

Morelle	Richmond	Stevens
Moulton	Rose (NY)	Suozzi
Mucarsel-Powell	Rouda	Swalwell (CA)
Murphy (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Takano
Nadler	Ruppertsberger	Thompson (CA)
Napolitano	Ruppertsberger	Thompson (MS)
Neal	Rush	Titus
Neguse	Ryan	Tlaib
Norcross	Sánchez	Tonko
O'Halleran	Sarbanes	Torres (CA)
Ocasio-Cortez	Scanlon	Torres Small
Omar	Schakowsky	(NM)
Pallone	Schiff	Trahan
Panetta	Schneider	Trone
Pappas	Schrader	Underwood
Pascarell	Schrier	Vargas
Payne	Scott (VA)	Veasey
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Vela
Peters	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Peterson	Shalala	Visclosky
Phillips	Sherman	Wasserman
Pingree	Sherrill	Schultz
Pocan	Sires	Waters
Porter	Slotkin	Watson Coleman
Pressley	Smith (WA)	Welch
Price (NC)	Soto	Wexton
Quigley	Spanberger	Wild
Raskin	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Rice (NY)	Stanton	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 service-members 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 in 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)	Fortenberry
Clyburn	Hastings	Fox (NC)
Cohen	Hayes	Fulcher
Connolly	Heck	Gallagher
Cooper	Higgins (NY)	Gianforte
Correa	Himes	Mooney (WV)
Costa	Horsford	Mullin
Courtney	Houlihan	Murphy (FL)
Cox (CA)	Hoyer	Murphy (NC)
Craig	Huffman	Newhouse
Crist	Crow	Norman
Cuellar	Cuellar	Nunes
Davids (KS)	Davids (KS)	
Davis (CA)	Davis (CA)	
Davis, Danny K.	Davis, Danny K.	

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
Massie	Fox (NC)	Westerman
Meeks	Miller	Williams
Fulcher	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Wittman
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Gibbs	Mullin	Woodall
Gohmert	Murphy (FL)	Wright
Gonzalez (OH)	Murphy (NC)	Yoho
Gooden	Newhouse	Young
Gosar	Norman	Zeldin
Gottheimer	Nunes	
Granger		

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

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.

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