and we should not rush to war. If what we are worried about is the defense of the United States and its people, we do not need this resolution.

If the United States truly faced an imminent attack from anywhere, the President has all of the authority in the world to ensure our defense based on the Constitution, the War Powers Act and the United Nations Charter.

Our own intelligence agencies report that there is currently little chance of chemical and biological attack from Saddam Hussein on U.S. forces or territories. But they emphasize that an attack could become much more likely if Iraq believes that it is about to be attacked. This is a frightening and dangerous potential consequence that requires sober thought and careful reflection.

President Bush's doctrine of preemption violates international law, the United Nations Charter and our own long-term security interests. It will set a precedent that could come back to haunt us.

Do we want to see our claim to preemption echoed by other countries maintaining that they perceive similar threats? India or Pakistan? China or Taiwan? Russia or Georgia?

I would submit that we would have little moral authority to urge other countries to resist launching preemptive strikes themselves. This approach threatens to destabilize the Middle East, unleash new forces of terrorism and instability and completely derail any prospects for peace in the region.

Unilateralism is not the answer. Iraqi weapons of mass destruction are a problem to the world community, and we must confront it and we should do so through the United Nations. Multilateralism and steadfast commitment to international law should be the guiding principle as we move into the 21st century.

As I said, the purpose of my amendment is to let the United Nations do its work. Let us give inspections and other containment mechanisms a chance to succeed once again. Inspections did make real progress in eliminating weapons of mass destruction in the 1990s despite Saddam Hussein's best effort at obstruction and deceit. U.N. inspectors destroyed large stockpiles of chemical weapons, missiles and weapons of mass destruction. We can and should renew and expand this process. In addition to inspections, we should improve border monitoring through an enhanced containment system to prevent shipments of nuclear materials or other weapons to Iraq. And we should install surveillance technology on the border to detect such materials.

As part of enhanced containment, we should work with the countries bordering Iraq and with regional seaports to ensure that United Nations Security Council resolutions are enforced, and we should plug holes in the current arms embargo blanket. We should also work on nonproliferation efforts globally to secure weapons materials.

All of these are diplomatic options that we can and should undertake and which can lead to success.

What we are doing today is building the framework for 21st century international relations. It will either be a framework of unilateralism and insecurity or multilateral cooperation and security. It is our choice.

During the Cold War, the words "first strike" filled us with fear. They still should.

I am really appalled that a democracy, our democracy, is contemplating taking such a

fearsome step and really setting such a terrible international precedent that could be devastating for global stability and for our own moral authority.

We are contemplating sending our young men and women to war where they will be doing the killing and the dying. And we, as representatives of the American people, have no idea where this action will take us, where it will end and what price we will pay in terms of lives and resources. This too should cause us to pause. We have choices, however, and we have an obligation to pursue them, to give U.N. inspections and enhanced containment a chance to work. What this resolution does state very clearly and firmly is that the United States will work to disarm Iraq through United Nations inspections and other diplomatic tools. It states that we reject the doctrine of preemption, and it reaffirms our commitment to our own security and national interests through multilateral diplomacy, not unilateral attack.

I urge you to protect our national interests by giving the United Nations a chance by supporting this amendment.

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, this week, universally respected Senator Joe Lieberman, a Democrat, provided an extraordinary op-ed in *The Wall Street Journal*: "President Trump's order to take out Qasem Soleimani was morally, constitutionally, and strategically correct. . . . No American can dispute that Soleimani created, supported, and directed a network of terrorist organizations that spread havoc in the Middle East." In Syria, "more than 500,000 Syrians have died."

"During the Iraq war, Soleimani oversaw three camps in Iran." These trained fighters have killed more than 600 American soldiers.

The claim that President Trump "had no authority to order this attack without congressional approval is constitutionally untenable and practically senseless. . . . Democrats should leave partisan politics at 'the water's edge' and . . . stand together against Iran and dangerous leaders like Qasem Soleimani."

Senator Joe Lieberman tells the truth. We must resist: "Death to America," "Death to Israel."

I extend our sympathies to the family of Nawres Hamid, an Iraqi American Muslim from California, who was murdered by Soleimani-financed terrorists 13 days ago.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a valuable member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

□ 1515

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 83, directing the President to cease military hostilities against Iran.

Last week, President Trump ordered a provocative and disproportionate drone strike, killing Quds Force commander Major General Qasem Soleimani.

Soleimani was a malign actor who masterminded the killings of many U.S. soldiers, but assassinating him has unleashed the dogs of war. Iran launched a dozen ballistic missiles against two U.S. military bases in Iraq, and we must be prepared for further Iranian retaliation.

These threats stem from the President's fateful and reckless decision to withdraw from the Iran nuclear deal, a deal that was working by every measure, leaving us with no leverage and Iran with nothing to lose.

We don't need another war. Peace demands action now. That is why Congress must reassert its solemn constitutional duty under Article I to decide when and where the United States goes to war. This resolution does just that.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, on Tuesday night, Iran launched at least a dozen ballistic missiles against two U.S. military bases in Iraq.

Thankfully, there were no American casualties, but I remain concerned about further Iranian retaliation.

These attacks come after President Trump ordered a drone strike that assassinated Iranian Quds Force commander Major General Qasem Soleimani.

Soleimani was a bad actor and masterminded the killings of many U.S. soldiers in Iraq and Lebanon. He will not be missed.

But killing Soleimani was supposed to make us safer. In reality, the President's order has unleashed the dogs of war.

What is unfolding now is the result of the Trump Administration's incoherent foreign policy, stemming from its fateful and reckless decision to withdraw the United States from our own agreement, the Iran nuclear deal.

By all accounts, prior to our withdrawal, Iran was in compliance with the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA).

It was only after our withdrawal, and re-imposition of sanctions lifted under the agreement, that Iran began to exceed its stockpile of low-enriched uranium, and then resume uranium enrichment.

Following the Soleimani strike, Iran has vowed to ignore all restrictions set by the nuclear deal. This move has set in motion the very thing we were seeking to avoid—a nuclear-armed Iran.

Our abrogation of the Iran nuclear agreement leaves us with no leverage and Iran with nothing to lose.

Iran and its proxy forces have engaged in a series of retaliatory actions: attacks on oil tankers in the Persian Gulf, downing an American drone in international waters, cruise missile attacks against Saudi oil plants, and rocket attacks against U.S. forces in Iraq.

Secretary of State Pompeo claimed, "The world is a much safer place, and I can assure you, Americans in the region are much safer after the demise of Qasem Soleimani."

And yet, in the wake of Soleimani's killing, the State Department has urged Americans to leave Iraq immediately whether by air or by land, and put Americans in the region on high alert.

Two years ago, I warned that we were sleepwalking into an armed conflict. That the hidden scandal of the Iraq War—the manipulation of intelligence to support a predetermined

outcome—was now an overt political strategy to undermine the Iran nuclear deal.

I fear now that these steps have brought us to the brink of war with Iran.

According to Pompeo, “this was an intelligence-based assessment that drove our decision-making process.”

Yet, when asked about the imminent threat facing Americans from Soleimani, Pompeo pointed to a previous attack in Iraq that killed an American contractor and injured four servicemembers, not a new, imminent threat.

Yesterday, the Trump Administration offered a sophomoric and utterly unconvincing briefing to members of Congress on the strike’s rationale.

President Trump’s decision to assassinate Soleimani was provocative and disproportionate and has endangered American lives and the security of the region.

We don’t need another war. Peace demands action now.

That is why Congress must reassert its constitutional authority to decide when and where the United States goes to war.

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution states that “Congress shall have power . . . to declare war . . . and to raise and support armies” and other armed forces.

And today the House of Representatives will make clear that Congress has not authorized President Trump to go to war with Iran.

Neither the 2001 nor the 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF) authorize the President to attack Iran or its senior officials.

I urge my colleagues in both the House and the Senate to support this war powers resolution, and reclaim our solemn constitutional duty to determine when the United States puts our uniformed men and women in harm’s way.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

This resolution is insincere and unserious. If my colleagues on the other side really want to limit the President’s ability to defend the United States, then they ought to take the vote and limit him and stand for that vote.

Now, if you are not familiar with terrorist Soleimani, let me just acquaint you.

His reign of terror for Americans started with 241 marines in Beirut, Lebanon. He and his organization continued on to the Khobar Towers, hundreds and hundreds of Americans dead by IEDs and thousands maimed. A servicemember from Pennsylvania incinerated—incinerated—in the vehicle that he was in.

Thank you terrorist Soleimani.

The President does not desire war with Iran or anyone else, but Iran has been fighting us since 1979.

I have got a news flash for everybody: They have been at war with the United States since they punched us in the face in 1979.

Washington has been appeasing Iran, and the policy of appeasement has been getting Americans killed since 1979.

542, that is the number of drone attacks under the Obama administration

in places like Yemen, Somalia, Pakistan.

Oh, by the way, not the theatre of war for the United States. Not a peep, Madam Speaker, not a peep from the other side.

The terrorist state of Iran cannot continue killing Americans and cannot have a nuclear bomb. Madam Speaker, it is time to stand up for America and Americans, including this President.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a longtime valued member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, this resolution imposes extraordinary restrictions on this President, an extraordinary President who needs extraordinary restrictions.

This is best exemplified by the President’s gratuitous comment that he would hit cultural sites in Iran. Not only is that a war crime, but it is a mistake because it drives the Iranian people toward the regime while alienating our European allies whose support for our sanctions is critical for them to work.

The minority leader came to this floor and said Democrats were dupes of the Islamic Republic. I will compare my record of efforts against the Islamic Republic of Iran with those of any other Member.

You could argue whether Soleimani’s death makes us safer or not over the next few months. We have removed a terrorist mastermind from the battlefield, but we have inspired the other terrorists.

The real issue is the effect on Iran’s program. That program is more robust today than it was a week ago, as Iran has employed more centrifuges and is building a larger stockpile, all without our European friends, who are still in the JCPOA taking any action against Iran.

There was no policy process on the golf course where the President made this decision. He heard not from a single expert on Iranian politics, religion, or the economy.

Our maximum pressure campaign is designed to put such pressure on the Iranian people that they choose not to endure it, but demand that the nuclear program be scaled back or ended, or that the regime that has that program be swept away.

This assassination undercuts that effort by building support for the regime and its nuclear program with most of the Iranian people by making Soleimani a martyr in front of a Shiite population, a Shiite religion that lionizes martyrdom, we increase the likelihood of an Iranian nuclear weapon.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlemen from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. I rise in total support of the decision to remove Qasem Soleimani.

I have heard the use of the word “disproportionate” from the Speaker. I have heard it here today on the House floor, and it is just a shocking word to be used to describe what took place. It makes me ask the question: At what point is it proportionate to take out a designated terrorist who kills 600 U.S. troops, wounds thousands of others, kills and wounds troops recently, and his proxies attack a U.S. Embassy?

If anyone has any doubt as to what Qasem Soleimani was doing in Iraq at the time we took him out, you can look at the IRGC’s own words. The IRGC put out a statement saying that Soleimani and companions were on their way to “plan a confrontation against the new scheme of the Americans to rebuild Daesh and the Takfiri groups in order to again disrupt Iraq’s security.”

Who needs an intelligence briefing to determine that this is totally legitimate?

On behalf of all of those Gold Star families and all the Blue Star families, of anyone who is deployed now, anyone who is in harm’s way, if you need proof, go to Walter Reed. If you need proof, sit down with some of these Gold Star families who lost their sons, their daughters, their fathers, their mothers, their brothers, and their sisters because of this designated foreign terrorist running a designated foreign terrorist organization, who was sanctioned by the United States, by EU, and by the United Nations.

I say good riddance.

Why are we having this debate? We should be coming together, not as Republicans first, not as Democrats first. We should be coming together as Americans first and voting this down.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution sponsored by my good friend from Michigan, Congresswoman SLOTKIN.

The Trump administration’s foreign policy failures have brought us to the brink of war. The administration has provided no evidence to demonstrate what imminent threat made Qasem Soleimani’s assassination and the perilous, predictable fallout necessary. But they have demonstrated a shocking dismissiveness as to what is at stake.

On the threat of retaliation from Iran, Secretary Pompeo said it may be that there is a little noise here in the interim. President Trump said, if it happens, it happens.

To the parents who are worried sick about their kids serving in the Middle East, it isn’t a little noise. Their children’s lives are at stake. Those stakes make today’s vote necessary.

The question before us is simple. Can we let this President drag us into another war that will cost billions of taxpayer dollars and, most importantly,

American lives? Will we at long last stand up and fulfill our constitutional duty to make decisions on war and peace?

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Democrats' dangerous resolution to undermine our national defense and allow unchecked Iranian aggression against the United States and our allies.

This resolution intends to cripple our ability to protect American soldiers serving in the Middle East and attempts to forbid the use of force against Iran, even if they are attacking Americans.

I am shocked and saddened by the partisanship of this Chamber. I was proud when former President Obama succeeded in his decision to kill Osama bin Laden in Pakistan. I am proud that President Trump ended Qasem Soleimani's brutal reign of terror that killed and maimed countless Americans and coalition forces and threatened many more to come.

But, instead of uniting behind the President's defensive position to strike one of the world's most powerful terrorists who was organizing attacks against Americans in Iraq, instead, many Democrats are arguing that the American President himself is guilty of aggression and escalation. This, Madam Speaker, is unconscionable.

These are pictures from the Military Times showing the assault and the burning of our Embassy in Baghdad.

I agree with the President that attacking Americans is never acceptable and Iran should be held to account. When American lives hang in the balance, Article II of the Constitution empowers the President to use force to protect and defend our country.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this egregious, partisan farce.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING), a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the chair of the Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, Energy, and the Environment.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, today we debate much more than the words on parchment that define our congressional responsibility.

Long before I knew this legal responsibility, I learned the moral responsibility inherent to what must be the most sober and deliberate decision we can humanly muster.

As a young boy, indelibly etched in my mind is the conversation with my grandmother the day she pulled a box out from underneath her bed, reverently handing me the medals and final belongings of my uncle who was killed in action and telling me about her lost son. I wondered then what was

so important to justify such a loss and what my uncle must have been thinking about.

That day carried with me as I traveled to Iraq as a newly elected Congressman to visit our troops during a time of war. I remember having a conversation with a young marine. I asked him his personal thoughts about the goals of the war, what he thought, did he think it was justified. He told me: "With all due respect, sir, that is your job. My job is to serve."

He was right. It is our job. That is why we are debating this, and that is why I am supporting this resolution.

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), the distinguished Republican Conference chair.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, the measure before us is an unconstitutional political stunt meant to undermine the President of the United States. It will not become law, but it will embolden Iran.

The Speaker and my colleagues who support this resolution ought to admit to the American people what they are doing, that is, undermining United States defense policy towards Iran.

Qasem Soleimani, the lead architect and overseer of Iran's web of terror is dead. This terrorist was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American servicemembers, the killing of an American citizen in Iraq just 2 weeks ago, and the recent assaults against our Embassy in Baghdad. He was engaged in planning for further deadly attacks.

But the Democrats in this body are so consumed by their hatred of President Trump that they will not even stand with him in support of the killing of the world's deadliest terrorist.

□ 1530

Instead, they have suggested a moral equivalence between the United States and Iran. The Speaker of the House even blamed America, describing the killing of Soleimani as "an unnecessary provocation."

Madam Speaker, what is a provocation is the introduction of this resolution, which shows doubt about American resolve. It makes war more, not less likely.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand united as Americans—to put partisan stunts aside—and to oppose this dangerous resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, this administration says starving the Iranian economy is in defense of human rights, when it is an abuse of them; and that their withdrawal from the nuclear deal was a demonstration of American leadership, when it was an abandonment of it.

Escalation is deescalation, and war is peace.

In fact, they are asking us to deny reality. The reality is that families of

American soldiers and diplomats are being kept awake at night worrying.

The Iraqi people who suffered decades of unjust war are now unjustly suffering as their country becomes a battleground in a proxy war.

The Iranian people have suffered because of maximum pressure and will suffer because of this escalation.

John Quincy Adams said:

America goes not abroad in search of monsters. America's glory is not dominion, but liberty.

This administration has gone abroad in search of monsters to destroy. May God show us the way to freedom, independence, and peace.

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, make no mistake, this resolution is about the killing of Soleimani. He was a terrorist, no different than al-Baghdadi, then al-Zarqawi, then Osama bin Laden, then Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. He was the head of a designated terrorist organization no different than ISIS or al-Qaida.

He was responsible for the deaths of our men and women—and I know most in here haven't seen or smelled or touched that kind of death, but let me tell you about it. They were burned alive inside of their Humvees. Their lungs were scorched by the flames of the explosions.

The vehicle fragments were blown into their skulls. Some of them were paralyzed. Some of them had their arms blown off. Some of them had their legs blown off. Some of them will never see again. Some of them will never be recognized again by those who knew them previously.

Each and every one of them, they are the credible explanation for deleting this terrorist target from our world.

And no doubt, it is dangerous to take out a terrorist target, but a coward is somebody who lacks the courage to endure danger. This is the fundamental difference in voting "yes" or "no" here.

If you vote "no," you understand that we would be justified to kill 100 Soleimanis for just one of our heroes who have been killed by him. The danger would be worth it.

For those who vote "yes," they see that he has killed hundreds of our servicemembers but can still not find the justification to kill him because, unlike our fallen heroes, they lack the courage to endure danger.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE), a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. TRONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to an unnecessary war with Iran in support of this resolution.

Today, the question before us is: Are the American people more safe or less safe after the killing of Qasem Soleimani?

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have significant concerns about the administration's inability to answer this question and communicate a coherent strategy to avoid war and keep us safe.

The American people have seen no evidence that killing Soleimani was a result of an imminent threat; no evidence of a discernible political plan for our policy toward Iran moving forward.

Questions of war and peace are the most fundamental of the issues that come before this Congress. They require deliberate and thoughtful decisionmaking. This action by the administration was not that.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I never thought that I would hear on this House floor an apology to the Iranian people for an action that we took that was justified, taking out a terrorist. I cannot believe it.

And, yet, we just heard that on this House floor. We have a gentleman who gave his legs in service to this country and, yet, we are apologizing to the Iranians with a nonbinding resolution that is nothing more than a press release, Madam Speaker. It has no effect. It doesn't do anything. In fact, the Supreme Court says that. They know that.

All they are doing is trying to get a press release to keep them from having a primary opponent. This is a sad, sad day. And, yet, here we are, having another speech to try to take on the President of the United States for actually taking out a terrorist.

I would ask my colleagues opposite: How many Americans does a terrorist have to kill before they join with us? Is 600 not enough? Does it have to be 1,000, 10,000, a million? At some point we have to stand up and let the long arm of justice go in and take out these terrorists.

I am here to tell you today that this nonbinding resolution, indeed, they want to talk about their constitutional requirement, well, check with the Supreme Court. In 1983, they ruled that this has no effect. At least our Senators opposite, they know that. It has to be a joint resolution.

And, yet, what is this vehicle normally designed for? For Soap Box Derbies. Well, at least that accomplishes something. All this does is emboldens our enemies to suggest that the American people are divided.

But I am here to tell you that we are not divided. We are a safer country because of the actions of this President, the decisive actions of this President and our military.

More important than that, this War Powers Act that got passed, it was a message that came out of a difficult

time. But I want the message to be clear today. We are standing behind our military men and women. We have their back, and we will not yield.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, let me remind my friend that we, too, cherish our military and also have their backs.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), chairwoman of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution. Congress has constitutional authority when it comes to one of the most important decisions any of us can make: to send our brave men and women of the Armed Forces into harm's way in service of our country.

Recent events demonstrate just how important this congressional role is. When the President decided to strike a high-level Iranian official, he made a decision that was provocative in the strongest sense of the word. He did that without any meaningful congressional consultation.

The information that we have received is woefully insufficient, including the notification and the briefing provided by senior officials yesterday.

Congress and the American people have no assurance that the President is acting as part of a well-thought-out strategy that makes Americans safer rather than sets us on a war path.

I am deeply opposed to an unauthorized war with Iran. That is why I support this resolution, which reiterates that only Congress can declare war and that we have not done so here.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER).

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I oppose this dangerous resolution. Iran has been at war with us for 40 years. They held Americans hostage in Tehran. They murdered our marines in Beirut. They killed hundreds, if not thousands, of American servicemembers in Iraq.

In recent months, Iran shot down a U.S. drone, they killed an American citizen, and they organized an attack on our embassy.

So let's be clear: General Soleimani was the mastermind behind these attacks. Soleimani was in Iraq claiming imminent attacks on our servicemembers, our diplomats, and our Iraqi allies.

Soleimani was an enemy combatant and a lawful target. As a Navy JAG, I prosecuted terrorists in Iraq. I was actually stationed right across from our embassy in Baghdad, and I witnessed these threats on our Armed Forces. So I applaud President Trump, I applaud our warfighters, and I applaud our intelligence community for reaching an incredible outcome against Iran.

Soleimani's death was a win for America, for freedom, and for peace. In supporting this resolution, Democrats

are choosing to stand with their far-left radical base rather than standing up against Iran.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution grants Congress the power to declare war.

This was not a matter of great controversy among the Founders, because going to war is the most portentous decision that a nation can make. And in our democracy, it is a decision to be undertaken by the people through the Congress, and not by one person.

We are all enormously grateful that no U.S. personnel were killed in Iran's missile strikes, and I hope that the President will take advantage of the momentary calm to deescalate the situation.

But we cannot assume peace will hold indefinitely because of the impulsive actions of this President which have so often brought us to the brink of war.

Qasem Soleimani was a malign force responsible for the death of many Americans, but after the briefings I have received, I have no confidence that there is some broad strategy at work, or that the policies of the President are doing anything but increasing the dangers to the American people.

That is a recipe for disaster, one which increases the likelihood of stumbling into a war that the American people do not want and Congress has not authorized.

The resolution before the House today is a step toward reasserting our constitutional duty to rein in a President whose unilateral actions have isolated us from our allies, increased the risk of a nuclear-armed Iran, and made us less safe.

Finally, I hope the vote today is the first of a broader reassertion of Congress' war powers including the sunset or repeal of the 2001 and 2002 Authorizations for Use of Military Force which have been stretched beyond recognition.

It is past time for Congress to do our job and not simply write the executive a blank check. I urge a "yes" vote on the resolution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WATKINS).

Mr. WATKINS. Madam Speaker, I spent somewhere around 8½ years in conflict environments and post-conflict environments between Iraq and Afghanistan. And all that time I knew many people who suffered at the hands of Qasem Soleimani.

One in particular takes me back to 2006 or 2007. I was smoking and joking at the embassy in Baghdad. I was doing so with a friend—really a brother, a West Point classmate—who shortly thereafter went out on a mission and was ultimately killed in a complex attack perpetrated by Qasem Soleimani.

I understand that action leads to risk, but inaction leads to more risk in the long run. And when searching for this divine strategy, look to what tactical operators know to be true, and that is, when we go throughout our work on the ground with the assault rifle in one hand, a sat phone in the other, we need to know that should anything happen to us, our President is going to have the freedom to rain fire down upon our enemies, and I am thankful for that.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT), an esteemed member the Foreign Affairs Committee.

□ 1545

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Without a coherent strategy, such actions as the recent ones that occurred in Iraq present a dangerous move toward the United States' engaging in a war that the American people do not want.

Today, we move to reclaim power that the executive branch has tried to usurp from Congress. We assert our constitutional authority to determine if the country ought to go to war, and we send a message loud and clear that we do not want to go to war.

We will not engage in reckless hostilities to endanger American lives, American interests, and our American values without fully evaluating imminent threat. We must continue to assert that, without new authorizations from Congress, this administration cannot engage in offensive military actions. That is what our Framers intended.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), who is a former CIA officer.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Madam Speaker, right now is not the time for a partisan exercise that could be used as propaganda by the ayatollahs. Instead, Congress should be united in condemning a regime that has been attacking America and our allies for 40 years.

Qasem Soleimani was the head of the most dangerous and well-armed terrorist organization in the world, and his death has removed a major terrorist leader off the battlefield. This decision followed repeated rocket attacks by Iranian proxies on American forces and an attempt to storm our embassy in Baghdad.

This decision was based on intelligence that our Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has described as compelling, imminent, and very clear, as Soleimani was planning attacks against our troops. This is an assessment with which I concur.

No one wants another war in the Middle East. Instead of tying the hands of our military, we should be sending a strong message to the Iranian regime that there will be consequences for their reign of terror, and we will protect our citizens at all costs.

The Iranian regime has killed over 600 American troops in Iraq. They have killed over 1,500 of their own people for peacefully protesting. They have lied to the world about their nuclear arsenal.

Appeasing them will only make future conflict and bloodshed more likely. That is why I wish today, instead of this partisan exercise, that we were sending to the Government of Iran a clearer message that no elected official in America is supportive of its behavior.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, President Bush's invasion of Iraq was the first foreign policy mistake in the history of the United States based on fake intelligence, and President Trump took us to the brink of war with Iran with an impulsive act at the end of last week that would be even more disastrous than the war with Iraq, which is still reverberating throughout the region.

Some on that side say: Oh, you are not with the troops; you are apologizing.

No, we are not. We are reasserting the constitutional duty that we are sworn to in this House of Representatives. Congress and only Congress can declare war. Once we have declared war, then the President of the United States as Commander in Chief can conduct it, as much as this gentleman could.

This is just a step. We need to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iraq based on fake intelligence because that was his lawyer's rationalization of why they could do this in Iraq, a sovereign nation, without their permission.

We also have to reform the War Powers Act because the War Powers Act itself does not reflect our constitutional authority.

Finally, we have to pass an amendment to prohibit a hostile action against Iran without authority from Congress.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

Mr. BACON. Madam Speaker, I oppose this resolution that is designed to embarrass our President in front of the world and, in reality, gives comfort to Iran's leadership. It weakens America and emboldens our enemies.

This resolution is not needed. The War Powers Act is still in effect, and the President is not conducting combat operations against Iran. He wants deescalation; he does not want war.

He is not doing what President Obama did in Libya. What the President did was a onetime defensive operation, when he targeted General Soleimani.

Let us be clear: Soleimani murdered 609 Americans in Iraq. His proxies attacked our embassy, and the Quds Force he commanded shed blood across

the world. He even attempted terrorism right here in Washington, D.C. He was the number one threat to Israel, and he was anti-Semitism personified.

I knew who Soleimani was when I was in Iraq. We were targeted by rockets every single day from Iranian proxies trained in, funded by, and armed by Iran and sometimes led by Iranian commanders, and fellow Americans died.

The targeting of Soleimani is justice for the 609 families who had a son or daughter murdered by this guy and the thousands missing an arm or a leg because of his savagery.

In bringing up this resolution, the Speaker said that our targeting of Soleimani was disproportionate. It is disgusting. This guy killed 609 Americans in Iraq alone. He was the mastermind.

Does it take 100 more? 200 more? 300 more? It is vile.

Our strike was also defensive. General Milley said that he saw some of the best intelligence he has ever seen and that it clearly showed Soleimani was in Baghdad, planning an imminent attack on Americans. To deny this is to call General Milley a liar.

This resolution weakens America and gives hope to the Ayatollah that we don't have the resolve to stand up to these attacks. A house divided will not stand. I pray wise leadership prevails and that we unify to oppose Iranian terror that murdered hundreds of our fellow citizens.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who has worked very hard on these issues for many years.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and also for his tremendous leadership.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 83. This critical resolution helps put a check on this administration's reckless and irrational unauthorized military actions against Iran.

The American people do not want, and we cannot allow, another unnecessary war of choice in the Middle East. This resolution is an important step in our efforts to prevent that from happening. This will restore our constitutional duty over military action.

Also, we must take up my bill, H.R. 2456, to repeal the 2002 AUMF and Congressman KHANNA's bill to prohibit any funds for a war with Iran, absent an explicit authorization. My 2002 AUMF amendment was included with bipartisan support in the House and passed in the 2020 NDAA bill, but it was stripped by Republicans from the final bill. Now, I know why.

Madam Speaker, this administration has falsely claimed that the 2002 AUMF could be used as a congressional authorization to attack Iran, which is completely outrageous.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, let me be clear: U.S. military deployment and operations carried out pursuant to the 2002 AUMF officially concluded in 2011. Maintaining this authorization is not only dangerous, but it is irresponsible.

Madam Speaker, it is past time to return to diplomacy and end these endless wars, and I urge an “aye” vote on H. Con. Res. 83.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO), who is a Marine veteran of the Persian Gulf war and a current member of the Mississippi National Guard.

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this resolution.

Let’s be clear with the American people: Democrats wrote this bill before being briefed by senior intelligence officials on the strike that eliminated Soleimani, a well-known terrorist.

At the end of the day, we all know that this man was responsible for the death of thousands of individuals, including over 600 American servicemembers. President Trump was absolutely right to respond and acted within his constitutional authority to protect American citizens. He owes no one an apology. Feelings can be healed, but dead Americans cannot be resurrected.

My question for those on the other side of the aisle who are hellbent on undermining this President over political differences is: How many more Americans did you want to die before President Trump acted?

Let’s reflect. President Obama authorized over 540 drone strikes, killing over 3,700 people and more than 320 civilians. Not a single one was authorized by Congress.

As a veteran and member of our United States military, I am ashamed of the behavior I am witnessing now. Our military deserves better, and so do the American people. During a time when our country should unite behind our Commander in Chief, this resolution turns us against ourselves. I support our men and women in uniform and hope my colleagues on the left will come to their senses to do the same.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), who is a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

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

I previously served in Active Duty in the United States military, and if we are going to put our troops in harm’s way, we better have a strategy. Unfortunately, we don’t have a strategy from the Trump administration. We just have reckless and impulsive decisionmaking by the President.

Let me just ask a very simple question: What are our goals with Iran?

Is it to get them to come back to the negotiating table on the nuclear program? Well, we are further away from that goal now because they have announced they are no longer going to abide by limits on the nuclear program.

Is the goal to get the regime to collapse? We are further from that goal, too, because the Iranian people who previously were protesting their government are rallying behind their leadership.

Or is the goal to work with our allies to contain Iran? Well, we are further away from that goal, too, because the Iraqi parliament just voted to kick us out of their country.

Madam Speaker, we are less safe than we were a week ago. Vote “yes” on this bipartisan resolution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, many of the senior leadership on the other side of the aisle voted for the 2002 AUMF on Iraq, including the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the majority leader, and the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The AUMF in 2002 gave this President every bit of authority he needed to go after a terrorist in Iraq. In fact, the terrorist that he killed, Soleimani, was designated under Barack Obama Executive Order No. 13224 as a Specially Designated Global Terrorist in 2011.

Where was the outrage when President Obama was using the same AUMF as justification for dropping bombs in countries like Yemen or Syria, or violating the sovereign airspace of Pakistan, which we all agreed with, but violated the airspace of Pakistan to go in and kill Osama bin Laden?

We were fine with that. This is a Specially Designated Global Terrorist who deserved death after he was responsible for 600-plus American deaths, atrocious and abysmal acts.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, there are two times we are going to be called to account for our votes here in Congress. One is at our next election; the other is when we draw our last breath of air. I am more concerned about the latter.

This vote isn’t about supporting or opposing President Trump. I voted for President Trump. I plan to vote for President Trump again.

This vote is about exercising our constitutional authority. More importantly, it is about our moral obligation to decide when and where our troops are going to be asked to give their lives.

Congress needs to do more of what we are doing here today. We need to debate our involvement in Afghanistan, and then we need to bring our troops home. We need to debate our involve-

ment in Iraq, and then we need to bring our troops home.

We certainly don’t need another war. If we do go to war, it needs to be with the blessing and the support of the people and a mission that our soldiers can accomplish.

We do that by following the vision of our Founding Fathers: We debate it here on the floor of the House.

That is what this resolution is about, and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), who is the Republican whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. If you look at what they are attempting to do, there has been a lot of talk about the 2002 AUMF, Madam Speaker, and I am sure, as Congress has over the years, we will continue to have a healthy debate over what that proper role should be of Congress as it relates to the 2002 AUMF. But that is not what this debate is about.

When you read the resolution, in fact, just by its own name, this is not an act of Congress. This isn’t even changing the law. So if you want to have a sincere debate over what that power should be that Congress gave to the executive branch, then let’s have that debate. But don’t try to pass some fig leaf resolution that is only intended to try to undermine the President in the middle of a conflict with the world’s largest state sponsor of terrorism, Iran.

There is no dispute about how bad of an evil terrorist Soleimani was, yet here you hear all of these equivocations: Oh, Soleimani was bad person but.

Madam Speaker, how can you sit here and try to apologize for the things that he did by saying that taking him out was wrong?

This world is a safer place with Soleimani gone. If you want to apologize to anybody, go apologize to the families of those hundreds of men and women in our uniform who are dead at the hands of Soleimani, not only the people whom he had already killed but the even more Americans whom at the very time of his death he was plotting to kill.

□ 1600

How much is enough? At what point do we say: Take him off the face of this planet so he can’t kill more innocent people? That is what was ultimately done.

We support President Trump in his efforts at keeping America safe, just like we supported President Obama when he took out Osama bin Laden, another evil terrorist who had the blood of thousands of Americans on his hands.

If we are going to be serious about keeping this country safe, absolutely,

there is a role for Congress to play, but you have got to support the efforts of your Commander in Chief to carry out his constitutional duty which he has to keep this country safe.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership in bringing this important opportunity for us to express our concern about the President's actions. I salute him and the support on the other side of the aisle for this legislation.

As we know, last week, the Trump administration conducted a provocative and disproportionate military airstrike targeting high-level Iranian military officials, and he did so without consulting Congress.

When I first heard from the administration, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, I said: Why did you not consult Congress in this change in approach?

They said: Because we had to keep this close. We had to keep this close.

You had to keep it close from the Gang of 8, the leadership of the Congress?

We had to keep it close because we didn't want the word get out.

Well, we deserve the respect from the administration, and the Congress deserves, by dint of the Constitution, the requirement of the administration to consult with Congress.

We know full well, better than many in the administration, the importance of classified information. We know that we are supposed to support sources and methods. We also know that the consultation that they would give to us does not enable us to divulge any information.

So who are they keeping it close from? They admitted, this administration, they were keeping it close from the Congress of the United States, and they did so.

Now, they did a classified presentation yesterday, which their own party members, Republican Senators, said it was the most demeaning and worst classified briefing that they had had. I, myself, think there is stiff competition for that designation of "worst presentation" by this administration in a classified briefing.

But all that is to say that the Constitution of the United States calls for there to be cooperation when we decide about initiating hostilities. Congress has the right to declare war. When do you decide that it is war? When do you decide it is just hostilities? When does that end? What line do you cross?

But, with the President's actions last week, he endangered our servicemen and -women, our diplomats and others by taking a serious risk of escalation of tensions with Iran.

This does not come with any respect for Iran. We know what bad actors they are in the world. I, from my intel-

ligence background, know that Soleimani was somebody whom we do not mourn the loss of. He did very evil things in the world. But we also know that when we take an action, we have to understand the ramifications of it.

Others could have taken Soleimani out. Israel could have taken Soleimani out, but they didn't. They didn't.

So, that has happened. That is where it is. As we go forward, it is really important for us to address the parameters of the War Powers Act, and that is what we are doing here today.

The Members of Congress have serious and urgent concerns about the administration's decision to engage—I use the term "decision" loosely—to engage in hostilities against Iran, and it is about a lack of strategy. What is the strategy to move forward?

Again, they did not consult with Congress. They gave a presentation that, by their own side of the aisle, has been described as demeaning and the worst. And then they tell Members to go read the classified documents.

Classified? Why are these documents classified? Why can't the American people know?

We understand redactions of sources and methods and the rest, but, if you read that document, you would know there is no reason for it to be classified; and without going into any substantive matters of what happened yesterday in the classified briefing, it is fair to say that Members were told to go read other documents which are redacted and, in many cases, classified unnecessarily.

Our concerns were not addressed by the President's insufficient War Powers authorization, which was classified in its entirety, leaving the Congress and the public in the dark about our national security, and our concerns were not addressed by the administration's briefing yesterday.

Today, to honor our duty to keep the American people safe—that is our first responsibility, to protect and defend; we must keep the American people safe—the House will pass a War Powers Resolution to limit the President's military actions regarding Iran.

Congress is reasserting our long-established oversight responsibilities as we mandate that, if no further Congressional action is taken, the administration's military hostilities with regard to Iran must end.

We salute Congresswoman SLOTKIN for her leadership in this resolution. She is a former CIA and Department of Defense analyst specializing in Shiite militias, who served multiple tours in the region under both Democratic and Republican Presidents.

It is important to know, because I heard the distinguished whip on the other side of the aisle ask: How come it is just a concurrent resolution? It is because, under the War Powers Act, that is one of the options that is provided. You can do a joint resolution, House resolution, or you can do a concurrent resolution.

The value and the beauty and the exquisite nature of a concurrent resolution is that it does not have to be signed by the President of the United States. The Congress of the United States, in its full power and full voice, can speak in a united way about what the War Powers Act should look like, and that should count for something to our colleagues who serve in the Congress of the United States. So, under the authority of the War Powers Act that gives us this option, we take this opportunity to do so.

I implore the administration to work with Congress to advance immediate, effective, deescalatory strategy that prevents further violence.

I also salute this resolution because it does give opportunity for the administration to act under certain circumstances which are part of the War Powers Act.

Madam Speaker, in December, a group of us, in a bipartisan way, traveled to Belgium and Luxembourg to observe the 75th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge and who served in that battle. One of our Members, ANNIE KUSTER, her father served in that, and she has letters from him at that time.

Other Members, on both sides of the aisle—Mr. SETH MOULTON, his grandfather served in the Battle of the Bulge—also on the Republican side of the aisle, the House and in the Senate.

And why I bring it up is this. That Battle of the Bulge was a decisive battle in World War II. It was a surprise attack, really, by the Germans. It was a bloody battle. We lost 19,000 Americans—19,000 Americans—in that Battle of the Bulge.

On the days that we were there, when I was listening to the description of it from the veterans who served, it sounded almost like Washington crossing the Delaware, because it was December, as it was in the United States in the beginning of our fight for independence. Supplies were insufficient. The camouflage for snow was not adequate. Our veterans, our then men in uniform were exposed—nurses, too. And it was a triumph that was very decisive in World War II.

And why I bring it up is because, when there was the observance of it—it was parts of 3 days we were there for it. But at the close of it, there was a ceremony that included a speech by the King of Belgium, the Grand Duke of Luxembourg—two of the places where this all took place—and the President of Germany, who spoke beautifully about Germany now, saying: When you freed Luxembourg and Belgium, you also freed the Germans.

What a beautiful statement.

But the close of it was from a veteran who served in the Battle of the Bulge, in his nineties. He was a teenager in the war. We saw the foxholes in which they fought, they lost their comrades in arms. He talked about the brotherhood, and he talked about allies, and he talked about the fight. At the end of the speech, the veteran said: I don't

know if I should say this, but I will. My message to all of you is pray for peace. Pray for peace.

That is what we should be doing is moving toward peace, not escalation of hostilities where that can be avoided. Not because we believe that the other side has good motivations or that Soleimani was not a bad person.

It is not because of what they are; it is because of who we are as Americans: a country that is committed to peace and security and prepared to protect and defend, as President Kennedy said, fight any fight, fight any foe, pay any price to keep the American people safe, but to not be frivolous and cavalier about how we decide to show strength when it really is more of an escalation than a deescalation.

So it is sad because you would think that, any time we would engage in such an important change in approach, we would be working together, consulting together, respecting the approach that each side takes to all of this and, hopefully, just be on one side of it all.

So I think this is very important. It doesn't do everything, and it is said: Well, it doesn't do this; it doesn't do that.

We should never be judging legislation, necessarily, for what it doesn't do, but respecting it for what it does do, and what this does is very important for the security of our country.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this brazen political stunt.

Qasem Soleimani was a vicious terrorist who built a cult following on the backs of dead Americans. He armed Hezbollah, KH, and other Iranian proxies who killed American troops and our allies throughout the Middle East. The Homeland Security and Defense Departments have kept close watch on his terror campaigns for years.

Soleimani was not visiting Baghdad because it was a great holiday destination. He was there to meet the leader of a terrorist group that killed an American just days before.

Our President used the law and his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief to eliminate this terrorist mastermind before he could kill again.

Democrats immediately responded by doubting our intelligence and dismissing the expertise of our military leaders. Now they bring this resolution to the floor that maligns our President, undermines our national security, and makes a martyr of a man who killed nearly 600 Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the majority whip.

□ 1615

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding the time.

Speaking out against the Vietnam War in 1967, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. implored: "We must move past indecision to action. We must find new ways to speak for peace. If we do not act, we shall surely be dragged down the long, dark, and shameful corridors of time reserved for those who possess power without compassion, might without morality, and strength without sight."

Dr. King's words are just as apropos today. President Trump, in ordering a significant military strike, without seeking authorization, or even consultation with Congress, has brought us to the brink of war.

The Constitution of this great country gives the solemn power to declare war to the people's representatives in Congress, not one person in the White House, whoever that might be.

With this resolution, Congress is acting to uphold our constitutional responsibility. If the President believes military action against Iran is warranted, this resolution, and the Constitution, require him to make the case to Congress and receive authorization.

Mr. Speaker, I truly regret that we find ourselves in the position we are today. The Trump administration's policy toward Iran, abandoning the nuclear deal rather than building on it, while escalating tensions instead, is an unwise application of American power, might, and strength.

The strike against General Soleimani, a bad man who no American mourns, drags us closer to another long, dark, and shameful corridor to an unnecessary war.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, our Constitution is clear that only Congress can start a war, but only the President can wage it. Congress started this war with the AUMF in 2002. It is still in effect.

The Founders didn't want one individual getting us into a war; but once in it, they didn't want 535 squabbling prima donnas second-guessing every decision on the battlefield.

President Trump needed no other reason to order the attack that killed Soleimani in Iraq, beyond the simple fact that he was acting as an enemy combatant against U.S. forces in a war zone in which the Congress had authorized the President to take military action.

I happen to believe the AUMF was a colossal mistake, but this resolution doesn't correct that mistake. It compounds it by deliberately undermining the position of the United States Government and the Armed Forces that we sent to Iraq at a perilous moment, which makes it not only unconstitutional, but disgraceful.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), the vice chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days, the American people have been unwillingly taken to the brink of war at the direction of this administration.

Through reckless actions, the White House has unified the Iranian public, alienated our partners in Iraq and Europe, undermined the fight against ISIS, and left the United States more isolated than before; all in just 1 week, and without the consent of this Congress.

This is a grave and serious moment in our country.

Two days ago, our brave men and women in uniform came under fire from 22 Iranian missiles, in harm's way because of their Commander in Chief.

Every American owes a debt of gratitude to our military for its courage and sacrifice. For that reason, a decision that risks troops' well-being must only be made thoughtfully and with the informed consent of the public and this Congress.

As a Member of Congress, my biggest priority is to protect the safety of the American people, at home and abroad. This can only be done by defending Congress' constitutional authority over declaring war.

For that reason, I urge us to support this resolution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. ABRAHAM. Major Ronald Culver, Jr., Corporal Justin Mixon, Sergeant Joseph Richard, III, Sergeant Terrell Gilmore, Staff Sergeant Jarred Fontenot, Corporal William Crouch, Private Mark Graham, Staff Sergeant Ronnie Sanders, Staff Sergeant Jacob McMillan, Sergeant Joshua Madden, Sergeant Jay Gauthreaux, Private Joshua Burrows, Corporal Joseph Dumas, Lance Corporal Jon Bowman, Lance Corporal John Hale, Sergeant Matthew Vosbein, Sergeant First Class Terry Wallace, Sergeant Brandon Teeters, Lance Corporal Derrick Cothran, Staff Sergeant Bryan Lewis, Sergeant Julia Atkins, Sergeant Willard Partridge, Corporal David Stewart.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Maryland). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Louisiana an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Sergeant David Murray, First Sergeant Michael Bordelon, Sergeant Nicholas Olivier, Sergeant Seth Trahan, Staff Sergeant Jonathan Reed, Sergeant Christopher Ramsey, Sergeant Michael Evans, Sergeant Robert Sweeney, Staff Sergeant William Manuel.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN), a valued

member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution before us today.

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution states: "Congress shall have the power to declare war." The Founders were unequivocal. Only Congress has the power to authorize acts of war.

Today, we bring forth this resolution to honor our Founding Fathers' vision for our country, for our government, one whose very survival hinges on the separation of powers and each branch's respect for the others' authority.

At this moment we, as a Congress, have an opportunity to pursue de-escalatory actions that protect the lives of our Armed Forces, diplomats, and civilians. I implore the President and this administration to work with this Congress in this effort.

Today marks this first step. We must aggressively pursue diplomacy so that no lives are lost. I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in that pursuit.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of a President who carried out his oath of office.

I am afraid the reason we are here today, again, is out of pure opposition to this President, and not the serious national security issues at hand.

Make no mistake; terrorist Soleimani is responsible for the deaths of hundreds of Americans, including those that my friend and colleague, RALPH ABRAHAM, just read. Hundreds of Americans; and he was plotting to kill many more.

The President used his full legal authority to take defensive action and eliminate this brutal terrorist. The world is safer today because of it.

In times like these, we need to come together as a country and stand behind our men and women in uniform. Whoever occupies the White House should have the ability to direct and address threats and prevent American bloodshed.

Just 48 hours ago, Iran attacked U.S. military personnel; and yet, we are hastily voting on this partisan resolution that will weaken national security.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this political show resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of the War Powers Resolution as an original cosponsor. This is a grave and pivotal moment in American history, and we must be greatly concerned for the security of our troops and the safety of the American people.

We live in an era of hybrid warfare and high-intensity reaction. One reck-

less military strike can incentivize countermeasures, not just in the immediate region, but thousands of miles away by Iran's proxies. Wise use of force matters.

Without congressional authorization, and in defiance of our Constitution, this President ordered an unprecedented strike on Iran's top generals.

There is no doubt Soleimani was a fierce enemy of liberty. However, this Lone Ranger attack by the President risks all-out war, greater instability in Iraq and Iran, losing the edge we have gained at such great cost; and some of those names have been put on the RECORD today.

We must protect against further attacks on our servicemembers and attacks on U.S. assets, wherever they might exist.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Ohio an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. To those ends, the American people deserve full transparency. The President must take steps to de-escalate this highly volatile situation in a most ungovernable part of the world.

Let us rigorously pursue, with our allies, turning back Iran's development of nuclear weapons. And let us do all we can to uphold our beloved Constitution, put raging bulls back in their cages, and make the American people safer.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and fellow Texan, Ranking Member MCCAUL, for his strong leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to weaponize impeachment to discredit the President. It is a whole other thing to handcuff our Commander in Chief and jeopardize the safety of our soldiers and prevent them from defending themselves.

Thankfully, this is a partisan resolution that is going nowhere. But it is also disturbing insight into the naive and impotent ideology of appeasement that invited Russia into Syria, created ISIS in Iraq, and emboldened Iran to terrorize and brutally murder throughout the Middle East.

This is not a resolution. This is a retreat, a de facto apology. But for what? For ridding the world of a brutal terrorist with American blood on his hands?

If this resolution were to become law, Mr. Speaker, it would be a death warrant, and not for the worst of terrorists, but for the best of Americans, our sons and daughters on the battlefield who would be left defenseless, sitting ducks for a murderous mob of mullahs in Iran and Iranian-backed militias throughout the region.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is past time for Congress to exert our authority over the questions of war and peace; and I am proud to vote for this concurrent resolution to invoke the War Powers Act in order to restrain this reckless President.

This vote would halt military operations and force the President to come to Congress to authorize any further acts of war.

The President, remarkably, said: "All is well."

Well, Mr. President, it is not well. Iran announced that it would withdraw from the nuclear agreement and will begin to resume its nuclear weapons plan. The United States has been forced to stop its actions against ISIS. Iraq is likely to expel the United States from its country, fulfilling what has been a dream, actually, of Soleimani.

Our European allies are angry because they were not alerted, and our actions have united the people of Iraq against us, and the people of Iran are together now.

Mr. President, America is not safer because of what you have done. And we must pass this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1630

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let us hope that demagoguery will not play too great a part in the consideration of this piece of legislation. I just heard one of my colleagues on the other side mischaracterize the position of my party and of this resolution.

This resolution is the law. This resolution is consistent with not only the law, the War Powers Act, but the Constitution of the United States.

I thank Representative SLOTKIN for authoring this resolution, as well as Chairman SMITH, Chairman ENGEL, Representative KHANNA, Representative LEE, and others who have been working hard to ensure that Congress maintains its role as a coequal branch of government when it comes to matters of war and peace.

This President, as we have seen, has consistently treated the legislative branch as inferior to the executive branch. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, we have had numerous votes on this floor last year to stand up for the coequal status of the Congress of the United States. Too often, our Republican friends have sided with the executive department, diminishing the authority and the position of the Congress of the United States. This is not about this President, nor is it about shrinking from confronting terrorism and terrorists.

Again and again, we have seen this President ignore Congress' directives on appropriations, including by shifting money away from the military to

fund his costly and ineffective border wall. This President has refused to disburse emergency funding for disaster relief that Congress allocated to help the people of Puerto Rico and other places where Americans are in need of help. This President withheld congressionally appropriated funding to help Ukraine repel Russian terrorism.

After criticizing his predecessor for the use of executive orders, President Trump has doubled down on using them to circumvent the will of Congress and the American people.

This resolution is to say: Mr. President, obey the law, obey the Constitution of the United States of America, which gives Congress the sole authority to declare war.

If you read the language of the resolution, it continues to say that we are for, certainly, defending any of our people at risk, period. The War Powers Act provides for that. Article II of the Constitution provides for that.

The President has ignored congressional subpoenas for documents and testimony, directing subordinates to build a wall of obstruction unseen in our history. It should, therefore, be no surprise that we representatives of the 320-plus million people of America, who expect us to be their voice in this critical issue of declaring war—and this resolution does not prohibit in any way the President of the United States, under his Article II powers, acting to defend our military, our allies, and our homeland.

With the actions taken last week, the President is unilaterally moving us toward involvement in another deadly and destabilizing war in the Middle East.

I am glad, frankly, as we all are, that the response that came from Iran was either ineffective or simply meant to be a message. I don't know which.

Thankfully, however, the Congress has, under law and our Constitution, a remedy to reassert our position as a co-equal branch—as a matter of fact, an Article I branch—and ensure, as the Founders intended, that only the Congress, speaking on behalf of all the people, could declare war.

Congress passed the War Powers Act in 1973 because they believed a Democratic President, and it was a Democratic Congress that adopted the War Powers Act, because they believed a Democratic President had overstepped the bounds.

Congress passed the War Powers Act in 1973, determined to ensure that no President can send our troops into war without the people's representatives authorizing it. I suggest to my friends on both sides of the aisle that is what the Founders intended.

We must use this tool of congressional power or, by our silence, acquiesce to the growth of the imperial Presidency, which by the way, has been going on for some 40 years, maybe even 50 years, irrespective of who is President.

This is not a partisan resolution. This is a resolution consistent with the

Constitution of the United States of America, which did not want a single person to be able to take America to war, to put our men and women at risk.

Let us be absolutely clear: Qasem Soleimani was a dangerous purveyor of terror and violence and a practice thereof. He was an architect of Iranian efforts to dominate the Middle East through aggression and fear. He has American blood on his hands, as well as the blood of our allies.

He has met the justice he deserves. I say that notwithstanding the fact I do not know from the information I have received whether or not, in fact, it was absolutely essential to take his life now because of imminent danger. Perhaps it was.

In any event, no one laments the loss of Soleimani's life, at least in this country and by freedom-loving people throughout the world. We are relieved that the Iranian counterstrike was limited and caused no American or allied casualties.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents and the American people are deeply concerned about what comes next with a possibility of further retaliation and escalation from Iran or its proxies. There may be a time when such action is called for, but it is this body that needs to make that decision, the United States Senate and this body.

Iran is a dangerous enemy of freedom and a sponsor of terror. It continues to harbor ambitions of dominance over its neighbors and to call for the destruction of Israel. This Iranian regime is no friend and must not be trusted.

Iran must never be allowed to acquire a nuclear weapon. I believe this Congress would vote to ensure that that was prohibited. This resolution makes those facts clear. We must have a sound, long-term strategy to deal with Iran and bring it into compliance with international laws and norms.

The threat of military force must continue to be a part of any strategy, along with sanctions and diplomacy, and this resolution in no way contravenes that premise.

The best way forward is for Congress and the administration to work together. That is what our Founders had in mind. Proper congressional oversight and involvement will help ensure, not undermine, that the administration adopts and pursues the best possible strategy to check and oppose Iran's malign ambitions.

Let us not demagogue one another. There can be differences. This resolution is brought to this floor of the House to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America and to again urge this President, as we have urged Democratic Presidents, to ensure that they follow the strictures of our Constitution on behalf of the safety of our people and the respect we have throughout the world.

We are a nation of laws. This resolution is about the laws.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the leader, and I do

not disagree with him that the President needs to come to Congress to authorize war with Iran, but that is not what we are looking at here today.

We do not currently have troops engaged in hostility in Iran subject to withdrawal under the War Powers Resolution. However, if the administration were to strike Iran directly, in my opinion, they would need to submit a war powers notification, and they would need to proceed with an authorized use of military force.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO).

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member McCAUL for yielding.

I oppose this resolution. The Speaker claims it is a necessary response to President Trump's "disproportionate" attack on "high-level Iranian military officials." Disproportionate?

Apparently, Democrats have forgotten who Qasem Soleimani was, one of the worst perpetrators of terror in recent history. He led the organization that founded Hezbollah, one of the most violent terrorist groups opposing Israel. He directed his groups to kill over 600 American servicemembers in Iraq and wounded thousands more. He led a brutal attack on peaceful protestors recently in Iran, killing over 1,000 Iranians.

A bully will not stand down unless he knows you are willing to stand toe-to-toe with him, unless he knows there are consequences to his actions. President Trump acted decisively in bringing down this brutal, inhumane bully, this terrorist mastermind, to stop an imminent threat. It was necessary to show Iran we will no longer tolerate their aggression.

We should be united in our support for eliminating this threat and in supporting the President's efforts to negotiate a new, more effective Iran deal.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution so that all options are on the table and so that we can negotiate from a position of strength toward achieving a peaceful solution.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this concurrent resolution, which requires President Trump to immediately terminate military operations against Iran. It is about time that Congress exercised its war powers authority under the Constitution. I believe this is long overdue.

The President has taken our Nation to the brink of war without properly consulting Congress or seeking the legal authority to do so. Only Congress can authorize military action under Article I of the Constitution.

To add insult to injury, the Trump administration has failed to fully explain to Congress and the American people what exactly the imminent threat was to the United States that required the strike that was undertaken. My constituents and people

across the country have been terrified about the prospect of a new war in the Middle East.

Now, let me be clear: No Member of Congress carries a brief for Soleimani or the Iranian Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. No President has unilateral authority to take our Nation to war without authorization from Congress. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

□ 1645

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if it were but a matter of offering three cheers for the legislative branch, that would be fine, but this is dangerous and simply makes no sense.

If the majority wished to assert Congress' authority, as several have argued, it would not use a nonbinding resolution, but let me take the majority at its chosen words, as if binding.

The words of the resolution would literally prohibit the President from ordering the shoot-down of Iranian ballistic missiles inbound for Haifa or a surface-to-air missile locked onto a Ukrainian airliner.

And the resolution's chosen words, as Democrats argue them, would prevent the President from the strike on Soleimani itself even if devastating harm to American soldiers were imminent but Democrats second-guessed that judgment.

The language they have chosen is designed to debilitate the President from protecting Americans.

The intemperate words of the past week have cost many their credibility. Now Democrats' spite for President Trump has cost them their good judgment.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the 2002 AUMF. In coming to that very difficult decision, I learned an important lesson: that we must ask every administration that seeks to use military force how it will manage the consequences of its actions, even if those actions can be justified.

Has this administration done that? Unfortunately, I think the answer is no.

I will vote for this resolution today for the same reasons I had then: no overall strategy, no justification, and nobody in this administration can answer how it will respond to the aftermath.

By virtue of the power and the responsibility granted to us by the Constitution, we must ask those questions.

Let's take this opportunity to make diplomacy work. Let's stand together as a Congress to establish our authority. Let's stand together and vote against a new war without an end game.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, Sergeant First Class Kurt Comeaux, Sergeant Christopher Babin, Sergeant Bradley Bergeron, Sergeant Huey Fassbender, Sergeant Armand Frickey, Sergeant Warren Murphy, Sergeant Craig Nelson, First Lieutenant Christopher Barnett, Private First Class Torey Dantzer, Private First Class James Lambert, Sergeant Taft Williams.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ranking Member McCAUL, for giving me additional time to finish the list that I started earlier.

These are 44 young Americans from Louisiana who died by IEDs in the most active part of Iraq when Soleimani and his proxies were engaged. They designed, they built, and they implemented these IEDs; and in Louisiana alone, 44 young Americans gave their lives for the United States of America.

President Trump, he had the authority, he has the right, and, thankfully, he had the courage to terminate Soleimani and remove this cancer from this Earth.

Mr. Speaker, to my Democratic colleagues and friends, I say, if you can look these Gold Star families in the face and tell them that this was not a justified strike and that Soleimani needed to be removed from this Earth, then God have mercy on you.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI), a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, we may be relieved that an impulsive act by President Trump has not immediately led to war with Iran, we may be relieved that an evil man is dead, but as that evil man wished, our troops have now been asked to leave Iraq, and if they stay, their ability to work with Iraqis to fight ISIS has been shot.

As he wished, the protest movement in Iran and Iraq that threatened the Iranian regime has been silenced.

As he wished, Iran is now breaking free of all restrictions on its nuclear program.

We are not safer today.

In this moment of danger, there is just one question that this resolution asks. It is not do you support what the President has already done, but should Congress play our constitutional role in deciding what happens next.

I support this resolution because passing it will protect us against going to war with a tweet, but it also ensures that, if we do go to war, which we may have to at some point, we will do so with the American people united, not

divided, as the Framers intended, as our national interest demands.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS).

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in defense of our Constitution and express the urgent need of Congress to reestablish itself as an equal branch of government.

Our Founders explicitly laid out the roles and responsibilities of the legislative, executive, and judiciary branches, creating a necessary system of checks and balances, but today we find our democratic system in jeopardy.

In the past week, there has been an increasing concern about the United States going to war with Iran.

Let me be very clear: If and when the President decides to use military action, he must go through Congress first.

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to declare war. Any attempt to undermine that power would be unsafe, unacceptable, and unconstitutional.

As a Navy veteran, I am constantly thinking of our brave servicemembers. It is why I take this constitutional responsibility seriously.

We cannot turn our backs to our principles, we cannot turn our backs to our values, and we cannot turn our backs to the Constitution.

I look forward to voting for the War Powers Resolution and taking Congress' power back.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE).

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in great frustration in opposition to this politically-motivated resolution. It is nothing but a blatant attempt to handcuff the President's ability to defend our citizens and our allies.

Just this morning, U.S. intelligence officials reported that they are now confident that Ukraine Airlines 752 was shot down by Iranian surface-to-air missiles, another 176 innocent lives lost.

The Islamic Republic of Iran has been hostile to our Nation for decades, and yet it has certainly escalated in the last several months with a campaign of antagonistic military action.

Have my Democratic colleagues forgotten about the shipping vessel sabotaged by naval mines last May and June, or the American drone shot down over international waters, or the British oil tanker seized by the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, or the Saudi oil facilities that were attacked?

And then when an American citizen was killed in an attack on Kirkuk Air Base in December and our Embassy in Iraq subsequently overrun, our President drew a line in the sand. Yet, after months of tremendous restraint, the President was determined that not one

more American life would be lost by this hostile Iranian regime, and I fully support the President in his actions.

I do agree with many of my colleagues that it is time for this body to have a serious conversation and to address the many issues inherent with operating under a 20-plus-year-old authorization for military force, but that should not be confused with the process that is taking place here with this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is nothing but an attempt by the majority in a 3-year-long process by their party to take any and every opportunity to undermine or embarrass this President. But be assured that this politically-motivated resolution nor any evil that comes our way will cause our President to hesitate when called upon to defend American lives.

I just say, God bless the President; God bless America.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, please don't question our motives or patriotism and we won't question yours.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution that reasserts congressional authority over going to war.

We know this: War is devastating for our troops, for their families, for families and children everywhere, for not just this generation but future generations to come, for our humanity. That is why our Framers gave this body the opportunity, the responsibility to have that discussion and declare war should it be needed.

In 2002, we rushed to war based on made-up claims of weapons of mass destruction, and the Iraq and Afghanistan wars took hundreds of thousands of lives, created millions of refugees, and cost us trillions of dollars.

Today, the President, without providing any raw intelligence to prove an imminent threat, has brought us to the brink of war with Iran. This resolution makes it clear that Congress has not authorized this war.

We also must repeal the 2002 AUMF and vote to withhold funds for this unauthorized war. It is time to reassert our authority.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of #13DistrictStrong. This is a district that believes in leading with compassion. They believe in a full stop to endless violent wars that only result in loss of life and the destruction of lives forever changed.

For us, Mr. Speaker, it is important to protect our democracy and promote global peace. We must remove political motives and for-profit schemes from the decisionmaking process to go to war. If we don't, it would only lead to more warfare and death.

We cannot allow a process that is tainted, secretive, or encompasses lies to make that choice. We need a country that easily chooses peace for generations to come.

I proudly represent a district that believes in the rule of law. That is why I rise today as their voice in support of a War Powers Resolution that will give them a say in whether or not our country goes to war.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN).

□ 1700

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in complete opposition to this resolution.

First, this is a nonbinding resolution. If you really wanted to exert some congressional decisionmaking, we would do a bill that goes before the President and gets signed or gets vetoed. This is purely theatrics.

None of these Democrat leaders stood up when President Obama violated the airspace of Pakistan to take out Osama bin Laden. Now, I am glad he did that, but there was no congressional authorization to go into Pakistan. At least here there is a congressional authorization for our forces to be on the ground and using military power.

The President has clear authority under Article II to act when our Nation and our military is at risk. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said: "The trigger for the drone strike that killed Soleimani was 'clear, unambiguous intelligence indicating a significant campaign of violence against the United States in the days, weeks, and months,' and that the administration would have been 'culpably negligent' if it didn't act"—General Mark Milley.

These people understand one thing, and it is strength. You will recall that when President Clinton pulled our forces out of Somalia after we got the black eye on Black Hawk Down, bin Laden cited that as proof that Americans run away, that they won't stand and fight.

I have been to combat three times in this region of the world, twice in Iraq and once in Afghanistan. I have looked these individuals in the eye. It is strength that they understand. And, clearly, it has shown itself to be true again.

This President stood up, and Iran's response was clear. They had two audiences in their response:

At home, they wanted people to see strength. They shot 15 missiles. Back in their press, they are saying they killed Americans. They didn't, of course.

The other audience, the United States and the rest of the world, they

fired 16 missiles, all 16 missed. All 16 missiles missed.

Remember when they hit Saudi Arabia? All those missiles hit. They know how to hit their target. They fired 16 missiles against us and not one hit.

What is the message they are saying? Immediately after they fired them, they stood up and said: We are done. No more. That is the end of our response. They told the Shia militia groups to stand down. Muqtada al-Sadr said to his people today: Stand down.

They respond to strength, and our President did the right thing. He was a strong response, a strong response to storming a sovereign U.S. territory of an embassy with 6,000 people, killing American contractors, and wounding American soldiers with a rocket attack.

Mr. Speaker, this President made a strong response, and it has shown itself to work.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I just can't really believe what I just heard.

It was the 2001 AUMF that specifically authorized our going after Osama bin Laden. He is the example of Congress getting involved. That was the authorization to get Osama bin Laden in Pakistan or anyplace else, and that is what we are trying to assure here, that things aren't just happening, that there is actual authority. Osama bin Laden is the wrong example, because we gave the authority to go after him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Speaker, as the mother of a United States Marine war veteran, I came to Congress with the promise of never sending someone else's child to a war that could be avoided. This War Powers Resolution says no war with Iran without congressional approval, while still ensuring defense if there is an imminent threat.

While we do not mourn the death of Iran's commander of terror, Americans and our allies worry about the ramifications that will make us less safe: the fight against ISIS has been diverted; regional protests against the Iranian regime are now against America; Iranian proxies have been further incited; and Iran is closer to having a nuclear weapon.

America is not a monarchy. The decision to go to war requires debate, deliberation, and collective judgment. That is why the law gives the responsibility to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this resolution.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I will continue to reserve until Chairman ENGEL is prepared to close.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. ENGEL, for yielding.

I am troubled by aspects of this debate. I think it is fine that we have different views, but to hear some on the other side characterize the position of

those who support this resolution as somehow not loving the country as much as they do when it is our country, as well, that we have pledged to defend—it is the same veterans on this side of the aisle who put themselves in harm's way as the veterans on the other side of the aisle. There is no distinction in the battlefield. We love our children and want to defend them as much as we know you do as well. So let's stop the demagoguery regarding patriotism.

This comes to a simple question. It is not even a question as to whether or not there was justification to take out Mr. Soleimani, because clearly there was. The question is: Who gives the justification? Who authorizes military action in this country?

We can all have our opinions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. KILDEE. We ought to consult the Constitution, which clearly vests that authority in this Congress. We ought not fear that authority and outsource it to the executive branch. We ought to embrace that authority and be willing to make that decision and follow the Constitution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding. Congress has long been absent without leave from its constitutional responsibility to authorize war before it occurs. From Vietnam to Iran, the verdict on the War Powers Act is clear: you lose it if you do not use it.

Congress chafes at outsized Presidential power, but has failed to exercise its own advice and consent power on war. Iran has stepped back for now from the brink of war, following the killing of General Soleimani, but a strong bipartisan 69 percent of the American people say that war with Iran is now more likely. No wonder, considering we just deployed 15,000 more troops to the region.

Trying to get answers after the fact, as Congress did in yesterday's briefing, yielded frustration, not answers. Unchecked executive power unbalances the safeguards against arbitrary power the Framers built into our Constitution.

With passage of today's resolution, we will reclaim that balance by reinserting Congress into decisions to go to war.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a very valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this War Powers Resolution, and I thank my colleague from Michigan, Representative SLOTKIN, for lead-

ing this effort today to assert Congress' rightful authority and to defend our solemn constitutional duty.

None of us want to see our brave men and women sent into another war.

To be clear, this vote is not about telling the administration that the President can't defend this country. My colleagues know that. They understand it. I strongly reject any implication that somehow, by supporting this resolution, we don't take our national security and the safety of our servicemembers seriously.

To the contrary, nothing we do today limits the ability to respond to a real and imminent threat or defend this country and our interests. To assert so is simply false and it is reckless.

Today, we are telling the President that, if there is a serious threat to the United States, our national security requires that a solemn decision is made to engage U.S. Forces, and the elected representatives of this body, of the American people, need to have that case made to them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield another 15 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to have a robust debate about any authorization for the use of military force.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes." I urge my colleagues to uphold the Constitution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I take a backseat to no Member of this body when it comes to defending the President.

This resolution offers no criticism of the President, no critique. It doesn't criticize the President's attack on Soleimani. As a matter fact, this resolution doesn't even say Soleimani's name in it. Yet it does articulate our very robust basis for self-defense, at times even preemptory self-defense to defend our troops. And it also articulates our nondelegable duty as the Members of the United States Congress to speak to matters of war and peace.

I represent more troops than any other Member of this body. I buried one of them earlier today at Arlington, and that sergeant died a patriot and a hero.

If the members of our armed services have the courage to go and fight and die in these wars, as Congress, we ought to have the courage to vote for them or against them. And I think it is ludicrous to suggest that we are impairing the troops from doing their job by not doing our job articulated in the Constitution to speak to these matters of war and peace.

I support the President. Killing Soleimani was the right decision, but engaging in another forever war in the Middle East would be the wrong decision, and that is why I am voting for this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, the system of checks and balances is broken. Last week's airstrike proves it.

After the strike, the administration produced a vague document that attempts justifying America's push to the brink of war.

Mr. Speaker, I fought in a war started by a President with false and trumped-up intelligence. We cannot let this President do the same.

Americans deserve to read the declassified report so they can judge for themselves whether the strike was worth the risk. They will find an administration shooting from the hip with no strategy to deal with Iran.

It is time for Congress to lead and exercise the authority the Founders gave us in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

It is time to tell the President he cannot send our troops to war with Iran without a strategy and without the consent of their representatives.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's strategy to counter Iran has failed. He has allowed Iran to restart its nuclear weapons program, disrupted our operations countering ISIS, continues to undermine our relationship with NATO allies, and has led America to the brink of a new and unnecessary war.

As someone who served in Iraq, I understand the costs of war, how our soldiers put their lives on the line, and the impact these decisions have on military families.

Our Founders entrusted Congress with the responsibility to declare war. Congress owes it to the American people and our men and women in uniform to carry out that responsibility.

It is time for Congress to declare that war with Iran is not in the best interest of the American people. It is time for Congress to repeal the 2002 AUMF and dramatically restrict the 2001 AUMF. And until we can do that, we must prevent the President from unilaterally committing the United States to another war in the Middle East.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in my office watching this debate, and I began to wonder who it is that we are actually debating against or what it is that we are debating against.

I think back to the killing of Osama bin Laden when we stood together as the United States in saying this was the right thing to do at the right time because it would save lives; the only thing we regretted was that we didn't do it sooner when we had the chance to take him out, but we delayed because we weren't sure.

□ 1715

I have gone back and read what President Obama said and he said, "I made this decision on my own." Yet, today, we stand in the people's House, and we are worried more about the loss of an election in 2020 than the loss of American lives and the continued loss of lives around the world by one of the worst terrorists of all time.

We sit here and try to pretend this charade is what we are concerned about. But what we are really concerned about is giving too much power to this President. This is a President who acted boldly. This is a President who carried out a strike that was so precise, so strategic, nothing else was hurt except the car in which that terrorist was riding in.

Yet, we sit here today and say: Our problem in America isn't terrorists around the world. Our problem in America is that we have a President who is too damn strong. The rest of the world knows today that our enemies certainly do fear us, because they know there is a deterrent in the White House.

Our friends and allies know that America will always be there, will always be there if we say we are going to be there, and we will always stand up for the values that this country has always stood for.

To have this debate tonight and this resolution is not about securing America or making America safer. This is about taking powers away from the President of the United States. We can call this anything we want and say, not just this President but any President in the future.

My God, are you kidding me? Are you kidding me? This is the people's House and our biggest responsibility is protecting our American citizens, and we are having this debate tonight? Please, do not tell me this is about taking away the Authorization for the Use of Military Force. This is about taking away powers from the President.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, again, I think it would be helpful if peoples' motives or patriotism wasn't questioned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the War Powers Resolution introduced by my colleague from Michigan, Congresswoman ELISSA SLOTKIN.

Soleimani was an evil man, a terrorist, a war criminal. No one should mourn his demise. But that doesn't change the question of who has the authority to take our Nation into war. It is Congress and only Congress that is endowed with the most solemn duty to decide if, when, and where to commit our Nation to war.

At the same time, as Commander in Chief, it is incumbent upon our President to ensure that the fine men and women who serve in our military are only sent into harm's way after careful

deliberation and tasked with missions that protect and further America's interests and reflect the values and high moral standing of our Nation.

Our country's Founders in their foresight provided us a robust and constitutional Republic and representative government. They wisely understood that taking a nation to war should not be a unilateral decision by a single person, but a considered decision by the people's elected Representatives.

This administration does not have congressional authorization for use of military force or a declaration of war against Iran. Ultimately, any sustained action against Iran requires congressional approval.

Today's resolution reflects the intentions of our Founders. It makes clear the President must seek authorization from Congress for any extended military engagement with Iran without restricting his ability to protect the Nation from imminent threat.

I have the honor of representing Naval Station Great Lakes where every enlisted sailor receives his or her basic training. I am the proud father of a son serving in our Navy. We owe it to these Americans, each one a volunteer answering the call to serve our country, to protect this Constitution and live up to the expectations of our Founders.

The American people do not want an unnecessary war with Iran. Today's resolution prevents President Trump from unilaterally or impulsively starting one. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER), a man who served on the battlefield in Iraq.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, actually, it takes a lot to get me to come down to these things, but I have been deeply troubled by some of the rhetoric I have been hearing about this. In fact, I was deeply troubled after yesterday when my colleagues, many of them, left a classified briefing only to immediately and recklessly trash the quality of intelligence they received, and in some cases, suggest there was no imminent threat from Soleimani.

To suggest that would require you to ignore the death of Americans recently in Iraq, as well as ignore the history of Soleimani's campaign of terror across the Middle East.

We learned this weekend, while this body was still in recess and before anyone had reviewed any of the classified information, that it was the intention of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to introduce this flawed War Powers Resolution without having even seen any of the underlying intelligence. That suggests that this is not a serious effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Maryland). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, this is not a serious effort. This is a political effort that will have the practical effect only of undermining our military deterrent in the Middle East, which for the first time in a long time is actually stronger.

I think this does a service not only to our personnel in the region, but ultimately to the Iranian people. And what the Iranian regime fears more than anything else, more than the American military and the President of the United States, is its own people. And that is the reason Soleimani's death squads have gunned down Iranian civilians in the streets.

We look forward to the day when the Iranian people can be free of their evil, barbarous, reckless regime, and I applaud the administration's actions.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW).

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, our Founders vested in Congress the solemn responsibility of sending our sons and daughters to war.

I have often heard folks say that now is not the time to discuss the use of force or the decision to send our men and women to fight. I heard that in 2003 when I was carrying a rifle in Baghdad. I heard it again in 2004 and 2005 when I was leading my unit through the mountains of Afghanistan, and I am hearing it again today in the Halls of Congress.

In the last 19 years, more than 7,000 Americans have given their lives in these conflicts; 53,000 have been wounded; and we have spent over \$4 trillion of taxpayer money. Do not believe the fearmongering.

This resolution does nothing to prevent the President from protecting the Nation against imminent threats. I have spent years fighting to keep Americans safe and will continue to do so.

I may have laid down my rifle, but my oath to this country endures. I will fight to ensure that we are having a discussion about when to send our men and women, our sons and daughters, and our sisters and brothers into harm's way. It is time to have this debate.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, at this point I continue to reserve the balance of my time until the chairman is prepared to close.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the President's most recent reckless actions. The killing of General Soleimani was a provocation to war that made Americans less safe for years and maybe decades to come.

The President has put his own ego over the strategic interests and safety

of Americans. What he has accomplished with these actions is to make Soleimani a martyr for a generation of militant Middle Eastern foes that we have.

It has united the Iranian people, not against their government, but against us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of the President and Congress to keep us safe, and the Founding Fathers knew that the collective wisdom of the people's Representatives was better at doing that than one person.

I just visited the SCIF and there is still not any report on any imminent danger claim that might have been made. The American people and Congress deserve to know what the threat allegedly was, given the inevitability of Iranian retaliation.

The two greatest powers Congress has are impeachment and declarations of war. We are here today on both of those issues because of a reckless, lawless, and impetuous President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), a very distinguished gentleman on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, the President should not be able to commit the U.S. recklessly and flagrantly to war. That is the reason there are constitutionally mandated checks and balances. The President escalated hostilities with Iran and did not demonstrate any imminent threat nor strategy as to why.

He clearly did not make our country safer. Quite the opposite. It is not a sign of strength as some of my colleagues suggest. It was an unchecked sign of more disarray and lack of strategic thinking.

We have seen what happens when we don't have a plan for what comes next when we take out a bad actor without thinking through long-term consequences.

We have lost too much blood and tears and treasure to ever allow that to happen again. I support, and implore my colleagues to support, this resolution for the sake and the state of future generations. I love this country. This is the greatest country in the world because we have checks and balances.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I have just got a couple of words I would like to

remind this body about. I have heard a lot of talk about patriotism, and I gave this arm in Vietnam.

I have got a lot of good friends whose names are on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall, so don't talk to me about patriotism, and how much I love this country when we are standing here debating an issue that we all know is not going anywhere.

The last thing I would say to you is, while I was serving in Vietnam, there were many occasions when I didn't have the ability to do what I thought was necessary. I just say to you that this body couldn't make up their mind whether they wanted to be in that war or not, and I suggest we get with the right program and do it now.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in favor of exercising our Article I authorities for matters as grave as war and peace, but the fact is, we are not at war with Iran. The President is not trying to start a war with Iran.

I met with the President earlier today. He told me that if this resolution passes, it will take all of his power to negotiate with Iran off the table. That is the worst thing that we could do.

Yesterday, he called for making a deal that allows for Iran to thrive and prosper. The President is making the choice to move toward deescalation.

The premise of this resolution is flawed because we are not engaged in hostilities with Iran. The President is not trying to start hostilities with Iran. Despite this public proclamation by our President, my colleagues are trying to claim that the President still wants to go to war.

I deeply regret that my colleagues are not serious enough about exercising our Article I authorities to pursue regular order on such a serious question. We have had no hearings in the House Foreign Affairs Committee since these events transpired. There was no Foreign Affairs Committee markup of this legislation.

I received the text of this legislation only 2 hours before the Rules Committee meeting last night on a War Powers Resolution. Debating issues of war and peace is perhaps our most important responsibility as Members of Congress, and, yet, this legislation dropped last night without committee consideration as required by the War Powers Resolution.

□ 1730

If my colleagues were as serious about Article I as they say they are, then this would be a joint resolution with the force of law. Instead, it is a House concurrent resolution that will never go to the President's desk. Let me translate what that means to the American people listening today.

Today, we are voting on a press release, a press statement. This is a political statement for a leftwing domestic audience. But they are not the only ones watching, Mr. Speaker.

Iran is watching, and its proxies are watching. What they see is a divided America that does not fully support the ability of our Commander in Chief to respond to imminent threats to Americans.

Churchill warned against appeasement when the dark clouds of fascism and the Third Reich swept in, in my father's war. Weakness invites aggression, he said. President Reagan said: "Peace through strength." I believe in these ideals and these axioms.

Last May, it was reported that Soleimani met with Iraqi militias in Baghdad and told them to "prepare for proxy war."

Without last week's strike, Soleimani would still be waging that proxy war, a war that he was escalating. An American was killed less than 2 weeks ago, and four American soldiers were injured. Our Embassy in Baghdad was attacked under Soleimani's orders.

What more do we need? What more evidence do we need?

Let's talk about the facts. He is a designated terrorist under the Obama administration. Importantly, the President told me today that Soleimani was planning to blow up our Embassy. I need no further proof, evidence, or intelligence than that from the President of the United States.

What if the President had not acted? Let's assume that. By the way, some on the other side of the aisle were criticizing him for not responding after our Embassy was attacked.

What if he did not act. What if Soleimani had made it back to Tehran to meet with the Ayatollah to give the green light to carry out the plot to attack our soldiers and diplomats in Iraq? What if the Americans were killed? What if they killed our soldiers and diplomats? What if they successfully stormed our American Embassy and held our marines and diplomats hostage, like they did in 1979 when this whole reign of terror started with Jimmy Carter in the White House?

How would the critics of the President respond then if we had done nothing? How would the American people respond? How would the Gold Star Mothers respond?

No, this President did the right thing to take out this threat that killed so many Americans. I have been to too many funerals, as many of us in this Chamber have, and many of those soldiers were killed at the bloody hands of Soleimani. As many Americans whose families still grieve today, we grieve for them.

Since 1979, Iran has presided over a reign of terror in the region. For over two decades, Soleimani has been the mastermind of terror, and the world is safer today without him.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that now is not the time to divide this Nation and play into the propaganda of Iran. Now is not the time to tie our Commander in Chief's hands. Now is the time to support our men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, this body has to make a decision about whether we are going to stand up for our constitutional responsibilities or just subordinate ourselves to the executive branch when it comes to war powers.

We are two decades into the 21st century. Our country has been at war almost that entire time. Not a day goes by that I don't wish we could have some of those decisions back, especially because we see that those measures we passed in 2001 and 2002 are still being used to justify sending American men and women into harm's way.

We could stand here all day and say your side let this happen when you were in charge, or you didn't say anything when this President did that. I don't disagree that it has been a collective failure on the part of this body that we have given away our authority on war powers and that we haven't done enough to grapple with the issue.

I hope today will not be the end of our efforts to make progress on debating Congress' war powers. If the President thinks he needs to use military force, then he needs to come to Congress and make the case and let us vote on it. This is the beginning of Congress' taking back its authority.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCARELL. Truth matters, Mr. Speaker. Truth matters.

Truth is not Democratic or Republican. Truth is not partisan. It is the basis of any society that hopes to be and hopes to remain civilized. And so, when a faction decides that facts are flexible, that facts are whatever validates their preconceived notions and not what is, then that nation may as well close shop and turn out the lights.

The Trump administration's justification for military action against Iran has been inconsistent at best. Donald Trump's speech on January 8, 2020 was a pathetic spectacle. And the Congressional briefing was a sham, a cavalcade of falsehoods that has been denounced by Democrats and Republicans alike.

Any rational observer, any fair-minded person can see it. Certainly, my Republican colleagues know. Which is why some have turned to audacious, outrageous statements. I have heard them say that dissenting voices support terrorism simply for asking questions. That those of us who want to avoid war are traitors.

They have gone so far and have gone so low to blame President Obama for Iran's recent attack on U.S. forces. Going so far as to lie that Iran was given over \$150 billion after the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action was signed.

These are scurrilous lies. Let me repeat that: these accusations are lies, told by desperate people. Told by people too cowardly to put their ambitions aside to lift a finger for truth. I'd say they should be ashamed of themselves, but they are clearly past shame. That ship has sailed.

In his opus, George Orwell observed that "The party told you to reject the evidence of your eyes and ears. It was their final, most essential command." That's an exact blueprint for these lies. Those propagating these lies may be at war with truth, but I'm not. I still believe in truth and in fact.

Here is the truth and the fact. The ham-fisted decisions of the Trump administration will not prevent Iran from getting nuclear weapons, but could hasten that outcome.

Here is the truth. War with Iran will not benefit us. War endangers our troops, leads to death and misery, and harms our allies.

Here is the fact. Americans do not want another damn war.

War powers belong to Congress, not the President, and it is our job here to defend our constitutional prerogative. And we did this by passing a war powers resolution.

I believe in truth. I do not believe in unnecessary war. And I stand with this House that today made a big statement for both. To correct the record of lies, I include in the RECORD this New York Times article "References in Address to 2013 Deal Had Holes" by Linda Qiu from January 9, 2020.

[From The New York Times, Jan. 8, 2020]

FACT CHECK—TRUMP'S INACCURATE STATEMENTS ABOUT THE CONFLICT WITH IRAN

(By Linda Qiu)

President Trump, responding during a White House address on Wednesday to the missile strikes by Iran, assailed the nuclear agreement reached by his predecessor and praised American military might. The 10-minute address contained numerous inaccuracies and claims that lacked evidence. Here's a fact check.

What Mr. Trump said:

"Iran's hostilities substantially increased after the foolish Iran nuclear deal was signed in 2013, and they were given \$150 billion, not to mention \$1.8 billion in cash."

This is misleading. The agreement reached by Iran, the United States and a number of other nations to constrain Tehran's nuclear program did not directly provide American money to Iran, but it did release about \$100 billion in previously frozen Iranian assets. Much of the amount was tied up by debt obligations, for example, \$20 billion to China for financing projects in Iran. Estimates for the actual amount available to Iran range from \$35 billion to \$65 billion.

A separate \$1.7 billion transfer of cash to Iran was to settle a decades-long dispute and was agreed to in negotiations that happened parallel to the nuclear deal. Before the 1979 revolution, Iran's shah had paid \$400 million for American military goods but, after he was overthrown, the equipment was never delivered. The clerics who seized control demanded the money back, but the United States refused. The additional \$1.3 billion is interest accumulated over 35 years.

Iran and other parties to the nuclear accord signed an interim agreement in 2013, but the formal agreement was not reached until 2015. The White House did not respond when asked for evidence of increased Iranian "hostilities."

It is worth noting that before Mr. Trump withdrew the United States from the nuclear agreement in 2018, his administration repeatedly certified that Iran was in compliance.

Afterward, as his so-called maximum-pressure campaign on Iran continued, tensions between the United States and Iran "escalated significantly," according to a recent Congressional Research Service report. Mr. Trump's claim blaming the nuclear accord for Iranian aggression rather than his with-

drawal from it is "almost an inverted reality," said Jim Walsh, a research associate at M.I.T.'s Security Studies Program and an expert on nuclear issues and the Middle East.

He said that attacks by the four groups supported by Iran and designated by some governments as terrorist organizations—Hezbollah, Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command—actually declined after the nuclear deal.

Attacks carried out by these groups decreased from more than 80 in 2014 to six in 2017, before increasing to more than 40 in 2018, according to the Global Terrorism Database maintained by the University of Maryland's National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism. And while Iran has been a violent and destabilizing force across the region, Mr. Trump's assertion that Tehran had "created hell" lacked context in some cases.

Iranian aid to President Bashar al-Assad of Syria in that country's civil war and Tehran's backing of Houthi rebels in Yemen both predate the signing of the nuclear agreement, formally known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

"There's nothing that Iran was doing after J.C.P.O.A. that it wasn't doing before," said Vali R. Nasr, a professor of Middle East studies at Johns Hopkins University and a State Department official in the Obama administration.

Calling Iran's backing of the Houthi rebels against the Saudi Arabia-aligned government in Yemen terrorism is "devaluing the word to the point where it's meaningless," said Anthony Cordesman, an expert on military affairs and the Middle East at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

As for Iran's activities in Afghanistan and Iraq, Mr. Cordesman said, "they were more aggressive there because they were working to attack ISIS—as we were."

What Mr. Trump said:

"The missiles fired last night at us and our allies were paid for with the funds made available by the last administration."

This lacks evidence. The White House did not respond when asked to substantiate this claim, and experts noted there was no proof that Iranian assets unfrozen by the deal paid for the missiles.

"There's a certain fungibility here," Mr. Walsh said. If the Iranian foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif, "took a dollar on the street, did that fund the missile attack?" he added. "That's not very useful from an analytical perspective. Nor is the case that giving them money caused them to attack the U.S."

"We have no indication," Mr. Cordesman said, "whether these missiles are funded by the money from the J.C.P.O.A."

The director of national intelligence's annual report on worldwide threats in 2019 did note that Iran continued to develop and improve military capabilities including ballistic missiles, but it did not tie those efforts to the nuclear deal. Furthermore, the annual reports warned of the same efforts in 2015, 2014, 2013, 2012 and before.

Critics of the Iran deal, including Mr. Trump, have long argued that it was inadequate because it did not address Iran's ability to develop ballistic missiles. Those restrictions have instead been established by the United Nations Security Council resolutions.

The diplomatic accord was an arms deal with a very narrow aim of curbing Iran's nuclear ambitions, "not a nonaggression pact, not a form of a friendship treaty," Mr. Nasr of Johns Hopkins said. "Whether there could have been more in the deal, of course. But piling in expectations is disingenuous."

What Mr. Trump said:

"The very defective J.C.P.O.A. expires shortly anyway and gives Iran a clear and quick path to nuclear breakout."

This is exaggerated. The major provisions limiting Iran's nuclear capabilities last a decade or longer. And the agreement increased the "breakout" period—the time it would take Iran to produce enough fuel for one weapon—to at least a year from an estimated two to three months. If the deal had been left in place and fully adhered to, Iran would not have been able to achieve nuclear breakout until 2030.

The agreement also prohibits Iran from pursuing nuclear weapons permanently. "Iran reaffirms that under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop or acquire any nuclear weapons," the first paragraph of the deal reads.

The American Israel Public Affairs Committee, a vocal critic of the deal, said it "largely expires after only 15 years." Under the deal's terms, Iran agreed not to use more than 5,060 centrifuges to enrich uranium—and not to pursue research and development on centrifuges—for 10 years. Limits on enrichment levels, facilities and stockpiles last for 15 years, according to a report from the Congressional Research Service.

Under the terms of the accord, Iran also agreed to convert a deep underground enrichment facility into a "technology center" that cannot contain nuclear material and where the number of centrifuges is limited for 15 years. Several provisions on plutonium, including forbidding the construction of new heavy water reactors, last for 15 years.

Inspectors are to monitor centrifuges and related infrastructure for 15 years, verify inventory for 20 years and monitor uranium mines for 25 years.

What Mr. Trump said:

"We are now the No. 1 producer of oil and natural gas anywhere in the world. We are independent, and we do not need Middle East oil."

This is misleading. The United States has been the largest producer of oil and gas in the world since 2013, a trend that began under the Obama administration thanks in large part to advances in shale drilling techniques.

The Energy Information Administration projected in January 2019 that the United States will produce more energy than it imports this year, the first time since 1950. But that is not the same thing as not importing oil from the Middle East at all. In 2018, the United States imported more than 1.5 million barrels a day from the Persian Gulf.

What was said:

"The American military has been completely rebuilt under my administration at a cost of \$2.5 trillion."

This is exaggerated. The \$2.5 trillion figure refers to the total defense budgets of the past four fiscal years: \$606 billion the 2017 fiscal year (which began before Mr. Trump took office), \$671 billion in 2018, \$685 billion in 2019 and \$718 billion in 2020. But the amount spent on procurement—buying and upgrading equipment—was about \$562 billion over that period.

Mr. Trump's use of the phrase "completely rebuilt" is somewhat subjective. Though the Trump administration has invested in operational readiness over the past few years, there are signs that the military continues to face substantial challenges in addressing an array of threats from around the world.

For example, the military earned a middling grade of "marginal" from the conservative Heritage Foundation's annual index of strength, based on factors like shortages in

personnel and aging equipment. The think tank noted that American forces are probably capable of meeting the demands of a single major regional conflict but "would be very hard-pressed to do more and certainly would be ill-equipped to handle two nearly simultaneous major regional contingencies." What was said:

"Three months ago, after destroying 100 percent of ISIS and its territorial caliphate, we killed the savage leader of ISIS, al-Baghdadi, who was responsible for so much death."

This is exaggerated. The Islamic State lost its final territories in March 2019, ending the physical "caliphate," but the terrorist group has not been destroyed. The recent confrontation with Iran has halted the United States' campaign against ISIS. Just this week, Defense Secretary Mark T. Esper and Gen. Mark A. Milley, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said that the fight against the group was continuing.

Mr. Trump alluded to the organization's endurance in his speech when he said: "ISIS is a natural enemy of Iran. The destruction of ISIS is good for Iran. And we should work together on this and other shared priorities."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, according to ABC News, General Mark Milley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs said that the "Dec. 27 attack on the Iraqi base near Kirkuk that killed a U.S. civilian contractor and wounded several U.S. and Iraqi forces . . . was designed and intended to kill, and [Soleimani] approved it. I know that 100 percent."

General Milley said that the trigger for the drone strike that killed Soleimani was "clear, unambiguous intelligence indicating a significant campaign of violence against the United States in the days, weeks, and months," and that the administration would have been "culpably negligent" if it didn't act.

Former Obama Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson said on NBC's Meet the Press that "whether Soleimani was a terrorist or a general in a military force that was engaged in armed attacks against our people, he was a lawful military objective."

Mr. Speaker, Soleimani is responsible for killing over 600 Americans and disabling thousands more. He is directly responsible for massive death and injury of innocent civilians in the region. In the last two months alone, he orchestrated 11 attacks on U.S. troops in Iraq—killing an American contractor and wounding four soldiers—and for the attack on our embassy in Baghdad.

After yesterday's classified briefing by America's top diplomatic, military and intelligence leaders, I came away convinced that the action by President Trump was justified, proportionate and above all necessary to protect American lives.

That said, it is astonishing that the resolution under consideration by the House today has absolutely no legal power, is non-binding—and by design can neither be signed nor vetoed by the President.

Remarkably, the text of H. Con. Res. 83 also sends a mixed message. While purporting to "terminate the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities in or against Iran. . . ." the non-binding resolution goes on to say that such a prohibition is null and void if "such use of the Armed Forces is necessary and appropriate to defend against an imminent armed attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its

Armed Forces, consistent with the requirement of the War Powers Resolution."

Imminent armed attack on our Armed Forces and diplomats is precisely the Trump Administration's justification for the drone strike against Soleimani.

According to the Council on Foreign Relations, no president used drone strikes more than President Obama who ordered 542 drone strikes killing an estimated 3,797 people including 324 civilians."

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, today, this body will vote to reaffirm the fact that Congress has the sole power to declare war, as laid out in the Constitution. After nearly two decades at war, President Trump has further risked the safety and security of America, our servicemembers, and our allies by escalating tensions with Iran to a dangerous new level. The Trump Administration's military airstrike targeting highlevel Iranian officials is just another example of President Trump undermining our national security by acting recklessly and without sound legal authority or reason. His rash decisions have made America less safe. War must always be our last recourse, and any escalation that brings our nation closer to a third disastrous war in the Middle East is unacceptable. The American people will not stand for it.

The War Powers Act exists as a safeguard against intensifying military actions that can accidentally lead to war. It ensures that a President will engage in a public conversation with the American people about the merits of war, before deploying their loved ones. The Trump Administration must now recognize Congress's authority as a coequal branch of government and request, as well as justify, authorization for any future military activity against Iran. Additionally, the Administration must work with Congress to ensure an immediate, effective deescalation strategy that prevents further violence.

While I am proud to support the War Powers Resolution, this must be the first of many steps to reassert Congress's responsibilities under Article 1 of the Constitution. I opposed the 2002 Iraq Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF) and have worked for the last decade to repeal it, including most recently voting against the National Defense Authorization Act when it failed to include a House-passed repeal. I was pleased the Speaker announced plans for the House to pass Congresswoman BARBARA LEE's resolution to finally repeal the 2002 AUMF and Congressman RO KHANNA's legislation to prohibit funding for military action against Iran not authorized by Congress. I am proud to cosponsor both of these bills. We owe it to our military and civilian personnel, our allies, and every American to ensure that Congress upholds its constitutional authority to authorize the use of military force.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, this Administration's impulsive and reckless behavior has made our nation and the men and women of our armed forces less safe. It has heightened the risk of a conflict in the Middle East and it has jeopardized our relationship with our allies—both in the region and around the world.

We should remember—not long ago, many Members of this body voted to ratify the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action or the Iran deal. That agreement was working, it was accepted by the world and, most of all, it was containing Iran from securing nuclear weapons.

President Trump and his Administration turned away from that agreement, setting off a chain reaction of events, which led to yesterday's attacks by Iran on American personnel who are serving in Iraq.

We should be clear—no one in this body—Democrat or Republican—will mourn the loss of Soleimani. He was a monster who was responsible for horrible atrocities. However, we also have to question whether the actions taken by this Administration in killing him made our nation, our servicemembers and our allies safer or less safe.

So where have the Trump Administration's policies brought us?

The government of Iraq is asking U.S. forces to leave. After thousands of American lives were lost and billions of dollars spent, our ally in the fight against ISIS appears to be moving toward expelling U.S. troops.

Iran has announced that it is resuming aggressive development of nuclear weapons. The people of Iran are coalescing behind their government, united in outrage from Soleimani's killing.

The United States government needs a comprehensive, well-considered strategy for Iran. That strategy needs to be explained to Congress—and more importantly to the American people. The rationale for killing Soleimani must be fully and publicly explained. I believe the American people—when they hear the evidence—will agree that this action was not necessary to prevent an imminent attack.

Most of all, we can no longer allow diplomacy and national security to be conducted through Twitter.

The Resolution we will vote on today would prevent the Administration from pursuing additional military action against Iran without properly consulting Congress.

We, as a nation, must learn from the mistakes of the past. We cannot allow our country to ignite another war by conducting foreign policy in an irresponsible, impulsive manner.

The young people wearing our uniform abroad count on us to be better. We have a moral obligation to the millions of innocent civilians living in the Middle East who could perish or lose loved ones or their homes if a broader conflict erupts.

We must be better than this Administration has been. I urge my colleagues to support this Resolution.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when the President of the United States approved airstrikes targeting General Qassem Soleimani, he did so without the authorization of, or consultation by, the Congress. Americans stationed abroad are now categorically less safe than they were before the president took action.

Let me be clear, Mr. Speaker, no American will mourn the loss of General Soleimani—and nor should they. We are not here on the floor today to debate the merits of his assassination, but rather to address the failure of this Administration to adhere to the longstanding procedure of congressional consultation as mandated by the War Powers Resolution; specifically, the failure to properly and expeditiously articulate to the Congress any intelligence supporting the alleged threat which prompted this assassination.

The Administration's actions have already endangered the lives of many American servicemembers, diplomats, and foreign service officers. I fear that the path we are on

now, one lacking a coherent strategy moving forward, will only add to the instability of the region and lead to an extended conflict for which we are not prepared.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply reaffirms to the president and to the public Congress's role in authorizing the use of military force. As representatives of Americans from every corner of the country, we deserve to have our voices heard in a serious discussion on the implications of yet another conflict in the Middle East.

I plan to vote in favor of the resolution and would urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 781, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution, as amended.

The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of H. Con. Res. 83 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5078.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 194, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—224

Adams	Dean	Kaptur
Aguilar	DeFazio	Keating
Ailred	DeGette	Kelly (IL)
Amash	DeLauro	Kennedy
Axne	DelBene	Khanna
Barragán	Delgado	Kildee
Bass	Demings	Kilmer
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Kim
Bera	Deutch	Krishnamoorthi
Beyer	Dingell	Kuster (NH)
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Lamb
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael	Langevin
Blunt Rochester	F.	Larsen (WA)
Bonamici	Escobar	Larson (CT)
Boyle, Brendan	Eshoo	Lawrence
F.	Espallat	Lawson (FL)
Brown (MD)	Evans	Lee (CA)
Brownley (CA)	Finkenauer	Lee (NV)
Bustos	Fletcher	Levin (CA)
Butterfield	Foster	Levin (MI)
Carbajal	Frankel	Lewis
Cárdenas	Fudge	Lieu, Ted
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Lipinski
Cartwright	Gaetz	Loeb
Case	Gallego	Lofgren
Casten (IL)	Garamendi	Lowenthal
Castor (FL)	Garcia (IL)	Lowey
Castro (TX)	Garcia (TX)	Luján
Chu, Judy	Golden	Lynch
Cicilline	Gomez	Malinowski
Cisneros	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney
Clark (MA)	Green, Al (TX)	Carolyn B.
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Maloney, Sean
Clay	Haaland	Massie
Cleaver	Harder (CA)	Matsui
Clyburn	Hastings	McBath
Cohen	Hayes	McCollum
Connolly	Heck	McEachin
Cooper	Higgins (NY)	McGovern
Correa	Himes	McNerney
Costa	Horsford	Meeks
Courtney	Houlihan	Meng
Cox (CA)	Hoyer	Moore
Craig	Huffman	Morelle
Crist	Jackson Lee	Moulton
Crow	Jayapal	Mucarsel-Powell
Cuellar	Jeffries	Nadler
Davids (KS)	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano
Davis (CA)	Johnson (TX)	Neal
Davis, Danny K.		Neguse

Norcross	Ruppersberger	Takano
O'Halleran	Rush	Thompson (CA)
Ocasio-Cortez	Ryan	Thompson (MS)
Omar	Sánchez	Titus
Pallone	Sarbanes	Tlaib
Panetta	Scanlon	Tonko
Pappas	Schakowsky	Torres Small
Pascrell	Schiff	(NM)
Payne	Schneider	Trahan
Pelosi	Schrader	Trone
Perlmutter	Schrier	Underwood
Peters	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Peterson	Scott, David	Veasey
Phillips	Sewell (AL)	Vela
Pingree	Shalala	Velázquez
Pocan	Sherman	Visclosky
Porter	Sherrill	Wasserman
Pressley	Sires	Schultz
Price (NC)	Slotkin	
Quigley	Smith (WA)	Waters
Raskin	Soto	Watson Coleman
Rice (NY)	Spanberger	Welch
Richmond	Speier	Wexton
Rooney (FL)	Stanton	Wild
Rouda	Stevens	Wilson (FL)
Roybal-Allard	Suozzi	Yarmuth
Ruiz	Swalwell (CA)	

NAYS—194

Abraham	Graves (GA)	Olson
Aderholt	Graves (LA)	Palazzo
Allen	Graves (MO)	Palmer
Amodei	Green (TN)	Pence
Armstrong	Griffith	Perry
Arrington	Grothman	Posey
Babin	Guest	Ratcliffe
Bacon	Guthrie	Reed
Baird	Hagedorn	Reschenthaler
Balderson	Harris	Rice (SC)
Banks	Hartzler	Riggleman
Barr	Hern, Kevin	Roby
Bergman	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers (WA)
Biggs	Hice (GA)	Roe, David P.
Billirakis	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Bishop (NC)	Hill (AR)	Rogers (KY)
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Rose (NY)
Bost	Hollingsworth	Rose, John W.
Brady	Horn, Kendra S.	Rouzer
Brindisi	Hudson	Roy
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga	Rutherford
Brooks (IN)	Hurd (TX)	Scalise
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Schweikert
Bucshon	Johnson (SD)	Scott, Austin
Budd	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Burchett	Joyce (OH)	Shimkus
Burgess	Joyce (PA)	Smith (MO)
Byrne	Katko	Smith (NE)
Calvert	Keller	Smith (NJ)
Carter (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Smucker
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Spano
Cheney	King (IA)	Staubert
Cline	King (NY)	Stefanik
Cloud	Kinzinger	Steil
Cole	Kustoff (TN)	Steube
Collins (GA)	LaHood	Stewart
Comer	LaMalfa	Stivers
Conaway	Lamborn	Taylor
Cook	Latta	Thompson (PA)
Crenshaw	Lesko	Thornberry
Cunningham	Long	Timmons
Curtis	Lucas	Tipton
Davidson (OH)	Luetkemeyer	Turner
Davis, Rodney	Luria	Upton
DesJarlais	Marchant	Van Drew
Diaz-Balart	Marshall	Wagner
Duncan	Mast	Walberg
Dunn	McAdams	Walden
Emmer	McCarthy	Walorski
Estes	McCaul	Waltz
Ferguson	McClintock	Watkins
Fleischmann	McHenry	Weber (TX)
Flores	McKinley	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Meadows	Wenstrup
Fox (NC)	Meuser	Westerman
Fulcher	Miller	Williams
Gallagher	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Gianforte	Moolenaar	Wittman
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Gohmert	Mullin	Woodall
Gonzalez (OH)	Murphy (FL)	Wright
Gooden	Murphy (NC)	Yoho
Gosar	Newhouse	Young
Gottheimer	Norman	Zeldin
Granger	Nunes	

NOT VOTING—13

Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	Kind
Carter (TX)	Hunter	
Crawford	Johnson (OH)	

Kirkpatrick Serrano Torres (CA)
Loudermilk Simpson Walker

□ 1801

Mr. CRENSHAW changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRISON TO PROPRIETORSHIP ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5078) to amend the Small Business Act to provide re-entry entrepreneurship counseling and training services for incarcerated individuals, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 370, nays 41, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]
YEAS—370

Adams Cicilline Estes
Aderholt Cisneros Evans
Aguilar Clark (MA) Ferguson
Allred Clarke (NY) Pinkenauer
Amodei Clay Fleischmann
Armstrong Cleaver Fletcher
Arrington Clyburn Flores
Axne Cohen Fortenberry
Bacon Cole Foster
Baird Collins (GA) Foxx (NC)
Balderson Conaway Frankel
Banks Connolly Fudge
Barr Cook Fulcher
Barragán Cooper Gabbard
Bass Correa Gallagher
Beatty Costa Gallego
Bera Courtney Garamendi
Bergman Cox (CA) Garcia (IL)
Beyer Craig Garcia (TX)
Bilirakis Crenshaw Gianforte
Bishop (GA) Crist Gibbs
Bishop (NC) Crow Golden
Bishop (UT) Cuellar Gomez
Blumenauer Cunningham Gonzalez (OH)
Blunt Rochester Curtis Gonzalez (TX)
Bonamici Davids (KS) Gottheimer
Bost Davidson (OH) Graves (GA)
Boyle, Brendan Davis (CA) Graves (LA)
F. Davis, Danny K. Graves (MO)
Brindisi Davis, Rodney Green, Al (TX)
Brooks (IN) Dean Grothman
Brown (MD) DeFazio Guest
Brownley (CA) DeGette Guthrie
Bucshon DeLauro Haaland
Budd DelBene Hagedorn
Burchett Delgado Harder (CA)
Bustos Demings Hartzler
Butterfield DeSaulnier Hastings
Calvert DesJarlais Hayes
Carbajal Deutch Heck
Cárdenas Diaz-Balart Hern, Kevin
Carson (IN) Dingell Herrera Beutler
Carter (GA) Doggett Higgins (NY)
Cartwright Doyle, Michael Hill (AR)
Case F. Himes
Casten (IL) Dunn Holding
Castor (FL) Emmer Hollingsworth
Castro (TX) Engel Horn, Kendra S.
Chabot Escobar Horsford
Cheney Eshoo Houlihan
Chu, Judy Espallat Hoyer

Hudson Huffman
Huizenga Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee Jayapal
Jeffries Mitchell
Johnson (GA) Moolenaar
Johnson (LA) Mooney (WV)
Johnson (SD) Moore
Johnson (TX) Morelle
Jordan Moulton
Joyce (OH) Mucarsel-Powell
Joyce (PA) Mullin
Kaptur Murphy (FL)
Katko Murphy (NC)
Keating Napolitano
Keller Neal
Kelly (IL) Neguse
Kelly (MS) Newhouse
Kelly (PA) Norcross
Kennedy O'Halleran
Khanna Ocasio-Cortez
Kildee Olson
Kilmer Omar
Kim Pallone
King (NY) Panetta
Kinzinger Pappas
Krishnamoorthi Pascrell
Kuster (NH) Payne
Kustoff (TN) Pence
LaHood Perlmutter
Lamb Peters
Lamborn Peterson
Langevin Phillips
Larsen (WA) Pocan
Larson (CT) Porter
Latta Pressley
Lawrence Price (NC)
Lawson (FL) Quigley
Lee (CA) Raskin
Lee (NV) Reed
Lesko Reschenthaler
Levin (CA) Rice (NY)
Levin (MI) Richmond
Lewis Riggelman
Lieu, Ted Roby
Lipinski Rodgers (WA)
Loeb sack Roe, David P.
Lofgren Rogers (AL)
Long Rogers (KY)
Lowenthal Rooney (FL)
Loweey Rose (NY)
Lucas Rose, John W.
Luetkemeyer Rouda
Luján Rouzer
Luria Roybal-Allard
Lynch Ruiz
Malinowski Ruppertsberger
Maloney, Carolyn B. Rush
Maloney, Sean Rutherford
Marchant Ryan
Marshall Sánchez
Matsui Sarbanes
McAdams Scanlon
McBath Schakowsky
McCarthy Schiff
McCaul Schneider
McCollum Schrader
McEachin Schriber
McGovern Schweikert
McHenry Scott (VA)
McKinley Scott, Austin
Scott, David

NAYS—41

Abraham Gosar
Allen Green (TN)
Amash Griffith
Babin Harris
Biggs Hice (GA)
Brooks (AL) Higgins (LA)
Burgess King (IA)
Cline LaMalfa
Cloud Massie
Comer Mast
Duncan McClintock
Gaetz Norman
Gohmert Nunes
Gooden Palazzo

NOT VOTING—19

Brady Granger
Buchanan Grijalva
Buck Hunter
Byrne Johnson (OH)
Carter (TX) Kind
Crawford Kirkpatrick
Fitzpatrick Loudermilk

Sensenbrenner
Sewell (AL) □ 1810
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Pocan
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey

□ 1816
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Zeldin

Palmer
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Rice (SC)
Roy
Scalise
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wright
Yoho
Young

Nadler
Pingree
Serrano
Simpson
Walker

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I was absent today due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall No. 5, “yea” on rollcall No. 6, “yea” on rollcall No. 7, and “yea” on rollcall No. 8.

PFAS ACTION ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 535.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 779 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 bill, H.R. 535.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1816

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 bill (H.R. 535) to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, with Mr. KILDEE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in the first section of House Resolution 779 and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act of 2019, is a comprehensive package of strategies to regulate PFAS chemicals, clean up contamination, and protect public health.

PFAS are an urgent threat to public health. They are toxic, persistent, and being found in the environment across

the country. These “forever chemicals” have long been linked with adverse health effects, including cancer, immune system effects, infertility, impaired child development, high cholesterol, and thyroid disease.

Mr. Chairman, the EPA has known about these risks for decades and has allowed this contamination to spread.

Last year, EPA announced its PFAS Action Plan. It was woefully inadequate, and since that time, we have learned that EPA is not even keeping the weak commitments it made in that plan. The EPA failed to meet key end-of-the-year 2019 deadlines. It failed to produce a regulatory determination for drinking water. It failed to produce hazard determinations for chemicals under Superfund. It failed to initiate reporting under the Toxics Release Inventory.

The Trump administration is failing hundreds of impacted communities, and Congress must act for communities like Hoosick Falls, New York; Parchment, Michigan; Parkersburg, West Virginia; and far too many more.

We need to act on behalf of States like my own State of New Jersey that are doing everything they can—adopting protective State drinking water standards and pursuing natural resource damage cases—but facing strong opposition from Federal agencies under the Trump administration.

There have been over 500 detections of PFAS in drinking water and groundwater sources in New Jersey, and this is simply unacceptable, Mr. Chairman.

It is time for Congress to take action and use every tool available to stop the flow of PFAS pollution into our environment and our bodies. That is exactly what the PFAS Action Act does.

This bill requires EPA to immediately designate two PFAS chemicals as hazardous substances under Superfund, the two most studied of the PFAS chemicals. EPA committed to make this designation in their action plan last year but has failed to fulfill that promise.

The legislation requires that, over a 5-year period, EPA reviews all other PFAS chemicals and decide whether to list them under Superfund. During that 5 years, the bill will require comprehensive health testing of all PFAS chemicals.

This is a really important point. You may hear my colleagues talk today about the need to base decisions on science, and this bill will generate that science. The two chemicals will be regulated upfront because we already have the science on them. Other PFAS will be regulated if, over the next 5 years, the science concludes that they are hazardous.

The bill also includes a moratorium on any new PFAS during that same 5-year period. This will provide EPA the time it needs to ensure it has enough science to really evaluate new PFAS.

H.R. 535 also requires a drinking water standard that will cover at least the two chemicals and others at EPA’s

discretion. Importantly, the drinking water standard will have to protect public health, including the health of vulnerable populations such as pregnant women, infants, and children. Because treating drinking water to remove PFAS is expensive, the bill includes grants for water utilities.

Mr. Chairman, this bill includes a voluntary PFAS-free label for cookware, which may be expanded through amendments to include additional categories of consumer products. This label will empower consumers to take steps to protect themselves from exposure to PFAS.

The bill requires guidance for first responders, to help them minimize their exposure to PFAS chemicals. This is important because PFAS is commonly found in firefighting foams.

Taken together, this is a serious, comprehensive, and reasonable bill that should garner strong bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I thank Chairman TONKO for all that he did to put this package together and, of course, the sponsor of the package, Mrs. DINGELL from Michigan, who has faced so many problems in your home State, Mr. Chairman, where Mrs. DINGELL is also very involved.

The bill includes a number of pieces of legislation before our committee by members of the Energy and Commerce Committee, as well as other Members of this body.

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

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, January 6, 2020.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,
*Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN PALLONE: I write concerning H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act of 2019. There are certain provisions in this legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 535, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure agrees to forgo action on the bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill would not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee’s Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 535 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

PETER A. DEFAZIO,
Chair.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2020.

Hon. PETER A. DEFAZIO,
*Chairman, Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFAZIO: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Energy and Commerce and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act of 2019, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this measure or similar legislation in the future. I agree that your Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within your jurisdiction. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your Committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will place our letters on H.R. 535 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

FRANK PALLONE, Jr.,
Chairman.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, many Members on both sides of the aisle have worked hard to understand and address the issues related to per- and polyfluorinated compounds. While I oppose H.R. 535 for both policy and practical reasons, I commend all of my colleagues who have been engaged on this issue.

Before I go into some of the more concerning aspects of this legislation, I think it is instructive to highlight a few facts.

PFAS is not just one or two chemicals. According to the EPA, this class of chemicals includes more than 5,000 different substances with different properties, applications, and risks. In fact, EPA’s master list of PFAS on its website includes 7,866 derivations.

EPA does not have health effects data on the vast majority of PFAS. In fact, EPA recently announced scientifically valid methods—that means you are able to test to determine what it is—for just 29 of these 7,866. We don’t have the capability even to understand if it is present because we don’t have the capability even to identify them.

EPA has actively engaged in a PFAS action program involving many disciplines across the agency. I recently talked to the Administrator to urge him to move as quickly as possible with multiple action items and timelines.

Now, enter this bill, H.R. 535. This legislation requires aggressive regulatory responses to this diverse class of man-made chemicals without regard to science or risk. This is an unprecedented way of conducting science and flies in the face of decades of U.S. environmental policy. In fact, we have

never legislatively banned a chemical in all the years since the Superfund, back in 1980.

To my colleagues who love to preach science on climate change, I hear you, but you cannot walk away from the science debate when it doesn't support your policy position. Let me say that again. For my Democratic friends who love to preach science, you can't walk away from the science debate on this and walk away from the fact that we need a scientific study of this. They are trying to have it both ways.

I know many of my Democratic colleagues think this bill is essential because they don't trust the EPA run by this President. I understand that is your call. But I would also ask you to think about the mandates you are placing on the Environmental Protection Agency, which will far outlast this administration. They will legally hamstring future ones from facing issues other than PFAS, whether it is lead or climate.

I mentioned that science-based decisions that have supported EPA's work for years are being jettisoned, but that is just one feature. The more long-range trouble includes the automatic designation of PFOS and PFOA as hazardous substances under the Superfund, which is called the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, CERCLA.

This designation may be warranted, but under this bill, it would come without knowledge of who is responsible, where PFAS contamination is, how serious it is, and without any public comment.

In fact, my colleagues think that putting it in the Superfund is going to solve this problem and that they are going to be able to clean it up right away. Well, I have a list here of Superfund sites. The Superfund was set up in 1980. We have a site here that is still a Superfund site back to 1983.

So those of you who think, put it in the Superfund, and it is all going to be cleaned up, good luck. If you have dealt with this issue, it is not going to happen, probably, in your lifetime.

Don't get me started on the perverse strict, joint and several, and retroactive liability to releases of hazardous substances, a trial lawyer's bonanza.

We know the majority understands this is an issue because the rule executed provisions relieving airports from Superfund liability. Plus, the bill requires EPA to review all 7,864 PFAS in 5 years to determine without public comment whether they present a substantial danger.

We can't do 29 in 20 years. How are we going to do 7,866 chemicals in 5 years? It just can't be done.

While a Superfund designation for just PFOS and PFOA may seem reasonable, the reality is section 15 of H.R. 535 deems all PFAS as hazardous air pollutants under Clean Air Act section 112(b). This automatically makes the entire PFAS class hazardous under the Superfund law.

As I mentioned, innocent parties like drinking water utilities that just treated what they got from their source water are hostage to endless liability for cleanup, regardless of their personal contribution. In fact, I would argue they didn't make any contribution. Why not exclude the water districts from Superfund liability if they are just passthroughs? No, we are taking care of the airports, but we are not protecting municipal water systems, co-op water systems, and other sources of drinking water, and we are going to put additional mandates and costs on them.

I know communities with PFAS pollution want it cleaned up quickly, but nothing, as I said before, with CERCLA is fast. It is always more expensive than you think, and the stigma of the designation scars a community's economy and dampens its future prospects.

Other significant problems with this legislation include section 4, which places a commercial moratorium on new PFAS chemicals for 5 years, even though Federal law already prevents any unsafe chemical from entering the market until EPA scientifically reviews it and determines its safety. This delays cleaner, greener, and safer chemicals from coming on the market.

Let me repeat this. Existing law bans and bars any new chemical or new use of an existing chemical from going to the market unless EPA signs off on that and it meets a tough safety standard. This bill places an arbitrary ban on top of that review. Next-generation heart valves, car brakes, solar panels, and military equipment all will be stopped from coming to market because of this.

□ 1830

Section 3 creates an unrealistic mandate on EPA to require all manufacturers and processor testing of PFAS. This requirement overlaps one that companies send all their existing PFAS information to the EPA by 2023.

Regardless, why even bother doing real science when you have already made a decision based on political science? More practically, does EPA even have the resources to keep up with such a demand? We could have asked them had they been invited to testify on this legislation.

These are not minor concerns. They sparked opposition, especially in the Senate, and are the reason why these items were not included in the National Defense Authorization Act. If this process is making good law instead of messaging, I would urge my colleagues to keep that in mind when voting. We can do better.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. SHIMKUS for yielding to me. He has really poured his heart and soul into this issue and has worked very hard on it, is so knowledgeable about it. And he is spot on.

Tragically, there is no science here. The EPA was not allowed to testify here. This is a solution that will never become law. It completely overreaches.

You are going to hear from some of our Members, including Dr. BUCSHON, who is a heart surgeon, about the impact this could have on new technologies and devices that get implanted into people's hearts.

You will hear about automobiles and aircraft that use these very specialized chemicals and materials in their manufacturing processes that probably have nothing to do with what we are trying to fix here.

You will hear, and it is true, that this is the first time we are going to throw science out the window and make a political decision.

So, Mr. Speaker, I must rise in opposition to H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act of 2020, and urge my colleagues, sadly, to do the same.

We all want a solution to the country's PFAS challenges. And while there is more work to be done, I would say, thanks to Mr. SHIMKUS and others, Congress has already acted to provide some funding for reducing PFAS in drinking water in rural and economically distressed areas.

We require the Federal Government to enter into cooperative cleanup agreements for Federal facilities with PFAS contamination.

But we all know more needs to be done.

Unfortunately, my friends on the other side of the aisle have chosen to go partisan with H.R. 535, and that is not the way to go, it is not the solution.

This follows two plays Democrats insist on running ad nauseam: putting politics over progress and pushing legislation that will never become law.

This was the playbook they ran in December when, sadly, they walked away from progress in protecting public health that resulted in two major missed opportunities.

First, we had the chance to mandate that the EPA establish a drinking water standard for PFOA and PFOS within 2 years. We had that opportunity to get it into law.

Second, we could have ensured immediate and mandatory cleanup of PFOA and PFOS at all Department of Defense facilities. We could have put that into law. We were in agreement except for Democrats here, and as a result, they wouldn't take yes for an answer, and we lost those opportunities.

But back to H.R. 535. This measure is packed with bad policy and unfortunately, or fortunately, is dead on arrival in the Senate.

Sadly, it delays much needed action to enact science-based solutions that protect our constituents. So this hurts Americans, it leaves our communities vulnerable, and it did not have to be this way.

During the Energy and Commerce Committee's consideration of H.R. 535, we had a very robust debate on this

bill. Mr. SHIMKUS offered a package of proposals that had bipartisan Senate support, and those all could have become law; in other words, a three-quarters agreement of the committees of jurisdiction.

These proposals were not the way he or I would have crafted them on our own, but we were willing to compromise, we were willing to reach across the aisle, we were willing to reach across the chamber to the Senate, because we wanted to be part of the solution.

Sadly, we are here today with a bill that, frankly, reaches a new low.

Last month, we had a vehicle to make real, meaningful progress on drinking water standards and PFAS cleanup. We could have done more, but that progress was stopped and this bill was brought forward.

So, Mr. Chair, I want to help communities deal with PFAS concerns. I want to do it in a scientifically-based way.

It is important the actions we take are appropriately measured and justified and backed up by science. This package, though, is not a practical, science-based solution.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our majority leader, and I want to thank him for prioritizing this PFAS package and making it one of the first things that we do in 2020.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Nobody has fought harder than Mr. PALLONE and Mr. TONKO to make sure that this legislation moves forward. And, of course, we worked very hard with the Senate to try to have these protections included in the Senate bill. Unfortunately, we didn't get there.

Mr. Chairman, while I am glad that Congress was able to take small steps to address the hazards of PFAS contamination through passage of the 2020 defense authorization bill last month, that action alone was not enough. That is why the House is taking further action this week.

These contaminants, known as forever chemicals, because they do not break down and can remain in the human body for many years, have been shown to raise one's risk of deadly cancers, reproductive and immune system disorders, and other health problems.

For decades, we have known that PFAS contamination is a problem.

According to the EPA, millions of Americans are exposed to unsafe levels of PFAS through their drinking water.

The Trump administration, under its own PFAS Action Plan, promised to establish a drinking water standard by the end of last year. Let me repeat that. The administration planned to have a standard by the end of last year. Unfortunately, that has not been accomplished. It has taken neither of the steps that it indicated it would, making this legislation very necessary.

That is why the House is considering PFAS legislation this week introduced

by Congresswoman DINGELL and Congressman UPTON, a bipartisan piece of legislation.

Mr. Chair, I want to congratulate Mrs. DINGELL for her continuing leadership on this issue. I also want to thank the others who have worked on this legislation, including the gentleman from New Hampshire, CHRIS PAPPAS.

The package of 12 bills was approved by the Energy and Commerce Committee in a bipartisan vote in November. Its provisions will, among others, establish a protective safe drinking water standard for PFAS contamination based upon science; improved testing of existing PFAS chemicals; limit the introduction of new ones; and provide for their safe disposal.

Most importantly, it will begin the process of helping clean up PFAS-contaminated sites under the Superfund program.

Critically important, particularly the sponsors are fighting contaminated sites in their own areas.

The Defense Department, which for years has used firefighting foam containing PFAS chemicals, has failed to clean up sites across the country that have contaminated the drinking water of countless Americans.

Why is that?

Because the EPA has failed to list these chemicals under the Superfund law, notwithstanding their toxic and adverse effects.

This legislation is a major action aimed at safeguarding public health and protecting Americans' access to clean and safe drinking water.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Representative DINGELL for her leadership on this issue; her partner, FRED UPTON, the former chairman of the committee; Chairman PALLONE and subcommittee Chairman TONKO of the Energy and Commerce Committee, who have both done extraordinary work on this legislation.

Mr. Chair, I also want to thank Chairman DEFAZIO of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for his committee's efforts to address this issue as well.

Mr. Chair, I commend the 50 members of the bipartisan House PFAS Task Force—50 members, bipartisan—who have been working diligently on this issue for years.

Mr. Chair, I also commend Representative CHRIS PAPPAS and ANTONIO DELGADO from New York, who have both focused very much on this issue and believe this legislation is critical.

This legislation may be the first comprehensive PFAS bill brought to the House floor, but I doubt it will be the last.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to join in voting for this bill. I hope that the Senate will take it up without delay and send it to the President's desk for approval with the strong bipartisan support it deserves.

I might mention that I have had extensive conversations with a former

Member of this House, now the Senator from Delaware, TOM CARPER, who has been very focused on this. And the director of his committee, who used to work for me, Mary Frances Repko, who is one of the most knowledgeable people I know, she has talked to me about this legislation.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank the committee, I want to thank the sponsors who have worked so hard on this, and I am glad that we could bring this to the floor at the first opportunity.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a cardiothoracic surgeon.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chairman, we all want to keep our communities safe from chemicals that can pose a threat to the health of our constituents. However, we need to get the solution right and not settle on a one-size-fits-all approach.

As currently written, the PFAS Action Act does not get it right, because it would impose Superfund liability under CERCLA on lifesaving and other medically beneficial products that have already undergone a rigorous approval process conducted by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to ensure they are safe to use in medicine.

To designate these lifesaving devices as a hazardous substance is inappropriate and may cost American lives.

That is why I am disappointed that my amendment to exempt FDA-approved or -cleared products from liability under section 107 of CERCLA with respect to PFAS was not made in order.

As a physician, I have firsthand experience with lifesaving medical devices that include PFAS, such as vascular grafts, stent grafts, heart patches, catheter tubes, and more.

In fact, this medical device right here, which you see pictured behind me, is used to close what is called an atrial septal defect, a procedure used to close a hole in the heart. This product contains polytetrafluoroethylene, a PFAS.

As a surgeon, I used to have to perform open heart surgery, with weeks of recovery and rehab for patients after this procedure.

This device now allows it to be done sometimes as an outpatient.

This bill, as it stands, would deny Hoosiers and Americans the healing power of modern medical devices using PFAS, and instead, lead to costly litigation, which would increase the underlying costs of healthcare.

We must be careful before instituting a one-size-fits-all approach to PFAS.

Mr. Chair, for that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Will the gentleman yield for purposes of colloquy?

Mr. BUCSHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Just to clarify: one is that we are exempting airports from Superfund liability, but we are not exempting medical devices that are FDA approved in infants' bodies?

Mr. BUCSHON. That is my understanding. That is correct.

Mr. SHIMKUS. And that device that you have is a per- or polyfluorinated compound; is that correct?

Mr. BUCSHON. That is correct.

Mr. SHIMKUS. And it is FDA approved?

Mr. BUCSHON. That is correct.

Mr. SHIMKUS. And if it is toxic, which means it would be defined as harmful to a baby, why are we using it in a baby to fix the heart?

Mr. BUCSHON. Well, because it has not been shown to be toxic. It has been approved by the FDA and shown to be safe for patient use. And we might not be able to use them in the future if it is declared toxic.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I thank the cardiothoracic surgeon for yielding.

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

Mr. Chair, I want to respond to something I keep hearing from my Republican colleagues, which is the argument that we should abandon important proposals because the Senate simply will not accept them.

We cannot control the Senate, but we have the ability and the responsibility to pass strong legislation through this body and work as hard as we can to get it enacted.

I believe in the prerogative and power of the House of Representatives to do what is right, and so I can only hope that the Senate will follow our example.

Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), a champion on this issue.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his leadership, and Chairman PALLONE's leadership on all of these issues.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 535.

Exactly 1 year ago, I introduced the PFAS Action Act, and have been joined by many of my colleagues in this effort in the last year.

□ 1845

I promised my constituents that we would take serious steps to address that issue, and that is what we are doing today.

Let us be very clear: PFAS is an urgent public health and environmental threat, and the number of contamination sites nationwide is growing at an alarming rate, including our military bases.

PFAS chemicals are everywhere. They are in our nonstick cookware; they are in food containers; they are in carpet, clothing, cosmetics, and firefighting foams, just to name a few.

PFAS is persistent. It accumulates in your body, and it is toxic. They are manmade, and they are known as a forever chemical. They don't break down in the environment; they don't break down in your body; and they don't break down in the wildlife.

Exposure to PFAS, even at low levels, poses significant health risks, and

we know that now. In a recent review, the CDC identified a number of health effects associated with PFAS exposure, including cancer, liver damage, decreased fertility, and an increased risk of asthma and thyroid disease.

Experts believe that as many as 99 percent—some people say 97. I have an official source that says 99. Who cares what that number is, because most Americans at that level have PFAS in their blood, and they don't even know it.

Michigan has been hit hard. It is ground zero for where PFAS has been identified. We have 74 sites, but only because, after Flint, we learned. We look and try to keep our citizens from being poisoned.

According to the Environmental Working Group, PFAS has been detected in the drinking water of more than 1400 communities across the country; and those drinking water systems serve 19 million people in this country, including 300 military installations that have been identified.

In my district, PFAS is in the water in the Huron River, and we can't eat the fish. I was at a townhall meeting and a man got up—he was older—and said to me: I used to eat that fish. I relied on it. When will I be able to eat it again?

I didn't want to say this to him, but the fact of the matter is probably not in his lifetime.

Most of these sites are not being cleaned up. And the number of sites is expected to grow across the country as more States do the testing they need to do to protect their citizens, to find PFAS.

But the most troubling thing is that the manufacturing companies know the danger of PFAS and even tracked it in the blood of their employees, while the EPA has completely abandoned its responsibility to act swiftly and comprehensively.

And our military is saying they don't have to clean it up. Why? Because it is not listed under CERCLA and because they are not required to do so.

Here is the reality. We are not cleaning up the contamination. We don't even have a protective drinking water standard.

And you talk about science, Governor Rick Snyder, a Republican, appointed a scientific community that said that the guideline—not a standard—isn't stringent enough to protect human life.

Now, EPA keeps coming and testifying before our committee, and they say they are going to do it soon, but I sure don't see them doing it.

Do you all realize that exposures to contaminated water, air, and soil that include PFAS and toxins kill more people than smoking, hunger, war, natural disaster, AIDS, and malaria together?

Did the Flint water crisis not teach us in this Congress and the country something?

Mr. Chair, I thank all of my colleagues who have worked on this issue.

When you know the facts, I don't understand how anybody could let American people be poisoned, and it is time for us to act.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 1 minute to respond.

Mr. Chair, if all this whole class of 7,866 chemicals is so dangerous, why does FDA allow us to implant them in the hearts of infant children?

If this is so dangerous—there may be a couple that are bad, we are not disputing that, but the entire class?

If it is so bad, why does the FDA say it is okay for food packaging?

If it is so bad, why didn't my friends in the Obama administration, in that EPA ban it? Because they want to do the scientific analysis.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act, sponsored by Congresswoman DINGELL and Congressman UPTON.

The EPA has acknowledged that PFAS chemical exposure can lead to adverse health effects for human beings, but it has been very slow to do anything about it.

PFAS chemicals present a clear and present danger to communities all over the United States. They are linked to cancer, can cause birth defects, disrupt thyroid hormones, and affect the immune system.

Beyond the military, where it is all over our bases, the chemicals can be found in food packaging, commercial household products, our workplaces, and our drinking water; and certain PFAS chemicals are so dangerous that they are no longer manufactured in the United States.

Mr. Chair, we need to pass this bill, as we have done once before.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, might I inquire of the time that is remaining for our side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 18 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TONKO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ.)

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Chair, there was an excellent question posed by a nonphysician as to why it would be safe for a medical device to exist within the baby and approved by the FDA, and I think it is important to understand the physiology of what is the pathophysiology of these chemicals in the human body.

The danger with these chemicals is when they actually cross either the air-blood barrier or are deposited into tissue, whether they are ingested, inhaled in a specific form, that then gets deposited and accumulates over time.

When they are packaged in a specific device, they don't necessarily start to get absorbed or within a certain amount to prevent certain illnesses. But when you break them down into

chemical reactions to actually get deposited, then that is when you come up with illnesses.

That is why it is so dangerous, because in terms of the tissue, in terms of the route of ingestion, in terms of the different forms of the way it is accumulated, it can have dire effects.

Ninety-seven percent of Americans have or have had harmful PFAS chemicals in their bloodstream. They are known as forever chemicals because, once consumed, they take years and years to leave your body.

We eat these chemicals when our foods are stored in PFAS-containing packages. And, like I said, there is some leakage there. We drink them when they accumulate in our drinking water in their most basic form. And PFAS can also be passed along during pregnancy and breastfeeding when they are in their smallest form as well.

Even small levels of exposure to PFAS have been shown to harm people's immune systems.

Again, this is through the medical-scientific literature. The medical-scientific literature has shown that small levels of exposure to PFAS have shown harm to people's immune systems, increase their risk of certain types of cancer, and affect thyroid function.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TONKO. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RUIZ. Even small levels of PFAS can be harmful to the public's health.

The PFAS Action Act of 2019 will help address this public health issue by establishing a maximum contaminant level for PFAS in drinking water, provide funds to help communities remove PFAS from their drinking water, and require continuing monitoring of PFAS. It also provides millions specifically for disadvantaged communities harmed by PFAS-affected water systems.

Having clean water to drink is a common good for everyone, not a privilege for the few.

I urge everybody to vote "yes."

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

Mr. Chair, on my time, I have a question for the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ). I have great respect for the doctor and his medical knowledge—just two questions.

One, if the medical device has been made, right, and then there is a defect, so they throw it away, and if we have labeled that as a toxic chemical, then that chemical in the municipal waste now becomes a Superfund site; right?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RUIZ. I do not know the answer.

Mr. SHIMKUS. The answer is, under current law, H.R. 535, not amended, the answer is yes.

So why would they make it?

Mr. RUIZ. What I can answer is that PFAS can be harmful to one's health even though they may have a utility for a medical device.

Mr. SHIMKUS. No, I understand the physiology. I got that. I am just telling you the problem with this bill.

But the question is, the device, labeled as toxic, thrown in a municipal waste field would then become a Superfund site under current law.

And then I guess the other question I would ask the doctor is: There are 7,866 permutations of per- and polyfluorinated compounds. I would ask the doctor, which one is he referring to?

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chair, our constituents across America would be surprised to know that so many of these districts have been poisoned by a chemical they never even heard of, the PFOS and PFAS chemicals. But they would be even more shocked to know that the very cookware that they cook their meals to serve to their little kids and to their families contain that very poison. So why wouldn't we want to let them know, give them a heads-up?

And then, turning to Florida, we had a cancer cluster in Ocala, Florida, that hurt countless firefighters. If we are not here to protect little kids and firefighters, why are we here?

We don't need to wait for the Senate to tell us whether we can act or not. We need to act now, and that is why I am supporting this bill.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, H.R. 535 lists only PFOA and PFOS under Superfund and leaves decisions for all other PFAS to EPA. EPA has already committed to listing PFOA and PFOS under Superfund and has been working on the listing since 2018. The bill will speed up that listing, so that cleanup of existing contamination starts sooner, but does not change how Superfund will apply.

The two PFAS that will be listed under Superfund by this bill have already been phased out by industry under a voluntary EPA partnership more than a decade ago.

□ 1900

They are not being made in this country anymore. So no one producing airplane door seals or heart stents or any other product is using the chemicals listed under the bill. The FDA is not approving heart stents made of these chemicals.

Most of those products are actually made from PTFE, better known as Teflon. The companies who make and use PTFE believe it is not hazardous. If that is true, the testing regime in this bill will show it to be true. And if it is true, the EPA will not list it under Superfund.

The bill leaves the listing decision for PTFE and all other PFAS currently produced in this country to EPA. It gives the EPA 5 years to evaluate those chemicals and supplies them with the needed science.

This is a reasonable approach that will not regulate PFAS chemicals that are found to be nonhazardous and will take no immediate action on PFAS chemicals still being made.

I also want to note that FDA review and CERCLA listing are not inconsistent. FDA review looks at whether a product is safe and effective for specific uses. CERCLA focuses on whether a chemical is hazardous when released into the environment.

Many items that have important, even lifesaving uses, are not safe when dumped into the environment. And to be clear, the FDA is not recommending that healthy individuals implant PFAS into their bodies. The FDA is making a careful decision that someone in need of a heart stent is served by this device more than they are harmed.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chair, I thank Representative TONKO for yielding.

Article I, section 27 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, States: "The people have a right to clean air, to pure water."

Similar in spirit, the Environmental Protection Agency's website proclaims that: "The mission of EPA is to protect human health and the environment."

Unfortunately, EPA has taken only halting steps to deal with our PFAS water contamination challenge, despite its ongoing harm to human health. EPA's website describes those harms: "low infant birth weights, effects on the immune system, cancer . . . and thyroid hormone disruption."

I rise in support of H.R. 535 which will require EPA to mandate cleanup of contaminated sites, set air emission limits, and limit new PFAS chemicals in the marketplace;

Identify health risks by requiring comprehensive health testing, reporting and monitoring;

Require a national PFAS drinking water standard that creates clarity for States and municipalities;

Holds polluters accountable.

I am pleased to have worked on this public health issue and to see that part of my bill, H.R. 2600, included, which will require EPA to develop needed rules for safe PFAS disposal.

I rise in support of this bill.

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

Mr. Chair, just a couple of points. Obviously, we have numerous problems with all of the sections of this bill.

The one that is also troubling is the 5-year ban, because under TSCA, which we worked on, passed in a bipartisan manner, no new chemicals can come to the market unless it is safe.

So what this bill does, is already label a per- or polyfluorinated compound that could be very lifesaving and helpful, it puts a scarlet letter on them beforehand and it doesn't allow it. Chemistry is the future, cleaner, greener, and it is the future for an EV world, super computing, you name it.

But we are banning per- and polyfluorinated compounds. Now remember, there are 7,866 different permutations of this. So where we accept the premise that there may be some that are terrible, we are not accepting the premise that they are all bad, and that is what this bill does.

I also want to highlight that Superfund designation is not salvation. Eielson Air Force base in Fairbanks, Alaska, went on the Superfund site November 21, 1989. It is still there after 30 years. So just think about the community now that has been stigmatized under a Superfund designation, and they are not going to be able to redevelop, retrain, rebuild, and grow the economy.

I have a whole list of these things from 30 years, 32 years, 30, 35 years ago. Most of us have dealt with Superfund sites in our district. I have. They are no fun and they are not helpful, and it takes forever.

Talking about forever chemicals, we are talking about forever Superfund sites, and that is what you are signing up for in this debate.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, to the gentleman from New York, I would like to enter into a colloquy regarding creosote contamination in the 18th Congressional District.

I certainly rise to support enthusiastically H.R. 535. For decades the residents of the Fifth Ward and surrounding areas, residential areas in Houston, which is located on the northern side of my district, have long suspected that creosote was making them sick. They were exposed to creosote through soil and water contamination through a railroad yard.

Last April, during a community meeting I hosted for residents on the topic of creosote contamination, I requested a cancer study from the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality after person after person spoke about cancer and their relative dying.

The study found that three adult respiratory-system-related cancers occurred in that Fifth Ward and surrounding areas, including Kashmere Gardens. The cancers included, lung and bronchus, esophagus, and larynx. Toxic substances, such as creosote, should not be in common use where human activity is present, and it should not take decades for hazardous environmental concerns expressed by citizens to get addressed.

Mr. TONKA. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield to the gentleman from New York for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, creosote is listed as a hazardous substance under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, CERCLA, for the purpose of

Superfund cleanup sites for the assignments of liability.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. TONKO. The mechanisms for reporting on potential toxicants should allow citizens ready access to information on what they can do to alert authorities to environmental threats.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The communities like the Fifth Ward and surrounding areas in Houston can be invaluable to assisting agencies in identifying ways to improve on the information provided to the general public—they live it every day. These are life or death issues—on the means and methods available to citizens to report environmental concerns and how these products are used amongst the community for products that are very needed in the community, and have those concerns adequately addressed.

Mr. TONKO. The public is vital to the work of environmental protection, and I look forward to learning more about the residents of the Fifth Ward and surrounding communities, and the gentlewoman's efforts to address creosote contamination. And I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this to the attention of the committee and Members of Congress.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman very much, and as I leave the floor, just want to take note of the contamination in the State of Texas and this is what we are fighting.

Mr. Chair, as a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I rise in strong support of H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act of 2019, which will regulate in a comprehensive fashion Per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances (referred to as PFAS).

I support the legislation because it also protects public health by containing provisions to clean up contaminated sites.

I have long held concerns regarding environmental justice issues that impact urban and rural communities who disproportionately face problems associated with contaminated water, soil, and air pollution.

My work to protect residents of the 18th Congressional District from harms caused by contaminants over the last year include: creosote ground water contamination and the opposition of permitting of a cement manufacturing facility near residential spaces in Fifth Ward Houston and Acres Homes respectively.

Through a series of major community meetings on environmental hazards I held last year I can attest that people are literally fighting for their lives and the lives of their children because of disparate conditions regarding managing containment and cleanup of an existing ground water creosote contamination site and the threat of cement dust contamination of a residential area if a State issued permit be allowed to stand.

Concerns about the health impact of creosote and other harms to human health have existed in Acres Homes and 5th Ward Houston for decades.

Because of recent actions on the part of the responsible party for containing the effects of creosote contamination of ground water, I called a community meeting including all relevant entities in April of 2019.

As an action item from that meeting I requested, that the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality arrange a cancer cluster study of the 5th Ward area of Houston that would be conducted by the Texas Department of State Health Services (DSHS).

The DSHS analyzed census tracts in Houston to determine the incidences of cancer.

The analysis examined cancers—specifically those associated with adults.

The study analyzed a half-dozen types of adults referencing cancers in the Texas Cancer Registry.

It concluded that “the numbers of esophagus, lung and bronchus and larynx cancers were statistically significantly greater than is expected based on cancer rates in Texas.”

The DSHS's work was incomplete—we do need more data.

This report, however, confirmed the fears of constituents in my district, as expressed at my April town hall meeting.

According to the report, incidences of cancer outside of normal probabilities has occurred in 5th Ward Houston.

Specifically, the DSHS analyzed the Texas Cancer Registry available from 2000 to 2016, as it relates to the affected areas, in which “[l]ung, bronchus esophagus, and larynx cancers were statistically significantly greater than expected.”

The report also found that the types of cancers which were identified in the study are consistent with those present in arsenic, which comprises creosote.

Given the findings of the DSHS report, and the impact this has on the health and wellbeing on my constituents in Kashmere Gardens, I will be working to address the need to place energy and effort to address community environmental concerns more effectively.

And there have been critical, tangible health consequences to the emergence of these cancer clusters for decades that went uninvestigated.

In my April community meeting and in December during a media event and tour, I heard stories that were stark in their nature, compelling and tragic on the incidence of illness and cancer that has plagued residents of 5th Ward.

Speaker after speaker at these community meetings spoke of the existence of the cancer, either in themselves or in their relatives.

It was startling.

One participant spoke of having a vegetable garden and concerns about whether it was safe to eat the food grown.

Another resident spoke of a recent diagnosis of cancer and the number of neighbors and family members who had contracted cancers over the years.

The open over 20 feet deep creosote dipping pit that abutted back yards of residents for decades was real.

The runoff from rain storms tainted with creosote that filled ditches with oily black and brown smelly residue happened.

The persistent smell of creosote near where they lived was constant.

A few weeks ago, I walked Lavender and Lily streets and engaged with residents who had thyroid cancer or lung cancer who shared

their stories with me in hopes that something can be done.

I remain concerned about the existence of cancer clusters in Houston's Fifth Ward.

The safety and well-being of the Kashmere Gardens Community and surrounding areas are my overriding concern.

My advocacy on this issue and on behalf of those identified in the city is longstanding and unwavering, and I will not relent until the community and its citizens have answers about the impact creosote has in the lives and health of my constituents.

This is why I am in strong support of H.R. 535.

This legislation addresses PFAS chemicals, which are an urgent public health threat because PFAS are persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic, and communities across the country are discovering PFAS contamination in their air, land, and water.

Mr. Chair, PFAS are a class of man-made chemicals defined by the presence of fluorinated carbon atom, the strongest carbon bond possible.

Because of this bond, these chemicals are extremely persistent in the environment and are known to bioaccumulate in humans and wildlife, which is why they are called "forever chemicals."

PFAS have long been linked with adverse health effects including cancer, immune system effects, infertility, impaired child development, high cholesterol, and thyroid disease.

Contamination has been found across the country, much of it around industrial facilities and Department of Defense installations.

According to monitoring by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), millions of Americans are exposed to unsafe levels of PFAS through their drinking water.

Mr. Chair, it is urgent that this Congress enact this legislation because the U.S. Environmental Protection Administration and industry have failed to address known threats presented by PFAS chemicals.

EPA and industry have known about the risks from PFAS chemicals for decades but failed to act to prevent the spread of this contamination.

Industry studies showing adverse health effects as early as 1950 have now been made public.

EPA has recognized the risk of these chemicals since at least 1995, when the agency amended its polymer exemption to exclude new PFAS chemicals.

Despite that knowledge, EPA took no action on PFOA and PFOS until 2006, and then relied on a voluntary industry phase out instead of using the regulatory tools available.

EPA is continuing to allow new PFAS onto the market, some without any review under "low volume exemptions" to the Toxic Substances Control Act.

Last year, EPA issued a "PFAS Action Plan" that did not take needed action to address cleanup of contaminated sites, set limits on PFAS in drinking water, or even require reporting of PFAS releases.

In fact, the only commitments made in the action plan were to make some determinations by the end of 2019—commitments that were not met.

H.R. 535 will provide the protections impacted communities need quickly and for the long term.

The PFAS Action Act of 2019 would require EPA to use tools under several environmental statutes to:

1. Stem the flow of PFAS contamination into the environment by requiring cleanup of sites contaminated with PFOA and PFOS, setting air emission limits, prohibiting unsafe incineration of PFAS, and limiting the introduction of new PFAS chemicals into commerce;

2. Identify health risks by requiring comprehensive health testing for all PFAS, reporting of PFAS releases, and monitoring for PFAS in drinking water;

3. Limit human exposure to PFAS by requiring a drinking water standard for PFAS that protects public health, including the health of vulnerable subpopulations like pregnant women, infants, and children, and holding polluters accountable.

In addition, H.R. 535 provides grants to impacted water systems, creates a voluntary label for cookware that is PFAS free, and provides guidance for first responders to limit their exposures.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 535 addresses a critical threat to the public health and safety and that is why I support and urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, may I inquire again about time remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chair, I would like to commend the sponsor of this bill, my friend from Michigan, Congresswoman DINGELL. She is a true champion of clean air and water.

Families across my district are rightfully concerned about a chemical legacy that they and their children will bear unless we pass this bill. Sampling of wells is ongoing in the community of Devens, as well as its neighbor, the town of Ayer.

PFAS contamination was likely due, at least in part, to the firefighting foam used at the Fort Devens Army base over the past century. The town of Hudson has had to contend with its own PFAS issues, such as in its Cranberry Bog well.

The EPA has failed in its duty of care to the American people, so I urge my colleagues to protect public health and to pass H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act. Clean drinking water is something to which everyone in this Nation is entitled.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in full, enthusiastic support for this legislation which is long overdue. For decades, chemical corporations like 3M and DuPont knowingly manufactured products containing forever-toxic chemicals known as PFAS.

Our Federal Government has confirmed that PFAS can adversely affect

growth and learning in children, lower a women's chance of getting pregnant, increase cholesterol, hinder the immune system, interfere with hormone regulation, and even increase the risk of cancer.

As a cancer survivor myself, and as chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, I find it unconscionable that I have veterans coming to me to complain that their families are dying due to the Department of Defense's decades-long use of these chemicals.

As a member of the Oversight and Reform Committee, I have told 3M and DuPont to their faces that I don't know how they sleep at night. They poisoned our water and contaminated the bloodstream of millions of people all for profit.

It is past time that the Federal Government step up and do something about it, and we do that here today. I commend Congresswoman DINGELL for her work and so many of my colleagues who have fought so far and so long, including the chairman.

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER).

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act, a comprehensive bill to address PFAS contamination across the country. And I thank my colleagues for their commitment to bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chair, I am glad that one of the bills I filed in this Congress, H.R. 2638, has now been included in this legislation. It directs the Environmental Protection Agency to issue guidance on minimizing the use of firefighting foam and other equipment that contains PFAS chemicals by firefighters and first responders.

Its purpose is simply to minimize the risk for our firefighters and first responders as well as for our environment. We know that these chemicals are dangerous for humans who have been exposed to them, and we know they are dangerous for our environment.

Unfortunately, we have seen the impacts in our community as recently as last year. During the ITC plant fire in Deer Park, Texas, in March 2019, firefighters used more than 130,000 gallons of foam to extinguish the massive flames in that fire. Not long after, high levels of PFAS chemicals were found in the water in the Houston Ship Channel and lower levels were found farther downstream, according to the Galveston Bay Foundation.

Our first responders risk their lives every day to protect our communities. We must do everything we can to protect theirs.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the House leadership for bringing forward this package today. I want to explain why it is critical that Members support this bill.

The health and the safety of communities across our great country are compromised by these dangerous chemicals. For their sake, let's not pretend that nibbling at the edges with the latest NDAA is enough to declare victory.

I have visited the communities and met the families who are dealing with the fallout from PFAS exposure and environmental contamination. They elected us to put their needs first, and they need more than half measures.

I appreciate my Republican colleagues' willingness to work on cleanup of Federal facilities, but that simply is not enough. I cannot in good conscience go home this weekend and tell the people of Rensselaer County: "We are cleaning up DOD sites, but we have no plan for the polluted industrial sites in Hoosick Falls, or any others like it around the country."

It just isn't right. We need to take action under Superfund and hold PFAS polluters responsible, regardless of whether they are public or private.

The bill also requires any national drinking water standard to, at a minimum, ensure vulnerable groups, including pregnant women, infants, and children, are protected.

I won't tolerate EPA adopting an unsafe standard, and I do hope Members with impacted communities won't either.

The bill includes other critical provisions to reduce PFAS exposure, empower consumers, and expedite cleanups. We have waited too long already for the administration to act. I fear we will keep waiting, or worse, deal with the consequences of unprotective actions.

Until we enact these provisions, we cannot say that Congress has done its job.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

As we went through the TSCA debate, one thing I learned was exposure over time of the hazard equals the risk.

□ 1915

Sometimes, we conflate a bad chemical as risk unless you can protect it from exposure. That is why I have been focusing on the 7,866 chemicals. That is why I am talking about the PFAS that might be in a hockey puck but not in the bloodstream.

But this bill says that everything is going to be labeled as a hazardous waste and followed up on Superfund. The contrary argument is: Great, put it in the Superfund. When will that get cleaned up?

If it is in Ellison Air Force Base, Alaska, 30 years, and it is still not cleaned up. Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, 30 years, and it is

still not cleaned up. Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California, 32 years, and it is still not cleaned up. Dover Air Force Base, 30 years, and it is still not cleaned up. Central Landfill in Johnston, Rhode Island, 33 years, and it is still not cleaned up. Walsh Landfill, Honey Brook Township, Pennsylvania, Superfund site, 35 years, and it is still not cleaned up. Colbert, what we have is 35 years of litigation.

I like that red map that they are touting out here on this bill. That red map indicates trial lawyer action in all those States because most of the Superfund money goes to litigation.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I also want to highlight what we have done. I think some people have alluded to it, that nothing was done, but a lot was done in the National Defense Authorization Act. A little bit more was done in the end-of-year spending bill. This Safe Drinking Water Act provision could have been in, and we all know it. That could have been in law today. But it wasn't, as leverage for this bill that we are talking about today.

In the NDAA, we require EPA to mandate that drinking water systems monitor for unregulated PFAS. That is law. In the NDAA, it is now law that we provide grants to communities to address emerging contaminants in drinking water, including PFAS.

Currently, in law, we require new reporting for PFAS under the Toxics Release Inventory program. Currently, under law, it is required that manufacturers and processors of PFAS submit health and safety information. It is now law.

Current law restricts new uses of long-chain PFAS. Now, what do I mean by long chain? That is when there are 7,866 different per- and polyfluorinated compounds. You have long-chain ones, and you have short-chain ones. We are banning the long chain, and again, we need scientific research, but this bans them all, whether or not they are safe.

EPA law now is guidance for appropriate destruction. Now currently under law, it requires the Federal Government to work expeditiously with States to enter in a binding cooperative agreement concerning cleanup.

Mr. Chairman, that is in respect to your State of Michigan. Michigan established its standard. The Department of Defense was hiding behind the fact that it couldn't negotiate. You guys were successful. Former Chairman UPTON was part of that fight. I applaud the State of Michigan for having that done, and now that is current law.

In the appropriations bill, which provided \$2 billion for the Clean Water and Drinking State Revolving Fund, \$20 million will go to State-level PFOS cleanup.

So as we hear this debate and as we go to the amendments, we are going to hear doom and gloom and that we are

negligent, that EPA is not doing anything, and that we are terrible people. In fact, at the end of last year, great strides were made, in a bipartisan manner. I applaud the NDAA. I applaud the end-of-year spending bill. And this, too, shall end.

I do want to highlight the fact that to ban 7,866 forms of per- and polyfluorinated compounds without doing science, that has never been done in the history of this Chamber and this body. It is more political science versus science.

We get it. We will move through this process. We will have our votes, and then this will be a fight for the next Congress because the Senate has said it is not going to support this bill. It is not going to bring it up. The President has already issued a veto threat.

It is a good exercise. I get to practice speaking on the floor with my friends in debate, which I look forward to as we bring up the amendments.

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chair, I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 535—The PFAS Action Act. This bill is a big step towards cleaner water for all Americans. It designates PFOA and PFOS as hazardous; these are two of the most prevalent substances that make up the group of substances known as PFAS. These 'forever' chemicals are known to pose serious health concerns that have affected many of my constituents throughout Bucks County along with Americans across our country. 99 percent of people have traces of PFAS in their blood.

One of my top PFAS priorities has been getting a federal Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) for PFAS chemicals in our water. Most states do not have an MCL and ones that do, are not uniform. State residence should not be the defining factor for an American to have safe drinking water, having one universal MCL for PFOA and PFOS in the U.S. helps to solve this problem.

Currently there is no limit on how much PFAS pollution is in our water and air. This bill gives EPA the power to begin regulating this lethal pollution. It will jumpstart the cleanup effort and hold PFAS polluters accountable. It will require polluting companies to submit information to EPA, so that the Agency can more fully evaluate the environmental and health effects of these toxins.

Hundreds of PFAS chemicals are used in commercial goods and The PFAS Action Act will put in place a labeling system so that PFAS-free products can be easily identified by consumers.

I have seen firsthand the devastating health effects that PFAS substances cause in my community. The Department of Defense (DOD) used PFAS chemicals in its firefighting foam for decades at the Willow Grove base that contaminated the water and soil in Warminster, PA. Last month I supported a new Defense bill that became law which ends the practice of using that specific kind of firefighting foam by 2024. This bill goes further and will make people safer and less likely to consume these toxins.

Every American deserves access to clean drinking water and clean air. Most of us think only clean water comes out of our faucets

when we turn them on, unfortunately, this is a misconception. Until this bill is signed into law and is fully implemented, we cannot trust that our water is not contaminated with these toxic substances.

I urge my Republican colleagues to vote “yes” on this bill. A vote for this bill means that you care about safe drinking water for your constituents. EPA has promised to address PFAS, and this bill will ensure that they make substantial progress by setting firm deadlines.

I would like to thank Congresswoman DINGELL, Congressman UPTON along with Congressman KILDEE, who co-chairs the Bipartisan PFAS Taskforce with me, for their work in leading this important bill.

I also want to thank Joanne Stanton and Hope Grosse of the Buxmont Coalition for Clean Water along with many of the townships and municipalities throughout my district, they have fought for years for meaningful action to be taken on this issue, and while this bill is by no measure the finish line, it is a major milestone.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-45, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116-366, shall be considered as adopted.

The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 535

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “PFAS Action Act of 2019”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Designation as hazardous substances.
- Sec. 3. Testing of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances.
- Sec. 4. Manufacturing and processing notices for perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances.
- Sec. 5. National primary drinking water regulations for PFAS.
- Sec. 6. Enforcement.
- Sec. 7. Establishment of PFAS infrastructure grant program.
- Sec. 8. Listing of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous air pollutants.
- Sec. 9. Prohibition on unsafe waste incineration of PFAS.
- Sec. 10. Label for PFAS-free products.
- Sec. 11. Guidance on minimizing the use of fire-fighting foam and other related equipment containing any PFAS.

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION AS HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall designate perfluorooctanoic acid and its

salts, and perfluoroactanesulfonic acid and its salts, as hazardous substances under section 102(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9602(a)).

(b) **DEADLINE FOR ADDITIONAL DETERMINATIONS.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall determine whether to designate all perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances, other than those perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances designated pursuant to subsection (a), as hazardous substances under section 102(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9602(a)) individually or in groups.

(c) **AIRPORT SPONSORS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—No sponsor, including a sponsor of the civilian portion of a joint-use airport or a shared-use airport (as such terms are defined in section 139.5 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation)), shall be liable under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) for the costs of responding to, or damages resulting from, a release to the environment of a perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance designated as a hazardous substance under section 102(a) of such Act that resulted from the use of aqueous film forming foam agent, if such use was—

(A) required by the Federal Aviation Administration for compliance with part 139 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(B) carried out in accordance with Federal Aviation Administration standards and guidance on the use of such substance.

(2) **SPONSOR DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “sponsor” has the meaning given such term in section 47102 of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 3. TESTING OF PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES.

(a) **TESTING REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 4(a) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2603(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES RULE.**—

“(A) **RULE.**—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) through (3), the Administrator shall, by rule, require that comprehensive toxicity testing be conducted on all chemical substances that are perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances.

“(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In issuing a rule under subparagraph (A), the Administrator—

“(i) may establish categories of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances based on hazard characteristics or chemical properties;

“(ii) shall require the development of information relating to perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances that the Administrator determines is likely to be useful in evaluating the hazard and risk posed by such substances in land, air, and water (including drinking water), as well as in products; and

“(iii) may allow for varied or tiered testing requirements based on hazard characteristics or chemical properties of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances or categories of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances.

“(C) **DEADLINES.**—The Administrator shall issue—

“(i) a proposed rule under subparagraph (A) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this paragraph; and

“(ii) a final rule under subparagraph (A) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph.”.

(b) **PERSONS SUBJECT TO RULE.**—Section 4(b)(3) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2603(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “subparagraph (B) or (C)” and inserting “subparagraph (B), (C), or (D)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) A rule under subsection (a)(5) shall require the development of information by any person who manufactures or processes, or intends to manufacture or process, a chemical substance that is a perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance.”.

(c) **PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES.**—Section 4 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2603) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES.**—

“(1) **TESTING REQUIREMENT RULE.**—

“(A) **PROTOCOLS AND METHODOLOGIES.**—In determining the protocols and methodologies to be included pursuant to subsection (b)(1) in a rule under subsection (a)(5), the Administrator shall allow for protocols and methodologies that test chemical substances that are perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances as a class.

“(B) **PERIOD.**—In determining the period to be included pursuant to subsection (b)(1) in a rule under subsection (a)(5), the Administrator shall ensure that the period is as short as possible while allowing for completion of the required testing.

“(2) **EXEMPTIONS.**—In carrying out subsection (c) with respect to a chemical substance that is a perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance, the Administrator—

“(A) may only determine under subsection (c)(2) that information would be duplicative if the chemical substance with respect to which the application for exemption is submitted is in the same category, as established under subsection (a)(5)(B)(i), as a chemical substance for which information has been submitted to the Administrator in accordance with a rule, order, or consent agreement under subsection (a) or for which information is being developed pursuant to such a rule, order, or consent agreement; and

“(B) shall publish a list of all such chemical substances for which an exemption under subsection (c) is granted.”.

SEC. 4. MANUFACTURING AND PROCESSING NOTICES FOR PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES.

Section 5 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2604) is amended—

(1) in subsection (h), by adding at the end the following:

“(7) This subsection does not apply to any chemical substance that is a perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(j) **PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES.**—

“(1) **DETERMINATION.**—For a period of 5 years beginning on the date of enactment of this subsection, any chemical substance that is a perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance for which a notice is submitted under subsection (a) shall be deemed to have been determined by the Administrator to present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment under paragraph (3)(A) of such subsection.

“(2) **ORDER.**—Notwithstanding subsection (a)(3)(A), for a chemical substance described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Administrator shall issue an order under subsection (f)(3) to prohibit the manufacture, processing, and distribution in commerce of such chemical substance.”.

SEC. 5. NATIONAL PRIMARY DRINKING WATER REGULATIONS FOR PFAS.

Section 1412(b) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 3009-1(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(16) **PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall, after notice and opportunity for public comment, promulgate a national primary drinking water regulation for perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances, which shall, at a minimum, include standards for—

“(i) perfluorooctanoic acid (commonly referred to as ‘PFOA’); and

“(ii) perfluorooctane sulfonic acid (commonly referred to as ‘PFOS’).”

“(B) ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the validation by the Administrator of an equally effective quality control and testing procedure to ensure compliance with the national primary drinking water regulation promulgated under subparagraph (A) to measure the levels described in clause (ii) or other methods to detect and monitor perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances in drinking water, the Administrator shall add the procedure or method as an alternative to the quality control and testing procedure described in such national primary drinking water regulation by publishing the procedure or method in the Federal Register in accordance with section 1401(1)(D).

“(ii) LEVELS DESCRIBED.—The levels referred to in clause (i) are—

“(I) the level of a perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance;

“(II) the total levels of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances; and

“(III) the total levels of organic fluorine.

“(C) INCLUSIONS.—The Administrator may include a perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance or class of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances on—

“(i) the list of contaminants for consideration of regulation under paragraph (1)(B)(i), in accordance with such paragraph; and

“(ii) the list of unregulated contaminants to be monitored under section 1445(a)(2)(B)(i), in accordance with such section.

“(D) MONITORING.—When establishing monitoring requirements for public water systems as part of a national primary drinking water regulation under subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (G)(ii), the Administrator shall tailor the monitoring requirements for public water systems that do not detect or are reliably and consistently below the maximum contaminant level (as defined in section 1418(b)(2)(B)) for the perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance or class of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances subject to the national primary drinking water regulation.

“(E) HEALTH PROTECTION.—The national primary drinking water regulation promulgated under subparagraph (A) shall be protective of the health of subpopulations at greater risk, as described in section 1458.

“(F) HEALTH RISK REDUCTION AND COST ANALYSIS.—In meeting the requirements of paragraph (3)(C), the Administrator may rely on information available to the Administrator with respect to 1 or more specific perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances to extrapolate reasoned conclusions regarding the health risks and effects of a class of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances of which the specific perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances are a part.

“(G) REGULATION OF ADDITIONAL SUBSTANCES.—

“(i) DETERMINATION.—The Administrator shall make a determination under paragraph (1)(A), using the criteria described in clauses (i) through (iii) of that paragraph, whether to include a perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance or class of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances in the national primary drinking water regulation under subparagraph (A) not later than 18 months after the later of—

“(I) the date on which the perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance or class of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances is listed on the list of contaminants for consideration of regulation under paragraph (1)(B)(i); and

“(II) the date on which—

“(aa) the Administrator has received the results of monitoring under section 1445(a)(2)(B)

for the perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance or class of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances; or

“(bb) the Administrator has received reliable water data or water monitoring surveys for the perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance or class of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances from a Federal or State agency that the Administrator determines to be of a quality sufficient to make a determination under paragraph (1)(A).

“(ii) PRIMARY DRINKING WATER REGULATIONS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—For each perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance or class of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances that the Administrator determines to regulate under clause (i), the Administrator—

“(aa) not later than 18 months after the date on which the Administrator makes the determination, shall propose a national primary drinking water regulation for the perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance or class of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances; and

“(bb) may publish the proposed national primary drinking water regulation described in item (aa) concurrently with the publication of the determination to regulate the perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance or class of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances.

“(II) DEADLINE.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Administrator publishes a proposed national primary drinking water regulation under clause (i)(I) and subject to item (bb), the Administrator shall take final action on the proposed national primary drinking water regulation.

“(bb) EXTENSION.—The Administrator, on publication of notice in the Federal Register, may extend the deadline under item (aa) by not more than 6 months.

“(H) HEALTH ADVISORY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), the Administrator shall publish a health advisory under paragraph (1)(F) for a perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance or class of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances not subject to a national primary drinking water regulation not later than 1 year after the later of—

“(I) the date on which the Administrator finalizes a toxicity value for the perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance or class of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances; and

“(II) the date on which the Administrator validates an effective quality control and testing procedure for the perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance or class of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances.

“(ii) WAIVER.—The Administrator may waive the requirements of clause (i) with respect to a perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance or class of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances if the Administrator determines that there is a substantial likelihood that the perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance or class of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances will not occur in drinking water with sufficient frequency to justify the publication of a health advisory, and publishes such determination, including the information and analysis used, and basis for, such determination, in the Federal Register.”

SEC. 6. ENFORCEMENT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not impose financial penalties for the violation of a national primary drinking water regulation (as defined in section 1401 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f)) with respect to a perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance or class of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances for which a national primary drinking water regu-

lation has been promulgated under section 1412(b)(16) of the Safe Drinking Water Act earlier than the date that is 5 years after the date on which the Administrator promulgates the national primary drinking water regulation.

SEC. 7. ESTABLISHMENT OF PFAS INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT PROGRAM.

Part E of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 1459E. ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY WATER SYSTEMS AFFECTED BY PFAS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall establish a program to award grants to affected community water systems to pay for capital costs associated with the implementation of eligible treatment technologies.

“(b) APPLICATIONS.—

“(1) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall publish guidance describing the form and timing for community water systems to apply for grants under this section.

“(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—The Administrator shall require a community water system applying for a grant under this section to submit—

“(A) information showing the presence of PFAS in water of the community water system; and

“(B) a certification that the treatment technology in use by the community water system at the time of application is not sufficient to remove all detectable amounts of PFAS.

“(c) LIST OF ELIGIBLE TREATMENT TECHNOLOGIES.—Not later than 150 days after the date of enactment of this section, and every two years thereafter, the Administrator shall publish a list of treatment technologies that the Administrator determines are effective at removing all detectable amounts of PFAS from drinking water.

“(d) PRIORITY FOR FUNDING.—In awarding grants under this section, the Administrator shall prioritize affected community water systems that—

“(1) serve a disadvantaged community;

“(2) will provide at least a 10-percent cost share for the cost of implementing an eligible treatment technology; or

“(3) demonstrate the capacity to maintain the eligible treatment technology to be implemented using the grant.

“(e) NO INCREASED BONDING AUTHORITY.—Amounts awarded to affected community water systems under this section may not be used as a source of payment of, or security for (directly or indirectly), in whole or in part, any obligation the interest on which is exempt from the tax imposed under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not more than \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2021.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AFFECTED COMMUNITY WATER SYSTEM.—The term ‘affected community water system’ means a community water system that is affected by the presence of PFAS in the water in the community water system.

“(2) DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY.—The term ‘disadvantaged community’ has the meaning given that term in section 1452.

“(3) ELIGIBLE TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY.—The term ‘eligible treatment technology’ means a treatment technology included on the list published under subsection (c).

“(4) PFAS.—The term ‘PFAS’ means a perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance with at least one fully fluorinated carbon atom.”

SEC. 8. LISTING OF PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES AS HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS.

(a) LISTING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator

of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue a final rule adding as a class all perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances with at least one fully fluorinated carbon atom to the list of hazardous air pollutants under section 112(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(b)).

(b) **SOURCES CATEGORIES.**—Not later than 365 days after the final rule is issued pursuant to subsection (a), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall revise the list under section 112(c)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(c)(1)) to include categories and subcategories of major sources and area sources of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances listed pursuant to such final rule.

SEC. 9. PROHIBITION ON UNSAFE WASTE INCINERATION OF PFAS.

Section 3004 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6924) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(z) **PFAS WASTES.**—

“(1) **FIREFIGHTING FOAM.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall promulgate regulations requiring that when materials containing perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances or aqueous film forming foam are disposed—

“(A) all incineration is conducted in a manner that eliminates perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances while also minimizing perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances emitted into the air to the extent feasible;

“(B) all incineration is conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, including controlling hydrogen fluoride;

“(C) any materials containing perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances that are designated for disposal are stored in accordance with the requirement under part 264 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(D) all incineration is conducted at a facility that has been permitted to receive waste regulated under this subtitle.

“(2) **PENALTIES.**—For purposes of section 3008(d), a waste subject to a prohibition under this subsection shall be considered a hazardous waste identified or listed under this subtitle.”.

SEC. 10. LABEL FOR PFAS-FREE PRODUCTS

(a) **LABEL FOR PFAS-FREE PRODUCTS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall—

(1) revise the Safer Choice Standard of the Safer Choice Program to identify the requirements for a pot, pan, or cooking utensil to meet in order to be labeled with a Safer Choice label, including a requirement that any such pot, pan, or cooking utensil does not contain any PFAS; or

(2) establish a voluntary label that is available to be used by any manufacturer of any pot, pan, or cooking utensil that the Administrator has reviewed and found does not contain any PFAS.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “PFAS” means a perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance with at least one fully fluorinated carbon atom.

SEC. 11. GUIDANCE ON MINIMIZING THE USE OF FIREFIGHTING FOAM AND OTHER RELATED EQUIPMENT CONTAINING ANY PFAS.

(a) **GUIDANCE.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the head of the U.S. Fire Administration and other relevant Federal departments or agencies, shall issue guidance on minimizing the use of firefighting foam and other related equipment containing any PFAS by firefighters, police officers, paramedics, emergency medical technicians, and other first responders, in order to minimize the risk to such firefighters, police officers, paramedics, emer-

gency medical technicians, and other first responders, and the environment, without jeopardizing firefighting efforts.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “PFAS” means perfluorooctanoic acid, perfluorooctanesulfonic acid, and any other perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance with at least one fully fluorinated carbon atom that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency determines is used in firefighting foam and other related equipment.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 116-366. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WOODALL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 47, line 7, insert “, Federal Aviation Administration,” after “U.S. Fire Administration”.

Page 47, line 8, insert “and representatives of State and local building and fire code enforcement jurisdictions” after “departments or agencies”.

Page 47, line 9, insert “, or contact with,” after “use of”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I introduced this amendment in partnership with my friend from California (Mr. DESAULNIER), with whom I serve on the Rules Committee and with whom I serve on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

I have a poster here, Mr. Chairman, of what it looks like when the foam is released to prevent a fuel fire in an airport hangar. If you can't tell from where you are sitting, this is the tail of the airplane being lifted up above the foam.

As currently drafted, I certainly agree with the ranking member that this bill is much too expansive. But in this one limited case, it doesn't go far enough. Our building code enforcement agencies locally, our local fire codes, require that in order to have a hangar permitted, it must have these fire suppression systems.

But what we found in our research, Mr. Chairman, is that more often than not, these systems go off unintentionally. In fact, in the last 16 years, there have been 174 hangar foam releases like this one. Only 37 of those were in re-

sponse to an actual incident. The other 137 were accidental releases.

If we are concerned about these toxic chemicals, certainly having them available for a dire firefighting need but released accidentally, it advantages no one. In fact, even in the 37 incidents that were in response to a fire event, none of those were in response to the fuel fire event that the building code requires these systems be installed to suppress.

What my amendment does, Mr. Chairman, in partnership with Mr. DESAULNIER, is to say that when we are having these conversations about how to restrict the use of these foams, we need to have the FAA present in those conversations, and we need to have the local enforcement authorities for fire and building code safety present in those conversations to prevent these types of releases, again, that advantage no one.

It is an opportunity to take what is a very well-intended effort to reduce the use of these chemicals and reduce it even further.

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment builds on an important piece of this bill, the guidance for firefighters and other first responders to minimize their risk from PFAS chemicals. This provision was developed by Representative LIZZIE FLETCHER, and I thank her for her leadership on addressing this important concern.

Our first responders take enormous risks every day for the greater good. Cancer from occupational exposure should not be among those risks. Unfortunately, occupational-related cancers now account for 65 percent of the line-of-duty deaths for firefighters each year.

Last year, Pat Morrison of the International Association of Fire Fighters testified before my subcommittee on the impacts PFAS in firefighting gear have had on firefighters. This is the single largest health-related issue facing the firefighting profession.

I thank Representative FLETCHER for her work in protecting firefighters, and I also thank the gentlemen from Georgia and California for their efforts on this important topic.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Woodall-DeSaulnier amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA).

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the PFAS Action Act.

The facts are that the industry, the Pentagon, and the EPA knew that PFAS are hazardous to health, yet we did not do anything as a Congress until Representative DINGELL had the courage to lead this act to get a bipartisan group together. I salute Representative DINGELL for her leadership.

I am proud to have sponsored the PFAS waste incineration act. The marked-up bill is included in the package. The provision requires the EPA to ensure all incineration of PFAS waste is done properly.

I thank Chairman TONKO and Chairman PALLONE for their leadership on this issue and also the ranking members for at least their work on the incineration part of PFAS and making sure that the waste is marked "hazardous."

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The gentleman from Georgia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), who is the ranking minority member.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I, too, rise in support of this amendment.

It is my understanding this amends section 18 to ensure the FAA, State and local building code inspectors, and fire marshals are at the guidance-making table. I understand the officers believe this will result in a broader collaborative dialogue that includes the risks posed by the use of foam suppression systems in aviation hangars. That would be helpful. I understand that, in aircraft hangars, foam systems are not being used by first responders pursuant to Federal regulations.

I have one question for the sponsor of the amendment about his intent with regard to one item. Is this amendment intended to open a dialogue about human health impacts or standards, or personal protective equipment requirements, responses, protocols, or anything like that?

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman for his question. Absolutely not. What the amendment does is it has language, Madam Chair, that inserts the words "or contact with" to make that point that firefighters are not using the foam; they are responding after the foam has already been used.

As Mr. SHIMKUS knows, when they come in contact with the foam in the course of their duties, it is our intent to lower the probability of any release of toxic foam on airfields. As I said, most of these releases are accidental releases. By bringing the building code inspectors to the table, we believe that we can reduce all instances of release without opening the dialogue on the topics about which he inquired.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague for the explanation.

I also would highlight that under this bill, airports are exempt from the Superfund liability. It does pose a ques-

tion of who cleans up the composed contamination on airports if we are going to protect airports from the liability. I guess airports went out; other communities do not.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Chair, I will close by saying we may disagree about, again, the breadth of the overall legislation, but as it comes to this individual line-item, we are talking primarily about accidental releases of a very important firefighting foam but one that we know we want to reduce the usage of, the bipartisan partnership that we have created with the support of the chairman and ranking member. I am grateful to them for their leadership and support.

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

□ 1930

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I remind everyone that PFOS/PFOA are dangerous contaminants that threaten individual lives and our communities, as our firefighters have pointed out, in various, various dimensions.

Madam Chair, I rise to support the amendment and the overall bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam 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:

Strike section 2.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, this amendment would strike section 2 of H.R. 535.

Section 2 of H.R. 535 requires the Environmental Protection Agency to designate the chemicals PFOA and PFOS as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, also known as the Superfund, and to do this within 1 year of enactment, and requires a review of the entire PFAS chemical group within 5 years.

I believe this to be flawed for several reasons:

First and foremost, the Environmental Protection Agency is already undergoing a thorough examination of the chemicals known as PFAS. Section 2 circumvents the regulatory process and would deny any public notice, any public comment, or any scientific study before deeming PFOA and PFOS as hazardous chemicals under the Superfund.

Any substance designated as a hazardous substance under CERCLA attaches strict, joint and several, and retroactive liability conditions. If you had any stake in the production, any stake in the ownership or cleanup of such a substance, that party might be liable under the Superfund law. The public has a right to comment on the impacts of such an important measure.

Second, section 2 is simply impractical. In the 40 years since the passage of the Superfund bill, Congress has never specifically placed individual chemicals or chemical groups into statute as hazardous chemicals under this act.

In those 40 years, 800 chemicals have been added to this list through the regulatory process. The Environmental Protection Agency is currently aware of between 5,000 and possibly as many as 7,800 PFAS chemicals. The problem is we don't know how many exist. The EPA would not be able to properly evaluate the thousands of chemicals that make up the PFAS in only 5 years.

PFAS chemicals must be properly assessed with the best science possible. As currently written, section 2 of the legislation denies the EPA the ability to properly and thoroughly evaluate these chemicals and shuts out the public from commenting on the regulatory impacts, including the potential future development of safer PFAS chemicals.

Madam Chair, for these reasons, I urge support of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, this amendment would strike the Superfund provision from this bill completely. It will significantly weaken this bill and leave hundreds of impacted communities in harm's way.

What does the Superfund provision in this bill do exactly? H.R. 535 lists only PFOA and PFOS under Superfund and leaves decisions for all other PFAS to EPA.

EPA has already committed to listing PFOA and PFOS under Superfund and has been working on the listings since 2018. So this bill does not pre-judge EPA decisions. EPA has already made those decisions.

The bill will speed up that listing so that cleanup of existing contamination starts sooner, which is critical. It also sets up a reasonable deadline for EPA to make decisions on other PFAS chemicals under Superfund to speed up any additional needed cleanups.

Superfund cleanups are essential to public health, and for impacted communities, they can be the difference between health and sickness, between life and death.

The question before Members on this amendment is whether cleanups of PFOA and PFOS should start right away or whether impacted communities can continue to wait.

While EPA drags its feet, people in hundreds of impacted communities across the country will continue to be exposed and continue to be harmed. Pollution will spread from these sites into the environment, into sources of drinking water, and into our agricultural resources. And eventual cleanups will become harder and more costly.

Madam Chair, impacted communities cannot afford to wait. I urge my colleagues, therefore, to vote “no” on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON).

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding and for offering such an important amendment.

Madam Chair, I agree that section 2 of the underlying bill presents a grave problem.

PFAS were first used in the 1940s and continued to be used in a variety of everyday objects, including pizza boxes, food wrappers, nonstick cookware, stain-resistant furniture, water-resistant clothes, firefighters’ protective suits, and medical devices.

I support this amendment because it would prevent so many important materials from being labeled as hazardous without the scientific proof to back it up. We should not label all 5,000 of these materials the same way.

Madam Chair, I urge a “yes” vote on the amendment.

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

Madam Chair, PFAS chemicals must be properly assessed with the best science possible. As currently written, section 2 of this legislation denies the EPA the ability to properly and thoroughly evaluate these chemicals. We are literally making the perfect the enemy of the good.

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman’s amendment. Superfund is a landmark environmental law and an essential public health program that works.

There are contaminated sites all across this country that pose direct threats to human health and the environment because of pollutants like lead, mercury, PCBs, and asbestos. Superfund is the program that gets those sites cleaned up.

Superfund does not regulate the use of chemicals; it does not block the use of chemicals; and it does not assign liability for the use of chemicals. It only applies to the release of chemicals into the environment.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have characterized

Superfund as a de facto ban. They say that the industry will so fear liability that they will abandon PFAS chemicals.

Experience shows that that simply is not true. There are hundreds of chemicals listed under Superfund that continue to be used in industrial and consumer products and by the Department of Defense. In fact, Superfund is designed to prevent releases of chemicals that are in continued use.

When a chemical is listed as a hazardous air pollutant under the Clean Air Act, EPA sets emission limits for that chemical that are implemented through permits. Facilities continue to use and emit those chemicals. At the same time, those chemicals are automatically listed under Superfund. The same is true under the Clean Water Act.

Madam Chair, the funny thing is that the two PFAS compounds covered by this bill, PFOA and PFOS, have already been phased out for more than a decade under a voluntary partnership between EPA and industry.

We have heard many concerns from my Republican friends about the specter of Superfund liability for different groups. These concerns are largely unfounded.

Drinking water utilities will handle PFOA and PFOS the same way they handle the hundreds of hazardous substances they currently remove from drinking water. The same will be true for wastewater utilities.

Farmers will continue to be able to use biosolids as fertilizer, just as they currently do, because Superfund already exempts fertilizer use. Manufacturers of airplane door seals and heart stents will be able to continue using the PFAS they currently use—all while impacted communities, like Michigan, will get the cleanup that they need.

The only change this bill makes in how Superfund operates is a limited exemption for federally required use of PFAS at airports. If this amendment were adopted, airports would lose that exemption. And if EPA eventually moves forward with listing PFOA and PFAS, as they have committed to do, EPA is not authorized to exempt airports. Only Congress can do that. So the airports need this amendment defeated, and they need this bill enacted.

A Superfund listing is an essential provision to accelerate PFAS cleanup nationwide. It is the foundation of the PFAS Action Act. By gutting it, we cripple our ability to serve and protect the American people responsibly.

Madam Chair, I join my colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change, in urging a “no” vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

The Chair is advised that amendment No. 3 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. HUDSON. Madam 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:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 19. INVESTIGATION OF PREVENTION OF CONTAMINATION BY GENX.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall investigate methods and means to prevent contamination by GenX of surface waters, including source waters used for drinking water purposes.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer my first amendment to H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act.

For the last several years, my constituents and neighboring communities in North Carolina have dealt with contamination from the PFAS chemical GenX. The company Chemours has been discharging this chemical into the air as well as the waters of the Cape Fear River, a common source of drinking water.

To put it simply, my constituents are scared. They are frustrated because this has been an ongoing issue, and they don’t have enough information.

This is an issue that I have been working on for many years. I have demanded action by EPA, and I had the EPA come to Fayetteville and hear directly from our community.

At our community engagement event, hundreds of people attended, and many shared their concerns with the potential links between GenX and serious health problems.

I worked with our chairman to have an Energy and Commerce hearing, and we invited Emily Donovan, a founding member of Clean Cape Fear in North Carolina, to testify. Emily gave compelling testimony about her personal experiences and the many people who have “suffered from the trauma of cancer treatments, benign tumors, and terminal diagnosis.”

I have talked with many of my constituents, including one whose neighbor has cancer, and they don’t know if it is connected to GenX. They can’t get information about it, and they are worried about their own children.

This is about getting answers for our community. This is about making sure

my constituents are protected and the water we are drinking is safe.

Until I know the science behind GenX, until I know exactly what safe levels and unsafe levels of exposure are, until we can adequately clean up the exposure we have had in North Carolina, I am not going to be satisfied.

I have a letter here from Secretary Michael Regan of the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality supporting this effort.

Madam Chair, I include that letter in the RECORD.

NORTH CAROLINA
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY,
Raleigh, NC, January 9, 2020.

Hon. RICHARD HUDSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HUDSON: As you know North Carolina has been at the forefront in dealing with the issue of emerging compounds. Because of the lack of guidance or action from the current U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), our state and others have taken the lead on the necessary investigations, scientific evaluations, remediation and enforcement actions for PFAS contamination caused by government and industrial uses.

It is clear that members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, understand the urgent need to immediately address the contamination from PFAS chemicals, especially in North Carolina. The North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality appreciates the leadership you and the state's delegation are providing to advance the conversation surrounding PFAS and GenX as we continue in our mission to protect our state's water and air.

I look forward to continued dialogue with you and your colleagues to encourage the U.S. EPA to move more quickly to set PFAS health standards and protections. I hope that we can count on you and the entire delegation to push for much-needed resources and support to address current and future contamination and remediation needs involving these forever chemicals.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL S. REGAN,
Secretary, North Carolina
Department of Environmental Quality.

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Chair, while I understand it takes time to develop the scientific evidence to make these decisions, my neighbors are tired of waiting. We must act now.

My amendment adopts this common-sense approach and requires the EPA to investigate methods and means to prevent contamination by GenX of surface waters, including source waters used for drinking purposes. This will enable us to find the best ways possible to safeguard our waters both now and for future generations.

Madam Chair, I thank Chairman PALLONE, Ranking Member WALDEN, Chairman TONKO, Ranking Member SHIMKUS, and my good friend and colleague Mr. DAVID ROUZER all for working with me on this, and I urge the rest of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1945

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, though I do not plan to oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, GenX is a group of PFAS chemicals that have been a particular concern for several communities. Last year, the Energy and Commerce Committee heard testimony from a member of one of those communities, Emily Donovan, of the group Clean Cape Fear.

Emily testified about the burden of disease in her community, including her husband's cancer, and the burden of having to educate and protect her community without the protections and resources of our Federal environmental laws.

Her group, Clean Cape Fear, had to seek donations to install drinking water treatment for the public schools of her town so that the children could have safe water to drink at school. That is just not right.

So I appreciate these North Carolina Members raising the issue of GenX to help Emily and other people impacted by GenX. I thank the gentlemen for their amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and this bill.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, my colleague, Mr. HUDSON, has led the committee's efforts to address GenX on behalf of his constituents in North Carolina. He has pressed EPA to complete its human health toxicity assessment on GenX using science.

This amendment takes the next step to focus EPA on ways to keep people's drinking water safe under GenX. This is a prudent step to harness the technical expertise of the EPA to identify ways to reduce contamination of the substance, which will be useful in connection with EPA's other work and will aim to stop future problems like those in Cape Fear River. I applaud my colleague and friend for his work.

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I support the Hudson amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. HUDSON. Madam 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 37, line 20, insert “, including the chemical GenX” after “carbon atom”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer my second amendment to H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act of 2019.

As I have just described, the chemical GenX has been a major concern for my constituents for years.

As I have already stated, my constituents are scared, and they don't know what the long-term health effects of being exposed to these chemicals will be.

Madam Chair, we cannot wait to begin the cleanup of drinking waters that have been affected by these chemicals. While this bill is far from perfect, I am encouraged that it does create a PFAS Infrastructure Grant Program to provide assistance to community water systems affected by PFAS.

My amendment would simply clarify that communities like mine that have been impacted by GenX are eligible for grants under this section. It would not affect the program in any way, other than providing clarity and relief to the people of North Carolina.

I know that we still have a lot of work to do to solve the PFAS issue. I am committed to working with all Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, as well as State and local leaders to make sure we are taking care of our communities. Everyone deserves clean water.

Today, we are taking a positive step, and I look forward to continuing to work on this issue. I would urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I do not intend to oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR (Miss RICE of New York). Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, this amendment explicitly includes GenX chemicals in the definition of PFAS covered by the legislation.

I want to be clear that GenX are PFAS chemicals and are already covered by this provision, regardless of whether this amendment is adopted.

I am happy to support, however, the amendment because we absolutely mean for this funding to be available to remove GenX from drinking water. But

no one should interpret this amendment as implying that GenX are not already covered within the definition of PFAS.

I also want to mention one important thing about GenX. We have heard a lot today about how PFOA and PFAS are dangerous, but that newer PFAS might be safer. I want to make certain that everyone understands, GenX is one of those supposedly safer alternatives. It is a set of short-chain PFAS that were developed to replace PFOA.

GenX is a great example of why we need the moratorium on new PFAS included in this bill, because if EPA had the needed science in hand when GenX was introduced, communities in North Carolina, and nationwide, might never have been impacted.

That is what we are trying to accomplish with this bill. We want to help the communities that have been impacted and head off future harmful pollution.

I thank the gentlemen for their amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and this bill.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Chair, I just want to say thank you to Chairman TONKO for working with me on this very important issue.

Again, folks back home in North Carolina are very concerned, to put it mildly. And so to give them a little bit of clarity, a little bit of certainty that GenX is covered means a lot to folks back home, so I appreciate the gentleman working with me on this.

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I appreciate the kind words from the gentleman from North Carolina. I appreciate working with him. I encourage my colleagues to support the Hudson amendment, his second amendment, and I will do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BALDERSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam 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:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 19. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not take effect until the date that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency certifies that the Environmental Protection Agency has completed the actions described in the document titled "EPA's Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) Action Plan" and dated February, 2019.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman

from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam Chair, my amendment would require the EPA administrator to certify to Congress the agency has completed its own PFAS Action Plan before the underlying bill may be implemented.

My amendment acknowledges the concern for human health and the environment caused by drinking water contamination and enables the EPA, the appropriate regulatory agency, to improve the situation through careful science.

PFAS are synthetic chemicals used in a variety of products that have commercial, industrial, and military uses. These substances are often found in everyday objects and relied upon by Americans.

One of the most important uses is medical devices. PFAS materials are central components of many medical devices because they are bio-compatible, durable, and deemed safe for implantation when necessary.

PFAS, and, in fact, fluoropolymers, have lifesaving applications in medical devices, including heart patches and grafts, stents, and surgical mesh. They are found in catheters and other medical tubing and guide wires used in surgical patients and to treat thousands of diseases. These substances are even found in sterile coatings on hospital gowns, masks, and other tools needed to keep hospital settings sterile and fight infections.

In my district of Ohio 12, medical device producers make these critical products and contribute to improving patients' lives every day.

Clearly, not all PFAS are the same. To assert that all these 5,000-plus substances are hazardous in one move is not based on science and it is dangerous. That would call into question the already approved medical devices that are saving lives.

The better solution is to allow the EPA to do its work and look at each chemical on its own merits, rather than labeling the whole diverse class as hazardous.

I agree with the authors of this bill that we must be cautious with the use of chemicals and reduce their levels in our water supplies, but this cannot be done at the jeopardy of American patients.

That is why I am thrilled to learn about EPA's PFAS Action Plan, which the agency published last year in response to greater awareness of this issue and rising public health concerns. As part of this plan, the EPA works with Federal, State, and local partners to understand and act on known PFAS dangers.

The EPA plan is a comprehensive, cross-agency approach. It includes concrete steps to monitor, detect, and address PFAS contamination.

One major action worth noting that the EPA has already taken is the De-

cember 3 proposal to establish a maximum contaminant level. This important step toward public safety is currently under interagency review.

For the well-being of all Americans, we should support this plan's success.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

This amendment would block implementation of the important public health protections in this bill until the EPA administrator certifies that its PFAS Action Plan is completed.

Let's be clear about something. This EPA is never going to complete that action plan. EPA has already failed to meet the weak deadlines it set for itself in that.

We were supposed to have a regulatory determination for PFOA and PFAS in drinking water. We do not. We were supposed to have designations of PFOA and PFAS under Superfund. In fact, in EPA's action plan they note that they started that activity in 2018. They haven't gotten it done.

We were supposed to have EPA action to require reporting of PFAS releases on the Toxics Release Inventory. We had to attach that to the NDAA to get it done.

And, by the way, Republicans supported taking that action on NDAA.

But even these specifics are giving this amendment too much credit. This is not a serious amendment because EPA's Action Plan is not designed to ever be completed. Many of the action items are characterized by the EPA itself as ongoing commitments.

Here is an example. EPA committed to holding responsible parties accountable for PFAS releases into the environment. That task is an ongoing commitment that can never be completed.

Evaluating new science, evaluating new PFAS, assessing new drinking water treatment technology, these are all things EPA will continue doing indefinitely.

In fact, one of the stated purposes of EPA's action plan is "preventing future contamination." When will EPA ever be done preventing future contamination?

So this amendment would actually block the important provisions in this bill from ever being implemented. It would harm public health and leave our communities worse off. I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for the opportunity to support this amendment to this deeply-flawed bill.

Madam Chair, I rise this evening in support of the Balderson amendment. H.R. 535 will have broad and significant impact on medical innovation and negatively impact patient outcomes.

PFAS materials have a variety of uses in healthcare, ranging from cardiac stents to the coating on contact lenses. Using innovative PFAS materials, surgeries such as those that were previously used to repair a child's congenital heart defect now no longer require risky, open heart surgery procedures and can simply be done as an outpatient with significantly less risks.

□ 2000

The EPA is already working on its own comprehensive PFAS Action Plan, and we must listen to science rather than regulating new devices and treatments out of existence.

Here is the bottom line: We cannot ignore the benefits that some PFAS chemicals have given to humankind.

Madam Chair, I strongly urge the adoption of the Balderson amendment.

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam Chair, the administration has demonstrated that one of its top priorities is the research and necessary regulation of PFAS. Its ongoing commitment to public safety is responsible. Congress should allow the EPA to complete its work before casting such a wide net on labeling 5,000-plus PFAS as hazardous. This is an opportunity for Congress to be proactive rather than reactive.

I invite Members to join me in supporting thoughtful action to ensure the safety of the American public and our environment.

Madam Chair, I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON).

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. DELGADO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. DELGADO. Madam 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:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ DISCLOSURE OF INTRODUCTIONS OF PFAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The introduction of any perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance by the owner or operator of an industrial source shall be unlawful unless such owner or operator first notifies the owner or operator of the applicable treatment works of—

(1) the identity and quantity of such substance;

(2) whether such substance is susceptible to treatment by such treatment works; and

(3) whether such substance would interfere with the operation of the treatment works.

(b) VIOLATIONS.—A violation of this section shall be treated in the same manner as a violation of a regulation promulgated under subsection 307(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1317(b)).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) INTRODUCTION.—The term "introduction" means the introduction of pollutants into treatment works, as described in section 307(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1317).

(2) TREATMENT WORKS.—The term "treatment works" has the meaning given that term in section 212 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1292).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELGADO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Chair, today, I am pleased to offer this bipartisan amendment to strengthen this legislation aimed at addressing PFAS contamination in our communities.

Right now, communities in upstate New York continue to struggle with the impacts of PFAS contamination in drinking water. Residents of Hoosick Falls and Petersburg in Rensselaer County are living every day with the impacts of PFAS contamination, which we know include thyroid disease, birth defects, autoimmune disorders, and cancer.

Last year, Emily Marpe, who now lives with her family in Hoosick Falls, testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee about her experiences with contaminated water in her home in Petersburg, New York. Emily spoke about her experiences of being unable to drink the water from her faucet and having to sell her home and then test her blood as well as the blood of her children for PFOA.

What Emily described is all too common in my district, and it is representative of the experiences of communities across the country. This is why PFAS has been a priority of mine and so many in this Chamber on both sides of the aisle.

The PFAS Action Act is a critically important bill. My bipartisan amendment will strengthen this legislation and address another element of this crisis: indirect discharge. My amendment, which pulls from the PFAS Transparency Act, would make it illegal for an industrial facility to introduce PFAS into a sewage treatment system without first disclosing information about that substance.

Right now, companies can tap into a public wastewater infrastructure and introduce PFAS into our sewage systems, regardless of the local treatment plant's ability to effectively treat the contamination.

Most municipal water treatment plants are not equipped to effectively treat for PFAS contamination, which makes indirect discharges extremely

hazardous, particularly when not disclosed.

The PFAS Transparency Act establishes a commonsense requirement that industrial facilities disclose this information to treatment systems beforehand, meaning more transparency and accountability for our communities.

I would like to take this moment to recognize my coleads on this measure, Representatives CHRIS PAPPAS and HARLEY ROUDA. We introduced this PFAS Transparency Act alongside the bipartisan Clean Water Standards for PFAS Act of 2020, which would require the EPA to review PFAS discharges under the Clean Water Act and issue regulations to address harmful discharges of PFAS into our Nation's waterways.

These bills together take important steps to increase our understanding of PFAS in wastewater and address harmful discharges in our water system, both direct and indirect.

I urge this House to stand with our communities facing unthinkable consequences of PFAS contamination. Madam Chair, I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Under the Clean Water Act, many industries discharge directly to municipal sewage treatment plants rather than discharge directly to surface waters. To address this practice, the Clean Water Act established a pretreatment program, which allows sewage treatment plants to work with industrial discharge connections to ensure that any industrial chemicals are properly treated or that these chemicals do not disrupt the normal functioning of the sewage treatment plants.

However, a pretreatment program is only effective if the sewage treatment plant knows which chemicals are being introduced into their sewage treatment systems. Yet, there is no current Clean Water Act requirement that requires industrial discharges to tell the municipality that it plans to release PFAS-related chemicals into the sewage system.

This amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELGADO) would address this current loophole. I support this amendment, and I appreciate the good work that the gentleman from New York has done not

only for the residents of his congressional district but for the residents of this country. This is an important amendment. I appreciate the hard work he has done and the sensitivity he has shown.

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Chairwoman, I am prepared to close, and I want to use this opportunity to strengthen our defenses against these dangerous “forever chemicals” and protect our drinking water for generations to come.

Madam Chair, I urge a “yes” vote on this important bipartisan amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This amendment makes it illegal for an industrial facility to introduce PFAS into a sewage treatment system without first disclosing information about that substance. This amendment effectively would create an entirely new and duplicative regulatory program under the Clean Water Act.

This amendment is an ad hoc attempt at regulating PFAS without any consideration of whether or how these requirements would duplicate or mesh with the implementation of the EPA PFAS Action Plan or similar, already existing regulatory requirements under the Clean Water Act.

The committee of jurisdiction for this provision is the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and they have held no hearings and conducted no stakeholder or scientific community engagement or consultation on this issue. As a result, this amendment is nothing more than an automatic reaction to regulate in a vacuum without risk information and without an understanding of its consequences.

Madam Chair, I urge a “no” vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELGADO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. PINGREE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 116–366.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam 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 46, line 12, strike “or cooking utensil” and insert “cooking utensil, carpet, or rug, clothing, or upholstered furniture”.

Page 46, beginning on line 14, strike “or cooking utensil” and insert “cooking utensil, carpet, rug, clothing, or upholstered furniture”.

Page 46, beginning on line 17, strike “or cooking utensil” and insert “cooking utensil, carpet, rug, clothing, or upholstered furniture”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maine.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank Chairman PALLONE and Congresswoman DINGELL for their leadership on PFAS issues, and I thank Congresswoman SPANBERGER, who is also a sponsor of this amendment with me.

I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act of 2019. This bipartisan bill would take much-needed and long-overdue action on these forever harmful chemicals.

These pervasive and dangerous chemicals pose serious risks to both human health and to our environment, and the delay in taking action on them has been inexcusable. They are known hormone disruptors, and studies link exposure to them to kidney and testicular cancer, thyroid disease, and other health problems.

PFAS chemicals are concentrated in human and animal blood and tissue and can remain there for years. It is estimated that 99 percent of Americans have PFAS in their blood.

In my home State of Maine, PFAS was first discovered from the groundwater at former military installations from firefighting foam, but PFAS has also been found in our public water supplies, soil, animal products, and household products like cookware and carpets.

A 2015 review by the Environmental Working Group showed the majority of PFAS in homes comes from its presence in carpets and textiles. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control named carpet as the number one source of PFAS exposure for infants and toddlers, who, as you can imagine, spend a lot of time playing, lying, and crawling on carpets.

My amendment would expand the Environmental Protection Agency’s Safer Choice label to additional household products, including carpet, rugs, clothing, or upholstered furniture certified not to contain PFAS. This change would prompt manufacturers to develop safer alternatives and help consumers find and buy healthier products for their homes.

I urge my colleagues to join me in taking action for the health of our communities and the environment and vote “yes” on my amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Maine for yielding.

I support the Pingree-Spanberger amendment, which would expand the voluntary label for PFAS-free products to include carpets, rugs, clothing, and upholstered furniture.

The PFAS-free label created under this bill was developed by Representative SOTO to help consumers who are trying to protect themselves from PFAS risks. I thank Mr. SOTO for his work on that provision.

Expanding that label to cover carpeting, rugs, clothing, and upholstered furniture makes great sense. Recent data suggests that those consumer products can be a significant source of PFAS exposure and that PFAS-free products are available on the market. Currently, consumers have no clear way to know which rugs have PFAS and which do not.

Manufacturers that are taking steps to produce these items without PFAS have no way of distinguishing their products in the marketplace. This amendment will give them that tool.

I congratulate both Representatives PINGREE and SPANBERGER for their sensitivity to consumers by placing this amendment before us. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and the overall bill.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, consumers have the right to know what harmful chemicals are in their homes, and they should have the ability to choose products that keep their families and their environment safe.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2015

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

Madam Chair, this amendment expands EPA’s Safer Choice program to include carpets, rugs, clothing, and upholstered furniture that do not contain PFAS.

The Safer Choice program was not meant to cover products like this, and it will be extremely expensive and time-consuming to do so. Revisions to the program of this type are not consistent with the intent of the program and would require significant changes to the program to implement it effectively.

To establish this standard, EPA would have to hold listening sessions and propose and finalize changes to the Safer Choice standard. Public involvement would have to be substantial.

Most importantly, for consumers’ information, labeling indicating the absence of PFAS does not necessarily mean a safer product, which undermines the purpose of the EPA program.

In addition, when bisphenol A, commonly known as BPA, was used in baby bottles, companies and retailers who made bottles with other substances had no problem labeling their products as BPA-free.

In some ways, this is a taxpayer-funded advertising campaign for corporations that can cut commercials for their products themselves.

In some ways, the Federal Government needs to get into this area. A better way would be to have a collaborative among the EPA, the Consumer

Product Safety Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Food and Drug Administration to make recommendations on how to convey any risk from these products.

This is not the right way to address this issue.

Madam Chair, I would urge a “no” vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam 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:

At the end, add the following section:

SEC. 19. HOUSEHOLD WELL WATER TESTING WEBSITE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall establish a website containing information relating to the testing of household well water.

(b) CONTENTS.—The Administrator shall include on the website established under subsection (a) the following:

(1) Information on how to get groundwater that is the source for a household water well tested by a well inspector who is certified by a qualified third party.

(2) A list of laboratories that analyze water samples and are certified by a State or the Administrator.

(3) State-specific information, developed in coordination with each State, on naturally occurring and human-induced contaminants.

(4) Information that, using accepted risk communication techniques, clearly communicates whether a test result value exceeds a level determined by the Administrator or the State to pose a health risk.

(5) Information on treatment options, including information relating to water treatment systems certified by the National Science Foundation or the American National Standards Institute, and people who are qualified to install such systems.

(6) A directory of whom to contact to report a test result value that exceeds a level determined by the Administrator or the State to pose a health risk.

(7) Information on financial assistance that is available for homeowners to support water treatment, including grants under section 306E of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926e) and State resources.

(8) Any other information the Administrator considers appropriate.

(c) COORDINATION.—The Administrator shall coordinate with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Agriculture, and appropriate State agencies in carrying out this section.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 2021.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

One community I represent is Oscoda, a small town in the northern part of my district. It was once the home of the Wurtsmith Air Force Base.

Even though that base closed more than two decades ago, the Oscoda community is now dealing with PFAS contamination from the base that is leaching into their drinking water and the nearby lakes.

For years, I have been fighting to help the people of Oscoda clean up PFAS contamination.

In January of last year, 1 year ago, I, along with Congressman BRIAN FITZPATRICK, founded the bipartisan Congressional PFAS Task Force to bring Republicans and Democrats together to address this growing and urgent public health threat. We now have 50 members up from the 14 members that we started with. As more Members of Congress learn about contamination in their districts, they are joining this movement.

We are beginning to know the problem, and we know that we have to do more urgently to act to clean up and address PFAS in the environment.

That is why I am a strong supporter of the bipartisan PFAS Action Act, a bill pushed through the Energy and Commerce Committee with the support of many Members, but most importantly, my Michigan colleague, Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL.

According to the Environmental Working Group, over 100 million people are exposed to PFAS in their drinking water. This isn't acceptable. Every American deserves clean drinking water.

The PFAS Action Act will help protect families from PFAS in their drinking water, lakes, rivers, and streams and in the air by requiring PFAS to be listed under the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Clean Air Act. It will also require polluters and corporations to clean up their PFAS contamination through CERCLA.

It is important that Congress acts, because the Trump administration has not.

While the EPA and the Defense Department both have had authority to protect the public from PFAS, they have so far failed in their responsibilities to address this public health crisis.

The EPA has run a public relations campaign to convince us that they care about PFAS but has failed to act to regulate these dangerous chemicals, even missing their own promised deadlines to act.

Just this week, the White House signaled that it would likely veto this legislation. In threatening to veto this bill, President Trump and his administration clearly are siding with polluters instead of protecting the health of the American people.

This act represents a continued push by this bipartisan group of legislators for much-needed legislation to clean up PFAS and to safeguard us from these chemicals.

Some of the provisions in this bill were taken out of the recently passed NDAA by Senate Republicans, who sided again with President Trump and the administration on behalf of corporate polluters to block these provisions from becoming law.

While we were able to include many good PFAS provisions in the NDAA, including phasing out of firefighting foam, requiring polluters to report when they release PFAS into the environment, and allowing for a nationwide study of PFAS contamination, many of these critical provisions were ultimately blocked by Senate Republicans. The House will continue to act to protect public health and urge action for Oscoda and so many other places around the country.

I also, obviously, urge the passage of my amendment, which would promote transparency and streamline EPA resources to help people potentially exposed to PFAS and other contaminants to understand better what their test results mean.

In the U.S., well water is essentially unregulated. For the 43 million people in our country with well water, when they get testing results back, it is hard for them to understand how it could impact their family's water supply.

Under this amendment, the EPA website would be simplified and streamlined, making it easier for millions of American families to understand the threat they face.

Madam Chair, I thank my colleagues, Congressman KIND from Wisconsin and Congressman GALLAGHER, for supporting me with this amendment. I encourage its adoption.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to adopt this.

Just to be clear, I support the underlying legislation, obviously. The amendment simply requires that we provide an opportunity for people who are potentially going to be affected by PFAS, particularly in drinking water but also from other sources, to be able to understand easily the threat they face.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this. Ultimately, this amendment is about making sure people are armed with the information that they need to protect their families.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I appreciate my friend and colleague from

Michigan. He has been very active on this issue for many years now, and I respect his intensity and his efforts. A couple of things, because a lot of the debate was initially just on the overall bill.

It is the Senate that caused us not to enact all these provisions in the NDAA. That is why they are on record as not going to move this bill.

We did have a chance for the Safe Drinking Water Act to be included in the final piece of legislation. That was blocked by someone, and now, here we are.

The President has threatened to veto the act. You are correct about that.

Mr. KILDEE also raised the benefits of what we did do, and I listed them earlier, from the EPA to mandate that drinking water systems monitor for unregulated PFAS, provide grants to communities, require new reporting of PFAS under the Toxics Release Inventory program, require manufacturers and processors of PFAS to submit health and safety information—these are all law today—restrictions on new uses of long-change PFAS, guidance for appropriate destruction of per- or polyfluorinated compounds, require the Federal Government to work expeditiously with States to enter into binding cooperative agreements. That is particularly important for the gentleman's State, which was a success. Of course, I have many more.

I would also like to highlight the appropriations bill, which included \$2.8 billion for the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, with that \$20 million going for this issue.

You do adequately highlight the success that we made at the end of last year on these two programs. We don't want to diminish the success. I know it is not as far as a lot of people wanted to go, but there was some success.

To your amendment, it is a federalism debate. Water wells in States are regulated, controlled, and tested by the States, not the EPA.

Under this amendment, the Federal Government would have to collect and manage information about individuals and their property. This amendment, both broad and vague at the same time, would be an enormous expansion of the Federal Government into an area that has been governed by States.

If these wells in the gentleman's State are not being tested, they are not being tested by his State, and I know his State is very aggressive.

Mr. KILDEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHIMKUS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. You raise an excellent point. The issue is, we could mandate, if you would choose to, that States provide information on a website that is easily discernible. The problem is that while wells and other sources may be tested—I don't know if you have had the opportunity to read the published tests from those examinations. The idea of the amendment is not just to

see that the information is somehow available somewhere but available in a fashion that is easily discernible by people who are not scientists.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Reclaiming my time, so you are saying your State is not capable of doing it themselves? I mean, your State health department can't do the research?

You are also talking about private wells on private property, bringing the Feds in to list the water systems for that. Obviously, under the system of Federal Government, we are raising some concerns on that amendment.

Let me continue. If I have some time, we can go on.

In addition to State departments of health that certify the laboratories—it is your department of health that certifies the laboratories that test the water, not EPA, as this legislation implies.

It would place a lot of burdens on EPA to carry out a program that States and local governments could more easily and appropriately handle. It would also likely take more than a year to establish this program, which is all the bill provides in this statutory language.

I believe this amendment also places serious unfunded mandates on States.

Finally, I have questions about whether the information being collected and disseminated under this amendment can be done in a way that meets the proper risk communication strategies called for in the Brown amendment.

That is why we have problems with this amendment.

Mr. KILDEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHIMKUS. I yield to the gentleman, my friend.

Mr. KILDEE. I appreciate the gentleman's concern.

I think we may simply have a disagreement as to whether or not there is a legitimate Federal role in ensuring that this information is readily available.

I understand the point about States, but I believe this is a national interest in part because it is the Federal Government very often which is the biggest culprit here.

The community, for example, that I represent in Oscoda, where so many individuals had their private wells affected, they were affected by the Federal Government's poisoning of the groundwater.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I wish I could debate longer, but my time has expired.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentlewoman from

Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), I rise to offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 2, add the following:

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 60 days after making a determination under subsection (b), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall make the results of such determination publicly available on the website of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I thank Congress Member LAWRENCE for her work on this amendment.

The amendment, Madam Chair, is simple. It would ensure that the public is notified when any additional chemicals in the PFAS family are designated as hazardous substances.

More specifically, this amendment requires the EPA to publish its determinations on the remaining PFAS chemicals on its publicly accessible website within 60 days.

Public reporting helps communicate how government is working for the people. For agencies like the EPA, full transparency is necessary to inform our communities about threats to public health and the environment.

□ 2030

Our constituents have the right to know exactly what contaminants are in the air we breathe and the water we drink. As she noted in her statement in support of her amendment, in her home State of Michigan, she knows the importance of clean air and clean water from firsthand experience.

We know threats to our environment and public health do not discriminate, and the Representative concludes that she knows that, too often, it is the most important unrepresented and disadvantaged communities that are left behind.

Mr. Chair, I urge support for the amendment from the gentlewoman from Michigan, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BRINDISI). The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, while I will not oppose this amendment, this section, in particular, is objectionable. But putting Agency decisions on their website sounds like a reasonable proposal.

I am concerned about the timing of 60 days—that would be something that the Agency can do without a problem—and would have preferred that the Agency was invited to testify on sweeping an antiscience bill and its implications.

I do not intend to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his support of this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment and the overall bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MISS RICE OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Miss RICE of New York. 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 37, lines 1 through 4, amend subsection (e) to read as follows:

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not more than \$125,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1), \$25,000,000 are authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021 for grants under subsection (a) to pay for capital costs associated with the implementation of eligible treatment technologies during the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on the date of enactment of this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Chair, my amendment would expand the PFAS Infrastructure Grant Program by 25 percent and designate the increased funds for reimbursing water districts that have already started to address the PFAS water crisis.

Like many communities across the Nation, Long Island, my district in New York, played a major role in the industrialization of America. Industrialization brought unparalleled economic growth, innovative new technologies, and transformed society as we know it.

But with these great societal gains also came unintended consequences, like PFAS drinking water contamination.

PFAS are toxic chemicals found in paint, cleaning products, packaging, and countless other products; and too often, they find their way into our drinking water systems.

According to a May 2019 study by the New York Public Interest Research Group, Long Island has the most contaminated drinking water in New York State, and Nassau County has the highest number of water systems with detected emerging contaminants, including PFOA and PFOS.

For years, water districts across the country have had to invest millions of their own dollars on technology to secure impacted wells and keep their residents safe. These costs have crushed our local communities, and that is why I have offered this amendment today.

Communities that could not wait for Federal action and that quickly redirected resources to address this immediate health threat should not be punished. The Federal Government failed to address this threat for decades. The least we can do now is help reimburse the costs incurred by local water districts that acted when Congress failed to do so.

Without this Federal reimbursement, costs could be unfairly transferred to residents in the form of higher water utility bills. We cannot let this happen. Residents should not be left with the bill when they had no responsibility for the crisis.

I would like to thank my colleagues from Long Island, Representatives PETER KING and TOM SUOZZI, for co-leading this amendment with me, and our other bipartisan cosponsors, Representatives FITZPATRICK, GRIJALVA, CISNEROS, and STEVENS, as well.

This is a commonsense bipartisan priority, and I urge all of my colleagues to support my amendment to help these communities.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman PALLONE for supporting the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I will use the time that I have available.

This amendment provides reimbursement funding for treatment technologies that were purchased up to 5 years ago. The program for which this amendment is offered is supposed to aid communities that have demonstrated problems and are economically disadvantaged and cannot afford the new technology because of the expense. That is why we have the program.

This amendment suggests that community water systems that had the means and no expectation of Federal funding to pay for them get money for past work. It does not seem a fair use and diversion of taxpayer resources considering the expense of the technology that can currently meet the criteria of an eligible technology and the unknown nature of the communities that might need it.

According to the EPA, there are few, if any, reverse osmosis treatment options that are economically viable on a

mass scale that would remove all detectable amounts of PFAS.

I understand the intent of the legislation, but our grant and loan programs are designed for communities that can't afford the expense. What my colleague is asking is that those communities that could and did make the investment, that they then be reimbursed, thus depriving communities that can't afford to do it an opportunity to obtain it.

Mr. Chair, that is why we object to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. 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:

At the end of the committee print, insert the following new section:

SEC. 19. RISK-COMMUNICATION STRATEGY.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall develop a risk-communication strategy to inform the public about the hazards or potential hazards of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances, or categories of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances, by—

(1) disseminating information about the risks or potential risks posed by such substances or categories in land, air, water (including drinking water), and products;

(2) notifying the public about exposure pathways and mitigation measures through outreach and educational resources; and

(3) consulting with States that have demonstrated effective risk-communication strategies for best practices in developing a national risk-communication strategy.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I want to first thank Chairman PALLONE, Chairman TONKO, and Congresswoman DINGELL for this comprehensive package.

We know PFAS-related substances remain in our bodies and environment for years, if not decades. Coupled with widespread consumer use and pollution, PFAS toxins could result in long-lasting public health problems.

This legislation confronts PFAS contamination, spurs cleanup efforts, and sets a drinking water limit. It is critical for government agencies to inform the public of the risk posed by PFAS-related substances.

My amendment would require the EPA to develop a national risk communication strategy to share the best

available science about PFAS and its hazards, notify the public about risks and mitigation measures, and consult with States with effective statewide risk communication strategies of their own.

In my home State of Maryland, PFAS has been identified in the water at eight DOD installations, tainting neighboring communities' local wells and seeping into the Chesapeake Bay watershed. I am proud that Maryland is committed to PFAS transparency and research and is taking this issue seriously.

Mr. Chair, there are some communities that are especially vulnerable to PFAS exposure, among them, firefighters at military installations. To stop the spread of fire at training sites, fire departments use a type of fire-fighting foam that contains PFAS-related substances.

Over the course of their careers, these firefighters put themselves in harm's way, unaware of the toxicity of these chemicals and the health issues they can cause down the road. We owe these servicemen and -women an unrecoverable debt, and it is our duty to communicate to them the hazards that they were exposed to while risking their lives protecting the public.

Whether it is former firefighters, military families living on bases, or the American people at large, the exchange of information between communities, risk assessors, and scientists is critical.

As we continue to learn more about the full range of health problems linked to PFAS, we must also communicate that risk to the public. Sharing this risk, the knowledge of the risk, is an important step to give the public the resources they need to defend against PFAS contamination and the adverse health impacts it can cause.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR (Miss RICE of New York). Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. By requiring the EPA to develop a national risk communication strategy surrounding PFAS, the Federal Government will be better able to educate Americans and inform the public about the danger of PFAS chemicals.

Experts believe that 99 percent of Americans have some level of PFAS in their blood, and most of them don't even know it.

I thank the gentleman for his strong leadership in addressing the PFAS crisis head-on and thank him for offering this amendment.

Incorporating this amendment will make the PFAS Action Act stronger and communicate the urgency to more people. I am proud to support this amendment and urge all of my colleagues to support it as well.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, we support the amendment because we think it is important to have a national risk communication strategy.

We get troubled and we get confused in this debate when we are going to declare 7,866 chemicals toxic without doing the basic science. Hopefully, as we move this forward, I believe we are going to find some of the 7,866 that are safe, so when we do a risk advisory, we are going to be able to say: These are bad; these are okay.

What the bill does is just say they are all bad, and we don't have any science to prove that. I think we are close on PFOA, and we are close to that on PFOS.

Again, we could have moved in a bipartisan manner to address those. We didn't do that. But we would like, as the EPA considers this and informing the public, that they look at hazard identification, exposure assessment, and a risk characterization.

So risk is a combination of time and exposure over a period of time. You can talk to toxicologists. That is what they do. That was the glue that held the TSCA bill together was the focus on using science.

Again, as you have heard tonight and you will hear tomorrow, our problem is that we are rushing legislation before we are allowing the science to truly evaluate this, and we are classifying, currently, all 7,866 as hazardous, which I don't believe they are.

We have never, in the history of this Republic, under the Superfund Act, legislatively banned a chemical. We have always allowed scientific process.

So I think the amendment is helpful in that it helps us be able to clarify when we do the scientific analysis what is safe, what is not.

Informing the public is good. Transparency is great. We support the amendment. We appreciate the gentleman bringing it forward.

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

□ 2045

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. PAPPAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam 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:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. ____ CLEAN WATER ACT EFFLUENT STANDARDS, PRETREATMENT STANDARDS, AND WATER QUALITY CRITERIA FOR PFAS.

(a) REVIEW AND REGULATION OF SUBSTANCES AND SOURCES.—

(1) REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable, but not later than September 30, 2021, and biennially thereafter, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register a plan under subsection (m) of section 304 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1314) that contains the results of a review, conducted in accordance with such section, of the introduction or discharge of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances from classes and categories of point sources (other than publicly owned treatment works).

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The Administrator shall include in each plan published pursuant to subparagraph (A)—

(i) information on potential introduction or discharges of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances;

(ii) any information gaps on such introduction or discharges and the process by which the Administrator will address such gaps;

(iii) for each measurable perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substance that is not on the list of toxic pollutants described in section 307(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, a determination, in accordance with the requirements of such section, whether or not to add the substance to such list; and

(iv) a determination, in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, whether or not to establish effluent limitations and pretreatment standards for the introduction or discharge of each substance described in clause (iii) that the Administrator determines under such clause not to add to such list and for which the Administrator has not developed such limitations or standards.

(2) REGULATION.—Based on the results of each review conducted under paragraph (1) and in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Administrator shall—

(A) in accordance with the plan published under paragraph (1), as soon as practicable—

(i) for each measurable perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substance that the Administrator determines under paragraph (1)(B)(iii) to add to the list of toxic pollutants described in section 307(a) of such Act, initiate the process for adding the substance to such list; and

(ii) for each measurable perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substance that the Administrator determines under paragraph (1)(B)(iv) to establish effluent limitations and pretreatment standards, establish such effluent limitations and pretreatment standards (which limitations and standards may be established by substance or by class or category of substances); and

(B) not later than 2 years after the date on which each plan is published under paragraph (1), publish human health water quality criteria for measurable perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances and classes and categories of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances for which the Administrator has not published such criteria.

(b) DEADLINES FOR COVERED PERFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES.—

(1) WATER QUALITY CRITERIA.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register human health water quality criteria for each covered perfluoroalkyl substance.

(2) EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND PRETREATMENT STANDARDS FOR PRIORITY INDUSTRY CATEGORIES.—As soon as practicable, but not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register a final rule establishing, for each priority industry category, effluent limitations and pretreatment standards for the introduction or discharge of each covered perfluoroalkyl substance.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—The Administrator shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate of each publication made under this section.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION ASSISTANCE FOR PUBLICLY OWNED TREATMENT WORKS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall award grants, in amounts not to exceed \$100,000, to owners and operators of publicly owned treatment works, to be used for the implementation of a pretreatment standard developed by the Administrator for a perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out this subsection \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, to remain available until expended.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) COVERED PERFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCE.—The term “covered perfluoroalkyl substance” means perfluorooctanoic acid, perfluorooctane sulfonic acid, or a salt associated with perfluorooctanoic acid or perfluorooctane sulfonic acid.

(3) EFFLUENT LIMITATION.—The term “effluent limitation” means an effluent limitation under section 301(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1311).

(4) INTRODUCTION.—The term “introduction” means the introduction of pollutants into treatment works, as described in section 307(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1317).

(5) MEASURABLE.—The term “measurable” means, with respect to a chemical substance or class or category of chemical substances, capable of being measured using—

(A) test procedures established under section 304(h) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1314);

(B) applicable protocols and methodologies required pursuant to section 4(a) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2603); or

(C) any other analytical method developed by the Administrator for detecting pollutants, as such term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1362).

(6) PRETREATMENT STANDARD.—The term “pretreatment standard” means a pretreatment standard under section 307(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1317).

(7) PRIORITY INDUSTRY CATEGORY.—The term “priority industry category” means the following point source categories:

(A) Organic chemicals, plastics, and synthetic fibers, as identified in part 414 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

(B) Pulp, paper, and paperboard, as identified in part 430 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

(C) Textile mills, as identified in part 410 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

(8) TREATMENT WORKS.—The term “treatment works” has the meaning given that term in section 212 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1292).

(9) WATER QUALITY CRITERIA.—The term “water quality criteria” means criteria for water quality under section 304(a)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1314).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

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

Madam Chair, for decades, Americans have been exposed to toxic PFAS chemicals and there are not sufficient protections in place to safeguard our communities, our drinking water, and our environment. Americans are getting sick from these forever chemicals that are known to cause cancer, immune disorders, and thyroid problems, among other serious health conditions.

I represent so many tireless advocates and concerned citizens in New Hampshire who have identified this threat in their own communities and raised our collective consciousness about the dangers of PFAS.

I have heard about PFAS from too many servicemembers and their families who were exposed to high concentrations in drinking water on a base.

I have heard about it from residents who have had their private wells contaminated by a manufacturing plant.

I have heard about it from families who live near a landfill where PFAS-laden waste was dumped, an area that also has some of the Nation’s highest cancer rates.

We must recognize that we are only having this conversation today because of advocates like them across the country who have sounded the alarm. It is about time we implement policies that address the widespread contamination that exists in every one of our districts.

We would be negligent if we fail to do so.

I am offering an important, bipartisan amendment to this legislation that is based on a bill that I have filed, the Clean Water Standards for PFAS Act. If we want to truly protect the public from PFAS, we must stop pollution which continues today. We must prevent industry and other polluters from dumping PFAS into rivers, streams, and other bodies of water, and further contaminating the environment.

This amendment calls on the EPA to set and enforce proactive limits for PFAS discharge. It also requires EPA to issue pretreatment standards for polluters who discharge PFAS directly to water treatment facilities. This amendment also creates a grant program to provide assistance to treatment facilities, ensuring that municipalities have the resources to meet

these requirements that will help keep our communities safe.

My constituents deserve clean water. There is nothing more important than the health and safety of our communities, and we must work together to stop PFAS from getting into the environment and poisoning our drinking water.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment. And I want to thank all of those who have stepped forward to address this issue, including the bipartisan Congressional PFAS Task Force as well as the coleads of this particular amendment, Representatives ROUDA, DELGADO, FITZPATRICK, KUSTER, CISNEROS, and KILDEE.

I really appreciate the discussion here today. It is about time that we go beyond action plans and actually implement some policies that are going to affect people’s lives in a positive manner back home. I urge adoption of this amendment and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chair, I understand this reflects an effort to improve this proposal from when we considered it under the National Defense Authorization Act, but I don’t know what has changed or what it means since there has been no hearing or a markup record for me to consult to better appreciate this proposal or its impacts.

There are 7,866 per- and polyfluorinated compounds listed on EPA’s PFAS master list, an uninformed policy could carry massive unintended consequences on the liability and regulatory forms.

As I read it, this amendment continues an antiscience mindset that seeks to regulate first, without adequate knowledge or understanding of the per- and polyfluorinated compound situation and then say, okay, we will figure it out later.

This amendment covers PFAS substances that may not necessarily be what chemicals the industry is currently using, and simultaneously mandates creating new standards for every measurable PFAS chemical substance. This means EPA will be forced to divert resources to chase those PFAS that are no longer in use and may not be necessary.

The amendment requires EPA to regulate PFAS compounds through the Clean Water Act without validated analytical methods for detection in wastewater; without established science or human and environmental impacts to determine appropriate and

legally, scientifically defensible standards; and without an understanding of how best to treat and remove pollutants from wastewater, even if there was a validated method for detection.

The deadline in this amendment will likely make EPA's work to implement it vulnerable to a legal challenge, delaying any real benefit that the proponents want from it, and enriching the trial bar in the process.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS).

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam 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:

At the end of the committee print, add the following new section:

SEC. 19. ASSISTANCE TO TERRITORIES FOR ADDRESSING EMERGING CONTAMINANTS, WITH A FOCUS ON PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES.

Section 1452(t) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(2) ASSISTANCE TO TERRITORIES.—Of the amounts made available under this subsection, the Administrator may use funds to provide grants to the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and Guam for the purpose of addressing emerging contaminants, with a focus on perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment.

This amendment is simply a correction. It would make the United States territories eligible for additional Safe Drinking Water Act funding authorized to address emerging contaminants like PFAS.

Today, we are discussing PFAS, toxic chemicals that have posed adverse public health risks and have persisted because they could not break down. Their carbon fluoride bond is the strongest

bond in nature, so PFAS contamination is continuing to be found all across the country: in the water, air, and soil. It has been extraordinarily widespread.

EPA has acknowledged that millions of people in this country receive drinking water with PFAS over the health advisory limit, and the United States territories have been no exception to this.

It has been a serious issue for communities that have been impacted, and more and more communities will be known to be impacted. A lot of those who have detected it are taking actions, which are expensive, to remove it from the drinking water.

That is why this bill, as reported out of the Energy and Commerce Committee and under the recent NDAA, provides new grant funding to assist water utilities struggling with this issue, contamination in the drinking water and others.

However, as currently written, this grant funding has only been made available to States through the Drinking Water Act's State Revolving Fund program, which does include the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, as States, but not other U.S. territories, which are generally provided with a separate reservation of overall program funding annually.

My amendment simply corrects this new program to permit the EPA to provide such grants to these American territories, including my district in the U.S. Virgin Islands, to assist their water utilities with PFAS treatment if it is found.

These territories have some of the most severe needs for Federal assistance in the area of clean water and drinking water-related infrastructure, and these needs have historically tended to be woefully underfunded.

They often have received less on a per capita basis than a number of similarly situated States. If Congress is to assist American communities with the removal of toxic PFAS from drinking water, it is only fair to include all American territories as eligible to receive this assistance.

I urge approval of my amendment as simply a matter of fairness. I would also take this opportunity to gently remind my colleagues to please consider Americans in territories in developing legislation intended to assist all Americans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Chair, in closing, I would like to just acknowledge to the Chair the support of the Energy and Commerce Committee, particularly my good friend, Mr. TONKO from New York, as well as Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL, for intro-

ducing this legislation and all of the staff that has worked on this.

I urge adoption of this amendment as part of fairness to all Americans who face this issue, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chair, we all support the territories having funding to address their drinking water needs. The biggest concern is, the territories really operate from a different system because they don't have the loan program. They don't really have the money to pay back the loan program. So there is a system by which grant funding is awarded to the territories to make up this need.

So the concern is that the amendment may disenfranchise the States from taking from the revolving fund program, when the territories, historically, because they don't use that, they get more grant money. So that is why we oppose it. We think it is going to impact the States' ability to apply for these funds, and we think that the territories have a different method of grant funding to meet their qualities and needs.

I request a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. BRINDISI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. BRINDISI. Madam 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:

Amend section 15(a) to read as follows:

(a) LISTING.—

(1) INITIAL LISTING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue a final rule adding perfluorooctanoic acid and its salts, and perfluorooctanesulfonic acid and its salts, to the list of hazardous air pollutants under section 112(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(b)).

(2) ADDITIONAL LISTINGS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall determine whether to issue, in accordance with section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412), any final rules adding perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances, other than those perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances listed pursuant to paragraph (1), to the list of hazardous air pollutants under section 112(b) of such Act.

In section 15(b), strike "the final rule" and insert "any final rule".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRINDISI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Madam Chair, I want to thank my colleagues from across the aisle, Mr. REED from New York and Mr. GALLAGHER from Wisconsin, for their support of this amendment.

Support for clean air and protecting public health are not Democratic or Republican values. They are American values, and I am glad to work with my colleagues on this commonsense amendment.

My amendment is straightforward. First, it requires immediate action on the most dangerous types of PFAS, including PFOA, which has been found at elevated levels in drinking water in many communities, including Hoosick Falls in upstate New York.

For these obsolete chemistries, EPA would be required to swiftly list these and hazardous air pollutants under the Clean Air Act. While we take action on the chemicals of greatest concern, we will also give the EPA time for a thoughtful, science-based process that acknowledges the differences across PFAS chemicals.

Our amendment will give the EPA 5 years to establish risk-based standards that protect human health and the environment for the many other types of PFAS chemicals.

This will bring the Clean Air Act provisions into line with the CERCLA provisions in this bill. We need to be thoughtful in this process. Protecting public health will make sure that our decisions are informed by the best science available.

This amendment is a commonsense compromise that strikes that balance. I, again, thank Congresswoman DINGELL and Chairman PALLONE, as well as Chairman TONKO for their work on this important legislation, and their willingness to work with me on our amendment.

I thank Congresswoman STEVENS for her work raising the issue of air contamination when it comes to PFAS chemicals.

I urge adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2100

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chairman, I again urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good attempt to try to bring some sense to this bill, and I appreciate my colleague's attempt.

What the amendment does is it really creates unachievable expectations. There are a lot of problems with the amendment, but one is that you are

asking for a final rule within 100 days, especially if it is not proposed, which is going to set up a deadline suit.

I have dealt with deadline suits. You got a deadline, and they can't meet it, then the agency gets sued.

Why do we pay utilities to hold nuclear waste? Because they have enacted a deadline suit because we say we are going to take their waste, the Federal Government. We didn't take their waste, and now we have to pay the utilities to hold the waste that we were supposed to take.

That is one issue that I have a concern.

Mr. Chairman, 7,866 compounds, Clean Air Act aspects, and you are going to have, as I used numerous times during the National Defense Authorization Act debate, as I have used on the rule debate, these 7,866 different aspects of PFAS we are coming to the floor not using science, not using due diligence, but using political science to say ban it.

Our argument has always been to let's do the science. The problem is, science takes a long time, and the political emotion of this debate just can't wait.

We have addressed a lot of these concerns everybody raised throughout the night through the enacted National Defense Authorization Act and by the omnibus bill. But if you look at the F-16 and the component parts, and we could have an automobile in the new electric vehicle era, new battery technology, medical devices, they are all going to have some type of per- or polyfluorinated compounds.

This amendment with the bill really is a de facto ban on the use of all per- and polyfluorinated compounds, or it is going to scare the producers of this, that they don't want to get caught in a litigation trap, so they are just not going to produce it.

We have talked about firefighting foam quite a bit tonight. It is really a great debate because we do think there is some bipartisan nature that we can get to on that chemical.

If you are in a nuclear sub underneath the Arctic icecap and a fire happens on the sub, do you want the second-best firefighting foam? I mean, really, do you? The second-best means it takes more time, and it takes more water. I don't think you do. But this is where we stand.

The amendment creates both an unrealistic burden and a litigation problem, and the EPA cannot possibly fulfill our requirement to review all PFAS for inclusion in the clean air policy in 5 years. We only have 29 methods of determining per- and polyfluorinated compounds right now, just 29. There are 7,866, and the amendment says to do it in 5 years.

I wish it could be done. I have been here a long time. Government moves slowly. When we throw all these sites into the Superfund, people are going to be hollering about it for 40 years. I read the list earlier of all these Superfund

sites that haven't been remediated. Now, we are just going to expand that. Pull up the map of the country and all those red States, either that is going to be where all the Superfund sites are or that is where all the class action lawsuits are going to be filed in those States to take down those companies that are providing either safe medical devices or equipment for our career and best airplanes and technologies.

Again, I want to applaud my colleague. I think this is something we could have done. We actually were talking about this in a compromise provision. We couldn't get there because of other issues. It is a valiant attempt. My friend is in the majority, and it is going to pass. Unfortunately, the Senate is not going to take up this bill, and the President already has a veto message on the bill. So it will be tied up for the next Congress, and I wish the gentleman luck.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GOLDEN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRINDISI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. BRINDISI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an amendment as the designee of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KIM).

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 36, line 12, insert “, after providing an opportunity for public comment,” after “the Administrator”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRINDISI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, Congressman KIM, for writing this amendment, and I rise on his behalf to offer it tonight.

This amendment is straightforward. It ensures that the list of technologies that are most effective in removing PFAS from drinking water are made public and available for public comment prior to final publication. This will allow healthy debate and discussion by scientific experts, universities, industry, and the public to help understand the most effective means of cleanup. By allowing the public to see this information, we can help ensure the EPA is putting our best ideas and methods toward cleaning up these chemicals and making our drinking water safe.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but I do not plan to object to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to having EPA obtaining technical input on technologies that are effective in removing PFAS from drinking water. I am concerned how formal a process the amendment seeks to impose. I was going to ask questions of Mr. KIM or Mr. PALLONE. They are not here, and that is fine.

The amendment only calls for public comment, but a full-blown notice and opportunity for public comment is an enormously expensive and time-consuming process for any agency, including the EPA. If the focus of the bill is to meet the timelines it imposes and not hold up grantmaking for a public comment process to play out, I think this amendment needs to be rethought a bit to get at the author's intent without tripping up EPA from executing the program.

I will not oppose this amendment because I know there are larger problems with this bill that will prevent it from becoming law, but I want to highlight that this is an acceptable amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. AXNE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRINDISI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. GOLDEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam 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 47, after line 15, insert the following new subsection (and redesignate the subsequent subsection accordingly):

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Administrator, in consultation with the head of the U.S. Fire Administration, shall submit to Congress a report on the effectiveness of the guidance issued under subsection (a). Such report shall include recommendations for congressional actions that the Administrator determines appropriate to assist efforts to reduce exposure to PFAS by firefighters and the other persons described in subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. GOLDEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act of 2019.

First, I thank Chairman PALLONE, Congresswoman DINGELL, and the Energy and Commerce Committee for bringing this bill to the floor today. We all know that PFAS contamination is a national issue that has devastated communities across the country.

As of October 2019, the Maine Department of Environmental Protection has more than 30,000 records for PFAS at 244 locations across the State of Maine. In my district, areas surrounding the former Loring Air Force Base, Houlton International Airport, Bangor International Airport, the Navy VLF Radio Station in Cutler, and the Bog Brook military training site in Gilead are known to be contaminated with PFAS compounds.

Groundwater, surface water, soil, and sediment samples collected from these sites identified the presence of these chemicals, posing a major risk to public health and safety.

We also know that emergency response teams are frequently exposed to PFAS in firefighting foams as they work to keep communities safe. Given my State still relies on not only career firefighters but a tremendous amount of volunteer firefighters, the threat of PFAS contamination and the resulting health risks is something I take seriously.

That is why I am pleased to see that the bill we are debating today includes a provision that would require the EPA Administrator, with the U.S. Fire Administration, to issue guidance on minimizing the use of firefighting foam and related equipment containing any PFAS by firefighters and other first responders.

However, I think it is important for Congress and the public to know just how effective this provision will be on the long-term health of our first responders. That is why I am offering an amendment that would require the EPA Administrator, in consultation with the U.S. Fire Administration, to brief Congress on the effectiveness of the guidance they are providing, to include recommendations for congressional actions that the Administrator determines appropriate to assist efforts to reduce exposure to PFAS by firefighters and other first responders.

This is a commonsense amendment to ensure that the Federal Government follows through on its commitment to protect the men and women who enter into harm's way to keep our communities safe.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BRINDISI). The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Maine's problem with the airports. Fortunately, we have exempted airports from Superfund liability, and there is not going to be an ability for the gentleman's sites to get cleaned up.

Other than that, based upon this amendment, we think the basic amendment is unnecessary. There is no objection to having EPA report annually on firefighter foam guidance. This amendment, though, does not have an end to annual reporting, and firefighting foam with fluorine is supposed to be phased out in 3 years under the military specs. Maybe moving forward, there could be a deadline.

In addition, the amendment asks for recommendations to Congress to reduce exposure to PFAS and firefighting foam. This assumes that any remaining foam is hazardous, and meaningful safe is not examined, only exposure, a very nonscientific way to address the problem.

Plus, I would prefer that there be some discussion, considering who is writing the report. The foam effect in this is discussed. Let's not add incomplete reporting. An underlying bill places enough unnecessary burdens on the public.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. GOLDEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2115

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MRS. AXNE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mrs. AXNE. 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 37, line 4, strike "2021" and insert "2024".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Iowa.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MRS. AXNE

Mrs. AXNE. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT TO RULES COMMITTEE PRINT 116-45

OFFERED BY MRS. AXNE OF IOWA

The amendment is modified to read as follows:

Page 37, beginning on line 1, amend subsection (e) to read as follows:

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not more than—

“(A) \$125,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021; and

“(B) \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2024.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1), \$25,000,000 are authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021 for grants under subsection (a) to pay for capital costs associated with the implementation of eligible treatment technologies during the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on the date of enactment of this section.

Mrs. AXNE (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the original request of the gentlewoman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

The gentlewoman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. AXNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard from many parents in my district worried about PFAS contamination in their drinking water. PFAS are manmade chemicals that can pose serious health risks and are of great concern to my constituents.

In large quantities, PFAS are dangerous and deadly to human health, and these forever chemicals are going to take a lot of work and innovation to clean up. These chemicals have been linked to cancer, effects on the immune system, and impaired child development.

While PFAS chemicals have not been found in the water supply in my district, there is a known contamination site. Our community has stepped up and is working together through a PFAS Working Group to address this contamination and conduct further testing, but it is past time that the Federal Government steps in, stops the production of these dangerous chemicals, requires cleanup, and provides resources to ensure that our communities aren't left to fight this alone.

Our public water utilities provide a critical service to our communities by ensuring families have safe and clean drinking water. However, without proper support, many water utilities won't be able to afford the necessary upgrades or would be forced to put the costs back on the backs of their community.

I am glad that this legislation creates a grant program to provide funding for water utilities to upgrade their drinking water systems in order to effectively remove PFAS. The PFAS Infrastructure Grant Program will ensure utilities have the resources they

need to protect our water systems without burdening the communities they serve with an unaffordable expense.

However, as the bill is written now, the PFAS Infrastructure Grant Program would only be authorized for 2 years. Our communities need more flexibility and time when deciding the best way to upgrade their water infrastructure and to combat PFAS.

My amendment would extend the PFAS Infrastructure Grant Program for an additional 3 years, allowing water utilities time to properly address their needs, test their water, and request funding, as necessary.

Additionally, my amendment would increase the funding available by \$300 million over that 3-year period. By more than doubling the current authorized amount, my amendment would ensure there are enough funds available so utilities can afford these necessary upgrades without negatively impacting the critical work that they do.

My State of Iowa also has many rural drinking water systems that don't have the scale to afford massive infrastructure costs. We see, time and time again, that smaller water systems are unable to remove hazardous and dangerous materials simply because of cost barriers. I am pleased that the underlying bill prioritizes small drinking water systems, and my amendment ensures the program has enough funding so no community is left behind.

This legislation is an important step to ensure Iowa families have access to safe drinking water without these harmful PFAS chemicals. My amendment strengthens the PFAS Infrastructure Grant Program, and I urge a “yes” vote.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. AXNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support of the amendment. I am glad there is bipartisan support to ensure that our communities have the drinking water and resources they need to protect that.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague. I rose in opposition, just so she understands that I will be speaking in opposition to the amendment. I appreciate the kind words.

Mr. Chair, I wish she would have been here when the Rice amendment was on the floor, which has been passed and added to the bill, which would now allow the rich communities that have already paid for their modifications at great expense to be able to dip back into these funds at the expense of rural communities. That was an amendment we passed earlier.

Mr. Chair, under this legislation, EPA is supposed to issue a national primary drinking water standard for PFAS, but PFOA and PFOS at a minimum. Once this is done, communities that are disadvantaged—and I am from rural Illinois, 33 counties—one, assistance for installing technology are eligible for the drinking water State-revolving loan programs.

This amendment creates a double-dipping opportunity for communities when the main focus of the Safe Drinking Water Act State revolving fund is to help struggling systems meet the mandate it imposes to protect public health.

More practically, because of budget allocations that the House appropriators are supposed to operate under, increased capitalization grants will suffer. Money, to the tune of \$75 million, will be diverted to this particular PFAS grant program at the expense of the State revolving fund.

Communities, especially rural communities, not only with PFAS but other compliance and health problems as well, could and will likely be a loser, so that is why I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to vote “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL) having assumed the chair, Mr. BRINDISI, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 535) to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, had come to no resolution thereon.

IMPEACHMENT HOLD

(Mr. SPANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, if there was any doubt that last month's impeachment vote was purely political, there shouldn't be now.

Throughout the partisan impeachment inquiry, we were told that it was critical to move quickly because the threat of waiting was too great. The Schiff report even said: “We cannot wait.”

In the interest of speed, any hope of fairness was discarded. Rules were broken. Democrats couldn't wait on a minority hearing, breaking House rules

that afforded us that right. Democrats couldn't wait on the courts to obtain additional testimony. But Speaker PELOSI continues to hold the articles from the Senate in an attempt to dictate the terms of the trial to Leader MCCONNELL.

The Constitution grants the Senate the sole power to try all impeachments, not the Speaker.

Democrats voted to impeach the President for abuse of power and claim he is a threat to the Constitution, but look at what you are doing. You are trying to take the Senate's constitutional power for your own political gain.

Follow the Constitution you spoke so much about. Transmit the articles to the Senate so that they can undertake their constitutional responsibility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRINDISI). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

IN CELEBRATION OF GEORGE STEVENS' 100TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I rise to celebrate a dear man in northern California from the town of Palo Cedro in Shasta County. George Stevens celebrated his 100th birthday on December 28.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of being able to stop by and spend time with George and his family at the event at the Palo Cedro Community Center, to celebrate with him and recognize, also, his service to our country, which is pretty amazing.

George is a Pearl Harbor survivor. He was there in the Army at the base there during the Pearl Harbor attack. Later, if that wasn't enough, he ended up being deployed to Europe, where he was at the Normandy invasion later on in 1944. And if that wasn't enough, a few months later in the winter, he fought at the Battle of the Bulge.

None of us would have the freedom we have if it weren't for people like George and all of his comrades who were there in that war preserving freedom for us and so many others with that sacrifice.

He is a true patriot, a great American, and he is a guy that still drives and does his home repairs around his place there in Palo Cedro.

Mr. Speaker, we are really proud of George and wish him a happy birthday. I am glad I got to spend time with him and his family.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 34 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, consistent with the statement that was

just made about BRIAN FITZPATRICK, I will be missing tomorrow's votes. If I were here, I would vote "no." There is too much good that is being done with the PFAS, and I would vote "no."

But I will be attending the funeral of a former Member of Congress, a great patriot, a friend, just a wonderful person, Michael Fitzpatrick, and it was an honor to serve with him in this body.

Obviously, we have had a lot of discussion about Iran, Soleimani, his death, the death of so many that he caused, and his role in being head of the IRGC, so I thought it would be helpful if we learned a little more for those who haven't.

It helps, I found, profoundly, if people know what they are talking about, and it seems there has been a whole lot of talking and not a lot of knowledge about what is going on with Iran.

Many of us remember, and I sure remember because I was in the Army at Fort Benning at the time, when our Embassy in Tehran was attacked initially, it was said by the Iranian leaders that the students attacked the Embassy; and after days of President Carter doing nothing but begging for them to let our people go, they realized that we were not going to do anything, and so they began to say: We have the hostages.

I always thought at the time, paying close attention to the news back in those days, that by saying the students did this that the Iranian leaders were giving themselves a back door if we had had a President who had put his foot down and said: Either you get them released, or we are going to come get them released ourselves; and if they are harmed, Iran will pay heavily.

I felt that was probably where they would say: Hey, we got them from the students. Here they are.

But that was the first clue after Vietnam that we were still a paper tiger. That is the way we were portrayed around the world. That is what we in the Army heard back in those days: Gee, all you have to do is drag out confrontation like Vietnam and they will turn tail and run.

That appeared to be consistent with us doing nothing about our Embassy, which, under international law, is American soil. It is American property. It is American housing. It was attacked, and we didn't do anything about it for a lengthy time, which sent the message to the new leader in Iran, the Ayatollah Khomeini, that we really were paper tigers. We were toothless. There was no power, no courage, and it encouraged them.

□ 2130

In fact, there was one effort at a rescue but, unfortunately, the military's hands were tied by people at the top.

I was told by a friend in the Army back at the time that the White House was the one that had them cut back the number of helicopters that would go into the desert across, around 500 miles or so of desert, with turbine en-

gines in the helicopters. And they knew, as my friend, General Boykin has confirmed, they had to get six to the landing area. Otherwise, it was an abort. And when it was clear only 5 were going to make it, that the mission was aborted.

The helicopter pilot may have gotten vertigo. The helicopter tilted. The blade went through a C-130 that was there to equip them for the trip in to rescue our hostages, and Americans were killed and left there in the desert at the staging area.

If there had been an adequate number of helicopters allowed to go in, they would have had sufficient number of six or more to make it. But the number going in was cut back, I was told, by the White House. They didn't want it to look like an invasion.

I am proud we have got a President that is not worried about it. I mean, I have asked him about this before, and he is more concerned about protecting our American treasure, our American military members; and he wants to commit whatever our military needs to get the job done. That is a far cry from where we were in the late 1970s.

In fact, I do recall President Carter, he had turned his back on the Shah. It didn't sound like the Shah was a great person, a great humanitarian at all, but at least Iran and the area were not at war with us at that time.

But when President Carter turned his back on the Shah, it opened the door for him to be overthrown. Apparently, people in the Carter White House did not give adequate thought to what happens when the Shah is gone, because what happened was the Ayatollah Khomeini.

And President Carter, as I recall, welcomed the Ayatollah Khomeini back in charge of Iran—he had not been in charge before—but welcomed him back to Iran, and proclaimed he was a man of peace. It could not have been a more ignorant welcome to the man that would start Iran on the course to be the greatest source of terrorism in the world.

So thank you very much to the Carter administration. Great job. You brought in, allowed in people who have continued to kill Americans at a rate greater than anybody else.

They have helped Afghanistan. That was a shock when we found that out. They have helped Sunnis, they have helped Shia. And normally, that doesn't happen, but they are so dedicated to destroying the Great Satan, America, in their view, and destroying the Little Satan, Israel, that we have to take them seriously. Too many Americans have been killed as a result of ignorance or optimism unjustified.

But this is a study done from the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, a very good study done, and it gives us a lot of information about Iran. It points out that Iranian military action, often working through proxies, uses terrorist tactics; has led to the death of well over 1,000 American soldiers in Iraq and

Afghanistan over the last decade and a half.

They point out that the explosively formed penetrators—a lot of people are familiar with the IEDs, but these are EFPs, explosively formed penetrators, a shaped charge designed to penetrate armor—that these are often camouflaged as rocks and were identical to those employed by Hezbollah against Israeli forces.

In 2006, the British Telegraph revealed that three Iranian factories were mass producing the roadside EFP bombs used to kill soldiers in Iraq.

In 2007, American troops discovered over 100 Austrian-made Steyr HS .50, 50-caliber sniper rifles, in Iraq. They can pierce all in-service body armor from up to a mile and penetrate U.S. armored Humvee troop carriers.

I fired a 50-caliber sniper rifle at Quantico. It is amazing how powerful they are.

But, unfortunately, they were found in Iraq, and they had apparently come from an Austrian manufacturer, but they were bought by Iran, and supplied by Iran, apparently, to Iraq to help kill American soldiers.

Iran also paid Taliban fighters \$1,000 for each U.S. soldier they killed in Afghanistan. In fact, the *Sunni Times* reported that a Taliban operative received \$18,000 from an Iranian firm in Kabul as reward for an attack in 2010 that killed several Afghan government troops and destroyed an American armored vehicle.

Iranian President Rouhani's so-called moderation, was displayed when he appointed Brigadier General Hossein Dehghan to be minister of defense. He had played a key role in the October 1983 suicide bomb attacks in Beirut, in which 241 U.S. Marines and 58 French paratroopers were killed.

And of course, Dehghan, apparently was replaced previously, in 1998 with a guy named Soleimani, who is with us perhaps in spirit only now, thanks to our current President and the ability of our United States military.

Anti-Americanism helped fuel the 1979 Islamic revolution in Iran, a violent anti-American doctrine that challenges any role for America in the Middle East, it has been, and remains the central focus of Iranian foreign policy.

Since the revolution, Iran has waged and continues to wage war against the United States and its allies. Unfortunately, though, Iran has been at war with the United States for 40 years now, since 1979, for sure—well, really, since the Ayatollah took over and President Carter welcomed him as a man of peace. He has not been a man of peace. He has been at war with the United States.

The report points out the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, IRGC—people hear that term quite a bit, but that was founded by Ayatollah Khomeini shortly after the overthrow of the Shah at the onset of the Islamic Revolution in 1978–79.

Iran's RGC has morphed from its initial, mainly ideological, composition

into a particularly powerful organ of Iran's political system, the upper echelons of which tend to be drawn from the ranks of the IRGC. They are developing an increasing lethal system such as advanced naval mines, coastal defense, anti-ship cruise and ballistic missiles and attack craft.

The IRGC boasts a paramilitary unit comprised of 10 to 20,000 individuals known as the Quds Force. That was what Soleimani commanded and was using strategically, killing Americans, as many as he could.

The strategic objective of the IRGC-QF is to subvert Iran's enemies and export the Iranian Revolution, a goal it attains largely by facilitating the delivery of weapons to pro-Iranian factions in Lebanon, Iraq, Syria, Persian Gulf States, Gaza, the West Bank, Afghanistan, and central Asia.

In 2007, the Treasury Department designated IRGC-QF as a terrorism-supporting entity.

The report is quite extensive. It goes on to point out many of the efforts, successful efforts to kill Americans, talking about the Khobar Towers in 1996 and many other attacks.

But it points out that in 1998, Major General Qasem Soleimani has led the IRGC-QF, in which time he has created branches focused on intelligence, finance, politics, sabotage and special operations. With a direct independent channel to Khomeini, Soleimani has successfully sought the assassination of political rivals, armed terrorist proxies, and directed a network of insurgent groups in Iraq that killed over 1,000 Americans. And that is just in Iraq. But we know more regarding what they have done in Afghanistan, in Lebanon, in Syria.

Mr. Speaker, I see I am joined by my friend, who has served his country honorably and well and made his way up to the rank of general. He knows a great deal about war in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for taking the time to discuss this with the American people and allowing me to be part of it. I saw the gentleman and I didn't want him to have to carry the freight alone.

There was a lot to be said today, and probably neither he nor I got to say everything we wanted to say about the proceedings over the last couple of weeks. And it frustrates me that our colleagues, right here in the House of the Congress will say, America assassinated General Soleimani.

You can put a general's rank on a puppy dog, or a rabbit, or you name it, on a car or a truck. This guy is a terrorist, no matter what he is wearing. He is a terrorist from a terrorist state, and that is his claim to fame. That is who he is. Responsible for the deaths of hundreds, if not thousands of Americans, and certainly responsible for the deaths and maiming of thousands of Americans.

And when they say, well, this President is starting a war. I wonder to myself, my goodness, where have you been for the last 40 years? Since 1979, right?

The gentleman knows this. LOUIE GOHMERT knows this, right?

We were all present and watched when Iran punched America in the face 40 years ago. It hasn't stopped.

So finally, after 40 years of appeasement—and the gentleman knows this well, because he is a great student of history.

Appeasement didn't work in World War II, right? And the results, the results of appeasement, leading up to World War II, was the untold deaths and untimely deaths and miserable suffering deaths of millions of people across Europe because of appeasement.

Yet, we have tried it with Iran for 40 years. Iran is playing long ball. People say, well, they were complying with the JCPOA and we let them out of it. Well, of course they were complying. There was nothing in it that stopped them from doing everything they wanted to do, which was get to a nuclear armed program where their ballistic missile program caught up to it, right?

So for 10 years all they had to do is not let us inspect their military sites, because we didn't demand or require that in the deal. They could keep on doing whatever they are doing there. Perfect their ballistic missile capabilities so they can deliver the payload to Israel or the United States.

Oh, and in 10 years we will have nothing to say about it because we approved all of this. And then we have a terrorist nation that uses terrorism as statecraft with a nuclear missile.

What is our leverage then? We have none, right? We have got another North Korea, is what we have.

So it befuddles me that—I am sure our well-meaning colleagues on the other side think that this is going to work. Einstein, of course, he described the definition of insanity; it is doing the same thing over and over and over again and expecting a different outcome.

Appeasement is dangerous. It is provocative. It encourages despots to be despots. And so far, for 40 years, that is what we have watched.

And finally, the President gave them warning after warning. They said, well, it wasn't warranted. We didn't have enough intelligence.

There was open source reporting. They told us what they were going to do. Do you remember the 9/11 attacks, where there was open source reporting? And then, after the fact, everybody said, where were the intelligence and law enforcement agencies? Why weren't they talking?

Here, our enemy, who says they are going to kill the Great Satan and the Little Satan—that's what they say, right?

□ 2145

They tell us what they are going to do, yet it is not enough for some of my

colleagues who would have then said: Mr. President, what did you know and when did you know it? And why didn't you do something about it?

You know this, right?

Mr. GOHMERT. In fact, it took me too long to get around to reading Winston Churchill's books on World War II, but he points out that when Hitler first moved into the Sudetenland, they were so disorganized that it was a disaster, that if there had been any resistance put up at all instead of Chamberlain waving a piece of paper that this means peace in our time and we are going to let him go in and move in and take over this land, that if there had been any resistance at all because of all the material breakdowns, mechanical failures—Hitler was furious.

He said any resistance would have caused the defeat of the Germans moving in, and then the Germans would have been humiliated. They would have, in all likelihood, gotten rid of Hitler because he got too ambitious and exposed them to defeat. He would have been gone, and the world would have been spared the tens of millions of people who died as a result of trying to placate the man.

Just supporting what my friend the Congressman is pointing out, it doesn't usually work well, and it hasn't worked well. I know there are people who say all we were doing was giving Iran their money back when we gave them all that money. Money is fungible. We say maybe that specific money enabled them to continue supporting Hezbollah and terrorists who would attack and kill Americans.

Mr. PERRY. You are absolutely right. There is the moral equivalency. If we would just give the criminal, the terrorist, the murderer their money back, it is legitimate. It is theirs. Just disregard the fact that these are killing, murdering terrorists.

There is no moral equivalence. You don't give murdering terrorists money, whether it is theirs or anybody else's. You throw them in jail.

These people should probably legitimately be in The Hague for crimes against humanity, not getting their money back. Among all the things that frustrate me, that is one of them. The other one, of course, is this whole war powers thing.

We have had a year in this Congress, a year of escalation of Iran attacking American targets. In November and December alone, 24 or 25 times, over two dozen times, attacking American targets, but it was never an issue.

You know when else it wasn't an issue? The kind gentleman from Texas, it wasn't an issue for 8 years when almost 4,000 people under the Obama administration, terrorists, rightly were killed by drone strikes. You know what came from the other side of the aisle regarding the War Powers Act? Nothing.

We agree with President Obama on that. We didn't agree on many things as Republicans with President Obama,

but we agreed that eradicating terrorists was a good thing. He did it not in the war zone of Iraq, as approved by this Congress. He did it in Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan, sovereign nations. The United States was going and killing people, including American citizens, outside the combat zone, but not a peep.

Yet today, with Iran watching, with our enemies watching, today is the day that we have to revise the War Powers Act and rein in a wayward President because he is trying to defend the country.

The good Representative from Texas, it has nothing to do with the War Powers Act. This resolution that is never going to go to the President was all about campaign messaging.

It is also messaging our enemies that we are divided in this country. We are not divided. We might be divided in this House, but we are not divided in this country.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I have an article here from January 2017, and the title from The Guardian is "America dropped 26,171 bombs in 2016. What a bloody end to Obama's reign."

I remember specifically because I had been to Libya, but as our Defense Secretary Bob Gates said in a live interview, Libya is not in our vital interest. We didn't have a real dog in that fight is what I am saying.

In fact, Qadhafi did have blood on his hands. He wasn't a good guy. But since the U.S. went into Iraq, he opened his doors and said: You tell me what weapons I can keep. I won't pursue nukes anymore.

He had not been a problem for us from that time forward, yet President Obama, without any authority from here, decides basically to go to war with Libya and with Qadhafi and dropping bombs on them. Why? Because he said NATO needs us to do this.

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. What I have heard on this House floor today is the President is capricious, irresponsible, doesn't have a plan, doesn't have a strategy. If the gentleman will please tell the audience, under the Obama administration and under Secretary Clinton, what was the strategy in Libya?

Mr. GOHMERT. There was no strategy in Libya other than to take out Qadhafi. Just like President Carter turning his back on the Shah and welcoming Ayatollah Khomeini in, when President Obama took out Qadhafi and, yes, he bombed him into oblivion.

We have seen reports that Qadhafi was begging, look, we will just go into exile, and he sent word to the President, if you will just let me leave in peace, I won't ever come back to Libya. Let's leave the country not destroyed, stop the bombing, and I will just leave, but never heard back from Washington.

The problem is that President Obama created a failed state in Libya, and it

has been the source of destabilizing all of North Africa. I don't know if there is any Member of Congress who has been allowed to have 2½ hours with the head of intelligence in Egypt as I have, but Egypt is paying heavily for President Obama's wrongheadedness in taking out Qadhafi and completely destabilizing North Africa.

Mr. PERRY. I wasn't in Congress. I didn't have the honor to be in Congress at that time. Maybe you were, or maybe you were more attuned to things, but I am just wondering, at that time, without a strategy, without a plan, firing on a sovereign nation, killing their leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Actually, President Obama had our forces, NATO forces, but they were American. They bombed his convoy as he was leaving Libya. That allowed the locals—

Mr. PERRY. It facilitated, yes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Then he was assassinated there.

Mr. PERRY. So to make the correction absolutely clear, the United States did not kill the leader of Libya, but we helped facilitate it, in some respects.

Mr. GOHMERT. In criminal terms, he was certainly an accessory. He could not have been killed without President Obama's help.

Mr. PERRY. Because if you were present, did somebody in this House say that this President is reckless, that he is destabilizing the region, that we are assassinating or aiding and abetting the assassination of leaders of foreign countries? Was any of that occurring in this House?

Mr. GOHMERT. Yes, it was, but only on one side of the aisle, and that was this side because we were okay with President Obama defending Americans and American interests. But as Bob Gates said, that did not include Libya. Now, he walked that back some, but it was clear it was not in our vital interests.

What really got me, though, is I am hearing so many people who were here back then. They didn't offer one peep about the illegality of what President Obama was doing. Many of us did, but they didn't say a word. And that was outside our interests.

Killing Soleimani, that was protecting American lives. Going after Qadhafi didn't protect any American lives, and in fact, it has caused total disruption.

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Did we have an Authorization for Use of Military Force in Libya?

Mr. GOHMERT. No.

Mr. PERRY. Was Libya an American combat theater?

Mr. GOHMERT. No.

Mr. PERRY. So when our good colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that this was illegal and unconstitutional, meanwhile knowing that the

Authorization of Use of Military Force, whether we agree with it or not it is in statute right now, in a combat theater where we are authorized to be by that AUMF, by votes of Congress, signed by a President, with an armed combatant who, by the way, as you probably know, is listed on the terrorist list by the United States and others and is not supposed to be out of Iran, his home country.

Mr. GOHMERT. Right.

Mr. PERRY. Yet, he was traveling to Syria and then through Iraq as a combatant and as a terrorist on the terrorist list. What is the point of putting terrorists on the list if you are not going to do anything about the terrorist on the list?

Mr. GOHMERT. Back to Libya momentarily, what President Obama did cost American lives, including at Benghazi. If he doesn't decide unilaterally whether NATO wanted it or not, he decided for America without any consent from Congress to go to war with Libya to take out their leader. It destabilized the country. It put American lives at risk that were not at that time, and it actually cost American lives.

I have an article here, and I have seen on Facebook some comments, but an "Iranian American activist outraged by 'propaganda machine' glorifying Soleimani."

There are so many Iranians who are speaking up now going: What is wrong with you people? This guy was a terrorist. He was killing Iranians. He was killing Americans. He was just merciless.

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. I just happened to notice on CNN about the time of the attack that they had the spokesperson for the Iranian Government during the hostage crisis speaking on CNN. NPR did something very similar. It is not just Iranian Americans who are unhappy with the situation, the propaganda not only by elected officials but by our media that is taking up the side of the enemy that wants to destroy America. It is disgusting.

Mr. GOHMERT. It really is, and it is just a shame that at a time when we ought to come together because, unlike Libya, we do have an interest in protecting American lives. We do have an interest in stopping people who want to destroy America. We ought to be united on this.

This is not a time to come in and try to condemn and belittle the President who did a good thing in taking out a terrorist.

One other thing, I don't remember anybody on the other side of the aisle here that made a peep when the President of the United States, President Obama, gave the order to kill al-Awlaki and his 16-year-old son. So al-Awlaki, he was an American citizen. Why, because his parents came over on

a visa, a student visa, had him, took him back, and taught him to hate America, but he got an American passport. He is an American citizen.

He had worked with some in the Obama administration, apparently worked with some in the Bush administration. But he was really an enemy of America.

President Obama gave the order not to take out a terrorist like Soleimani, who was in the process of stirring up terrorism and killing Americans, but this was an American citizen, and he gave the order to take him out with a drone strike, take out his 16-year-old son. Regardless of what al-Awlaki had done, his son was not a criminal, but President Obama just ordered him taken out and not one word from the other side of the aisle.

I would have thought we could have come together on that: Wait, before we take out American citizens, should we give them a trial or should we just let a President decide?

Now, I was okay with somebody that they had the evidence and that was in the process of being at war with us, but for heaven's sake, the people didn't raise not one peep about that.

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Was there a briefing? Was there a consultation from the President to the leaders of Congress or to Congress? Was there adequate information substantiating the imminence of an attack? Was there any of that, or was there any human outcry that there was none of that and then a rush to judgment on the President's authority to do that from our good friends on the other side of the aisle?

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, the media helped them out. This is just an incredible time, and it is a time when free people ought to be able to come together and unite together in the cause of freedom.

As Natan Sharansky pointed out, people didn't think he and his wife would be getting back together after he was released from prison in Russia because she was more religious and he wasn't, and he said that is ridiculous. I got along with the guy for 12 years in my cell, and the only thing we had in common was a desire for freedom. That ought to bring us together here.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of medical emergency.

Mr. SIMPSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for January 7 through January 10 on account of recovery from knee replacement surgery.

EXPENDITURES BY THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL UNDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 6, 116TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 302(c) of House Resolution 6 (116th Congress) I hereby submit the attached statement "setting forth the aggregate amounts expended by the Office of General Counsel on outside counsel and other experts pursuant to this title on a quarterly basis" for the quarter beginning on October 1, 2019 and ending on December 31, 2019, for publication in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

ZOE LOFGREN,
Chairperson.

AGGREGATE AMOUNT EXPENDED ON OUTSIDE COUNSEL OR OTHER EXPERTS—H. RES. 6

January 1–March 31, 2019	\$0.00
April 1–June 30, 2019	0.00
July 1–September 30, 2019	0.00
October 1–December 31, 2019	0.00
Total	0.00

SENATE BILL REFERRED

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

S. 1611. An ACT to ensure appropriate prioritization, spectrum planning, and inter-agency coordination to support the Internet of Things; to the Committee of Energy and Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H.R. 2476. An ACT to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure nonprofit facilities from terrorist attacks, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on January 6, 2020, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 1424. To amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure the Secretary of Veterans Affairs permits the display of Fallen Soldier Displays in national cemeteries.

H.R. 2385. To permit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a grant program to conduct cemetery research and produce educational materials for the Veterans Legacy Program.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), the House adjourned

until tomorrow, Friday, January 10, 2020, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3455. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting a notice to Congress of the anticipated use of Selected Reserve units that will be ordered to active duty under the authority of Title 10 U.S.C. 12304b, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 12304b(d); Public Law 112-81, Sec. 516(a)(1); (125 Stat. 1396); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3456. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Home Mortgage Disclosure (Regulation C) Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold received December 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3457. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2019-0003; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8607] received January 3, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3458. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2019-0003; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8605] received January 3, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3459. A letter from the Program Specialist, Chief Counsel's Office, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Regulatory Capital Treatment for High Volatility Commercial Real Estate (HVCRE) Exposures [Docket ID: OCC-2018-0026] (RIN: 1557-AE48) received December 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3460. A letter from the Program Specialist, Chief Counsel's Office, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans Exemption Threshold [Docket No.: OCC-2019-0022] (RIN: 1557-AE68) received December 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3461. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Head Start Program [Docket No.: HHS-ACF-2019-0006] (RIN: 0970-AC78) received December 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3462. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Office of Strategic Operations and Regulatory Affairs, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Exchange Program Integrity [CMS-9922-F] (RIN: 0938-

AT53) received December 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3463. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Extension of Start Date for Revised Photochemical Assessment Monitoring Stations [EPA-HQ-OAR-2019-0137; FRL-10003-87-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AU38) received December 23, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3464. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Approval, Partial Disapproval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; California; Control of Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0393; FRL-10000-52-Region 9] received December 23, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3465. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report covering the period from September 10, 2019, to November 9, 2019 on the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 107-243, Sec. 4(a); (116 Stat. 1501) and 50 U.S.C. app. 2410c(b)(2); Public Law 102-182, Sec. 305(a); (105 Stat. 1248); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3466. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3467. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report certifying that the export of the listed item to the People's Republic of China is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778 note; Public Law 105-261, Sec. 1512 (as amended by Public Law 105-277, Sec. 146); (112 Stat. 2174); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3468. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3469. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 2019 Annual Report on the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2462 note; Public Law 106-309, Sec. 304; (114 Stat. 1095); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3470. A letter from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting two (2) notifications of a designation of acting officer, a nomination, or an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3471. A letter from the Deputy Chief, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the final map and perimeter boundary description for the Sipsey Fork of

the West Fork Wild and Scenic River, in Alabama, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1274(b); Public Law 90-542, Sec. 3(b) (as amended by Public Law 100-534, Sec. 501); (102 Stat. 2708); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3472. A letter from the Deputy Chief, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the final map and perimeter boundary description for the Rio Chama Wild and Scenic River, in New Mexico, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1274(b); Public Law 90-542, Sec. 3(b) (as amended by Public Law 100-534, Sec. 501); (102 Stat. 2708); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3473. A letter from the Regulatory Documentation Specialist, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — List of Courts of Indian Offenses; Future Publication of Updates [201A2100DD/AAK001030/A0A501010.999900 253G] (RIN: 1076-AF46) received December 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3474. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tribal Energy Resource Agreements [192D0102DR/DS5A300000/DR.5A311.IA000118] (RIN: 1076-AF47) received December 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3475. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rights-of-Way on Indian Land; Bond Exemption [190A2100DD/AAK001030/A0A501010.999900 253G] (RIN: 1076-AF20; 1076-AF37) received December 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3476. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Indian Country Investigations and Prosecution Report for calendar year 2018, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 2809(b); Public Law 101-379, Sec. 10(b) (as added by Public Law 111-211, Sec. 212); (124 Stat. 2268); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3477. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Engine Alliance Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0912; Product Identifier 2019-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-21011; AD 2019-25-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 2, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3478. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0519; Product Identifier 2019-NM-089-AD; Amendment 39-21005; AD 2019-24-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 2, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3479. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; De Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0675; Product Identifier 2019-NM-068-AD; Amendment 39-19815; AD 2019-24-12]

(RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 2, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3480. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Interim Guidance on Income Tax Withholding from Retirement and Annuity Distributions [Notice 2020-3] received December 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3481. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Guidance Under Section 355(e) Regarding Predecessors, Successors, and Limitation on Gain Recognition; Guidance under Section 355(f) [TD 9888] (RIN: 1545-BN18) received December 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3482. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Dividend Equivalents From Sources Within the United States [TD 9887] (RIN: 1545-BN76) received December 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3483. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only — Opening of the third six-year remedial amendment cycle for pre-approved defined benefit plans (Rev. Proc. 2020-10) received December 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 1230. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

CONSENSUS CALENDAR

Under clause 7 of rule XV, the following motion was filed with the Clerk: Motion No. 11, January 9, 2020 by Mr. STIVERS on H.R. 4305

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5563. A bill to prohibit certain practices relating to certain commodity promotion programs, to require greater transparency by those programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 5564. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for certain re-

quirements with respect to ownership and diversity reporting for television broadcast stations and cable operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5565. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act by repealing certain provisions pertaining to enjoining disclosure, increasing the minimum baseline civil penalties for violations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 5566. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow all individuals to contribute to health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 5567. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to consider market entry barriers for socially disadvantaged individuals in the communications marketplace report under section 13 of such Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 5568. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide abortion counseling to a veteran who has an unwanted pregnancy; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 5569. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to identify, review, and implement effective interventions in Head Start programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HECK, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KATKO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. KEATING, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 5570. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a review of the deaths of certain veterans who died by suicide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 5571. A bill to facilitate the use of performance-based standards by the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself and Mr. MEUSER):

H.R. 5572. A bill to establish a grant program for family community organizations that provide support for individuals struggling with substance use disorder and their families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 5573. A bill to amend the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee):

H. Res. 782. A resolution encouraging public schools to design and teach a curriculum about the history of anti-Semitism and the Holocaust, and the vital and historic impor-

tance of the Jewish State of Israel; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H. Res. 783. A resolution honoring the members of the military and intelligence community who carried out the mission that killed Qasem Soleimani, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BYRNE (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H. Res. 784. A resolution condemning and censuring Nancy D'Alessandro Pelosi, Representative of California's 12th Congressional District; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H. Res. 785. A resolution supporting the designation of February 1, 2020, as "Blue Star Mother's Day"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. MCADAMS):

H. Res. 786. A resolution supporting the designation of January 11, 2020, as "National Martha Hughes Cannon Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Mr. HURD of Texas):

H. Res. 787. A resolution recognizing January 2020 as "National Mentoring Month", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 5564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio:

H.R. 5566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 5567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 5568.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 5569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, "The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .";

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Congress "shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce . . . among several States . . .";

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Congress "shall have Power . . . To Make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."; and

According to Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, the Congress "shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . . ."

By Mr. TRONE:

H.R. 5572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 5573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 states that Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among several States, and with the Indian tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 155: Mr. GOODEN.
 H.R. 333: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina.
 H.R. 651: Mr. GOODEN.
 H.R. 712: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 878: Ms. FINKENAUER.
 H.R. 945: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 961: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.
 H.R. 1049: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GOMEZ, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 1074: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1162: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1173: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CLOUD, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 1228: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1230: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.

H.R. 1274: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 1400: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. COX of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SHALALA, and Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 1409: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1450: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 1511: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1643: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1695: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 1711: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 1737: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1923: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1987: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2148: Mr. MCEACHIN.

H.R. 2214: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2218: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 2219: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 2271: Ms. CRAIG, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 2283: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2456: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LEVIN of California, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. AMASH, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BERA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. OMAR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2616: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 2694: Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2777: Ms. CRAIG, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 2812: Ms. FINKENAUER and Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 2850: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 2895: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 2958: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 2977: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 3043: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 3104: Ms. FOX of North Carolina and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3219: Mr. COX of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CROW, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 3355: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 3361: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 3374: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 3414: Ms. UNDERWOOD and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 3441: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 3657: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 3663: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 3760: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3794: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 3843: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 3971: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 3975: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 4056: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 4078: Mr. BOST, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 4097: Mr. GRJALVA.

H.R. 4111: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4138: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 4142: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 4189: Mr. WALTZ, Mr. BUDD, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. RYAN, and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 4194: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 4228: Ms. FINKENAUER and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 4301: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. WILD, and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 4305: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CROW, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GOODEN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLINE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. NUNES, Mr. WALKER, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 4309: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 4346: Mr. GRJALVA.

H.R. 4364: Mr. GRJALVA.

H.R. 4393: Mr. TRONE, Mr. RUSH, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 4399: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 4468: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 4681: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 4708: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 4709: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 4807: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 4843: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 4890: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 4907: Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. ROUDA, and Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 4932: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 4960: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 4968: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5050: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 5117: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BRINDISI, and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 5138: Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 5185: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5191: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 5200: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 5212: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5243: Ms. MATSUL.

H.R. 5248: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 5259: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 5260: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 5297: Mrs. MILLER.

H.R. 5309: Mr. KHANNA, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 5319: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 5337: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 5396: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 5403: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 5408: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 5417: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 5421: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 5424: Ms. MENG and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 5439: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 5445: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 5450: Mr. COHEN, Ms. MENG, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 5466: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5490: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 5492: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 5543: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 5546: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Ms. BASS.

H.J. Res. 66: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.J. Res. 76: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. COX of California, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mrs. FLETCHER.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. BRADY and Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 83: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KIM, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MCGOV-

ERN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DEAN, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 17: Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 50: Mr. YOHO, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. SPANO, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H. Res. 495: Ms. ESCOBAR and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H. Res. 620: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H. Res. 694: Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. HAYES, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H. Res. 780: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. TIPTON.