As a Washington Post editorial stated powerfully yesterday:

If Senators fail to summon Bolton, whom they were talking about, they will turn the Senate trial into a farce.

I might use the words show trial. We are familiar with show trials. Show trials are to pretend that you are seeking justice while you exonerate, theoretically, a guilty party.

I will remind Members of the iconic Japanese monkeys, the macaques. The three of them sit and see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil. I would characterize that as a see no evil, hear no evil, speak no truth juror. Keeping your eyes shut and ears plugged is refusing to hear, refusing to weigh the facts. See no evil, hear no evil, speak no truth.

In the old Supreme Court Chamber, if you visit that, you will see Lady Justice, a statue, with no blindfold. We hear that justice is blind. Justice cannot be blind. Justice must see the facts. It must see the equities. It must see who said what, when, where, how, and make a judgment.

A great legislator and contemporary of our Founders, Edmund Burke, once said, ''The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.''

This is a serious time in America. We will judge whether or not party is above principle; whether truth is trumped by see no evil, hear no evil, speak no truth.

Madam Speaker, I implore the good men and women of the United States Senate, do not do nothing, which Edmund Burke said was the only thing necessary for evil to triumph. Do something that will secure your place in history to be remembered for your courage, your honesty, and honoring your oath.

Allow witnesses like Ambassador Bolton to be heard. Allow a fair and impartial trial.

Madam Speaker, I believe that is what the American people are looking for. They are pretty divided on whether or not this is an impeachable offense. I get that. That is a legitimate argument to make.

But what is not legitimate is not to listen to the evidence. Senators must now do their duty to their oaths, to our Constitution, and to its authors, and to the cause of truth itself, to allow Ambassador Bolton and other witnesses to be heard.

I urge Senators to uncover their eyes, uncover their ears. The American people and history are waiting to hear truth from them. They are waiting for the Senate trial to seek the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

HONORING THE GREENSBORO FOUR

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

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize those four young men from North Carolina A&T State University who helped bend the arc of history towards justice, the Greensboro Four.

On February 1, 1960, 60 years ago this upcoming Saturday, David Richmond, Franklin McCain, Jibreel Khazan, and Joseph McNeil, took their seats at a Woolworth lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina, and changed American history forever. And after they were refused service, they continued to sit at that lunch counter until the store closed.

The next day, 12 more students sat at that same lunch counter; and by the next week, thousands of demonstrators began to fight against Jim Crow in North Carolina.

To honor the triumphs of these four young men, and to commemorate their efforts to make this a more just society, I am proud to introduce today, with my colleague, Representative G.K. BUTTERFIELD, a resolution recognizing the significance of the Greensboro Four sit-in.

May we all continue to live by their example as we make this a fairer and more equitable America for all that call it home.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3621, STUDENT BORROWER CREDIT IMPROVEMENT ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 550, MERCHANT MARINERS OF WORLD WAR II CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT OF 2019

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 811 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 811

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3621) to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to remove adverse information for certain defaulted or delinquent private education loan borrowers who demonstrate a history of loan repayment, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–47, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 550) to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with each of the two amendments specified in section 4 of this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except as specified in section 3 of this resolution.

SEC. 3. (a) The question of adoption of the motion shall be divided between the two House amendments specified in section 4 of this resolution. The two portions of the divided question shall be considered in the order specified by the Chair.

(b) Each portion of the divided question shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SEC. 4. The amendments referred to in the second and third sections of this resolution are as follows:

(a) An amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–48.

(b) An amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–49.

SEC. 5. If only one portion of the divided question is adopted, that portion shall be engrossed as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Senate amendment to H.R. 550.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 811, providing for consideration of two measures: H.R. 3621, the Comprehensive CREDIT Act; and the Senate amendment to H.R. 550.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3621 under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services. It self-executes Chairwoman WATERS' manager's amendment, which updates definitions, amends requirements for issuance of final rules, includes protections for workers affected by a Federal shutdown, and makes other technical changes. It also makes in order 14 amendments.

The rule also provides for consideration of two House amendments to the Senate amendment to H.R. 550. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for each House amendment. Finally, the rule provides for separate votes on each House amendment.

Madam Speaker, on H.R. 3621, the Comprehensive CREDIT Act of 2020, credit scores and credit reports play a critical role in determining which of our constituents across America will be able to pay for college, rent an apartment, buy a car or a house, start a business, meet major unexpected expenses, or even, increasingly, get a particular job.

Most Americans do not have the wealth to pay out of pocket for major expenditures, so credit is essential; and credit scores and credit reports have become the key screening and sorting mechanism, the key gatekeeper that makes the difference for millions of Americans between having the money to pay for college or not, being able to buy a house or rent an apartment or not, and, increasingly, qualifying as an employee for a specific position or not, because so many employers are increasingly using credit scores and credit reports as part of the qualifying process for appointing and hiring new employees.

The system of credit scores and credit reports is deeply flawed today, and we have done nothing to reform it in 17 years. The Federal Trade Commission tells us that one in five Americans has an error on at least one of their credit reports, and 5 percent of the people have errors grave enough to result in their being denied credit or having to pay substantially more for their mortgages or their auto loans or to obtain insurance policies.

The three big CRAs, consumer reporting agencies—Equifax, TransUnion, and Experian—have files on more than 200 million American consumers, which means that there are errors in the credit reports of at least 40 million of our constituents and serious, potentially life-changing errors in the credit reports of 10 million Americans across the country.

Correcting these errors often takes considerable time and procedural effort, as well as knowledge on how to communicate with the credit reporting companies. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the CFPB, determined that, in 2018, credit reports were the single most complained-about financial product in our country, and the three big CRAs were the most complained-about financial companies in America.

Many vulnerable populations like seniors, stressed and busy working-class Americans, and less financially literate young Americans describe immense frustration in trying to solve problems with credit scoring and reporting companies. Even beyond the errors and mistakes, the credit system takes advantage of the financially insecure and precarious, converting transitory lapses of poverty into a lifetime of financial stigma and hardship. It is very expensive to be poor in America.

Consumers lack the right to a free annual credit score. Many consumers who try to get a free annual credit report or to obtain their scores get tricked into purchasing high-priced credit monitoring or subscription services.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3621, the Comprehensive CREDIT Act of 2020, comprehensively addresses these abuses and combines six bills carefully constructed by our colleagues on the Financial Services Committee to improve transparency, fairness, and accuracy in America's credit reporting system. It reforms and upgrades the process for consumers seeking to resolve errors in their credit reports, and it seeks to ensure that consumer financial information held by the CRAs will be accurate, complete, and verifiable.

This bill will:

Prohibit reporting on consumers' debt relating to medically necessary procedures and delay reporting by 1 year for other forms of medical debt;

Remove adverse credit file information relating to defaulted or delinquent private education loans for borrowers who demonstrate a history of essentially timely and faithful loan repayments for these loans;

Permit reasonable interruptions in the consecutive repayment periods for student borrowers facing unique and extenuating life events;

Prohibit most current and prospective employers from using credit reports to make employment decisions unless required by a local, State, or Federal law or government;

Shorten the time period adverse credit information stays on consumer reports from 7 years to 4 years and from 10 to 7 years for bankruptcy information;

Give consumers a new right to appeal the results of disputes with the CRAs; and

Improve the oversight capabilities of the CFPB on credit reporting agencies and their scoring modules and require these agencies to better train their personnel on addressing consumer concerns.

It has been more than 15 years since we enacted comprehensive reform of the credit reporting system. The House can be proud of the significant progress this credit reform package will bring to hardworking people across America for whom credit and credit reports are the lifeline to education, housing, and, in many cases, good employment and financial stability.

Madam Speaker, on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550, the House also considers the rule on two important amendments to the Senate amendment of H.R. 550.

The first amendment, based on Representative RO KHANNA's No War with Iran Act, clarifies that Congress has not authorized military force against Iran and asserts Congress' funding power to enforce the congressional authorization requirements under the War Powers Resolution of 1973. It, thus, prohibits funds for any military force in or against Iran unless Congress declares war or enacts specific statutory authorization for the use of military force against Iran or there is a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States or our Armed Forces consistent with the provisions of the War Powers Resolution.

The second amendment, based on Representative BARBARA LEE's bill, will repeal the 2002 AUMF for the Iraq war against Saddam Hussein, which authorized the President to use the Armed Forces to the extent ''he determines to be necessary and appropriate'' to ''defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq'' and ''enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.''

The commanding premise of the 2002 authorization was the need to counter the threat of weapons of mass destruction putatively possessed by Saddam Hussein. But Saddam Hussein actually never had nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction and was driven from office in 2003 and was killed in 2006. The current government in Iraq is a strategic partner of the United States in the struggle against nonstate terror groups like ISIS and al-Qaida and poses no threat to our national security.

The 2002 AUMF does not authorize, and has never authorized, the use of force against Iran; yet it was invoked by National Security Advisor Robert O'Brien as a primary source of the administration's authority to engage in military hostilities against Iran, including the strike against Qasem Soleimani.

This is one problem with obsolete AUMFs hanging around decades after they were approved. Presidents can treat them like a loaded gun sitting on a table which can be picked up at will and used in a completely different context for a completely different reason.

The 2002 authorization must be repealed to ensure that no President now or in the future can use it as a pretextual justification for deploying military force without congressional authorization or a formal declaration of war as called for by the Constitution of the United States.

Madam Speaker, the Framers gave Congress the power to declare war because they had just had a revolution against the kings and the monarchs who, for centuries, plunged their populations into wars of vanity, intrigue, political advantage, and distraction of the population. The Framers understood that the power over life and death, over war and peace, was far too awesome to vest in one person, much less a political actor motivated by the desire for fame, prestige, and power. By giving Congress the exclusive power to declare war and to appropriate funds for war, the Framers made certain that the momentous decision to go to war, to send our troops into battle, would belong primarily to the representatives of the people, both the people who fight and die in our wars, their parents, and their families, and the communities that they are drawn from.

Over the last month, the President initiated a dramatic escalation of tensions with Iran without the consent of Congress and without consulting Congress pursuant to the War Powers Resolution of 1973. In the case of the strike against Qasem Soleimani, Congress was never consulted by President Trump, although he apparently spoke with several people who were guests of his at Mar-a-Lago, where the decisions were apparently being made.

On January 7, Iran retaliated for the killing of General Soleimani by launching ballistic missiles against our military and coalition forces in Iraq. We now know that at least 34 troops have been diagnosed with traumatic brain injuries from these strikes, injuries the President has dismissed as headaches. We have still yet to receive any legitimate explanation for the justification for the strike in Iraq, and the administration's subsequent briefing on these actions left far more questions than answers and troubled even many Republican Senators to the point of extreme frustration.

On January 8, when administration officials briefed Members of Congress on the President's actions, both Democrats and Republicans, alike, expressed grave concerns about the briefing, with one Member highlighting the administration had given no time, place, or method justifying the attacks. The President later said there were four threats to United States Embassies, an explanation which apparently was withdrawn in the aftermath. So we still don't know.

In any event, Madam Speaker, we need to return to the Constitution of the United States and the rule of law. The grave decision to go to war is one that belongs properly with Congress.

If we can send our sons and daughters into battle and ask them to exercise the most powerful courage in the world to do that, certainly, we can exercise and summon up the moral and political courage needed just to properly exercise our constitutional powers. We have the power and we have the duty to declare war when we engage in military hostilities abroad, and that is what we are doing with these two amendments.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and thank my friend from Maryland for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is not lost on me that you are in the chair for this debate; and having put in the years that you have put in working on this issue, I know you couldn't be down here for your amendment later on this afternoon. I am glad that you are in the chair today.

It matters, folks who invest themselves in ideas around here; and what I love about this Chamber is that, if a man or a woman, either side of the aisle, any region of the country, commits themselves to something, commits themselves in a transparent, heartfelt way, their colleagues respond to that.

I have had the great pleasure of voting for your amendments on this topic many times over the years because what my friend from Maryland says is exactly right. When it comes to matters of war and peace, this institution has, in many ways, by the wheelbarrow load, carried its authority down to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and left it down there, and the American people deserve better than that. Our men and women in uniform deserve better than that. And we, as stewards of this institution, can do better than that.

Though, while I am pleased to see you in the chair, Madam Speaker, I confess I regret that it is on this bill, at this time, in this way.

For decades, you have worked to build bipartisan support; you have not tried to work alone. When you have had to, you do go it alone. When you are going to be the only voice there, you will lead because you believe, and you will follow that path. But when you can, you build bridges.

What is so frustrating to me about the rule that is before us today is we have an opportunity to come together; we have an opportunity to speak with one voice; we have an opportunity to restore exactly the kind of dialogue that my friend from Maryland suggests this House owes the American people; and we are letting it slip.

□ 1245

I will start with the easier one. That is the Financial Services Committee bill that is wrapped up in this rule.

Madam Speaker, I don't know if you recall. It was just a few weeks ago we had another Financial Services Committee bill. It was H.R. 2534. It was the Insider Trading Prohibition Act.

It seems like something we ought to all be able to get together on, but it was brought to the floor in a partisan way with absolutely no consultation on the other side. It was going to be a straight party-line vote, but to the credit of the chairwoman and ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, they continued to work together right up until the Rules Committee finished its meeting—you know that is the last stop before the bill comes to the floor—and they found a bipartisan pathway forward.

They changed directions from what was going to be a straight party-line vote on the floor of the House that goes nowhere, to a vote—let me consult my notes because I want to be right—410–13 was the result when we got together and worked in a bipartisan way. That is a bill that is going to go somewhere.

All the challenges my friend in Maryland talked about with credit reporting agencies, they are real, and the ranking member on the Financial Services Committee agrees with that. In fact, he has a substitute that has supported those ideas in a bipartisan way that he wanted to make in order to try to get us away from a partisan path.

The Rules Committee, in its wisdom, voted on a party-line vote to deny the ranking member an opportunity to bring forward the bipartisan language that he had.

So, we will go down this partisan road. Again, that is a partisan road on protecting consumers. It is a shame that has to happen. This bill is going to go nowhere. The President has promised he will veto it. The Senate is not going to take it up. We are not going to protect any consumers. We had a chance to, and we let that slip. Shame on us.

As shameful as that is in the financial services space, as you know from your decades of work in the war and peace space, the consequences of failure for war and peace are even greater.

Time and time again, oftentimes with your leadership, this House has had opportunities to revisit the Authorization for Use of Military Force that it passed in 2001 and that it passed in 2002. Generally, it is in our appropriations bill, as you well know, because the committee of jurisdiction, the authorizing committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, that has the ability to have a full-throated debate on this issue to decide whether to repeal, whether to replace, how to structure that, has not moved legislation forward. We are in that exact same place today.

You introduced your language, Madam Speaker, in May 2019. That is the language that this rule is going to stuff into the Congressional Gold Medal bill for merchant mariners. We will talk about that here in a bit. It is

going to stuff your language that you introduced in May that has never had a markup.

Now, you led this issue when President Bush was in the White House, and we didn't get a markup. You led this issue while President Obama was in the White House, and we didn't get a markup. You are now leading this issue while President Trump is in the White House, and we still have never had a markup.

Now, don't tell me about your commitment to men and women in uniform. Do not tell me about what our Framers intended and bring language that has never had a committee markup to the House floor.

I asked these questions last night in the Rules Committee, Madam Speaker. I said: So which operations that are going on in Iraq today are going to be curtailed if we repeal the AUMF tomorrow?

I am not misremembering, Madam Speaker. So many times, when you have offered this language, you offered it for a date certain in the future. You recognized that doing something immediately would have consequences that would be very difficult for men and women in uniform to deal with, difficult for the administration, difficult for our allies. So very often you said: Let's put this down the road 6 months, 9 months, 12 months. Let's be certain that we are going to be done with it, but let's give time to transition.

I asked: This language today, what is the impact of that?

I asked: Which members of the State Department have come to testify that this is not going to put our allies in a predicament, in a precarious predicament in Iraq?

The answer was: Well, we haven't had those hearings. We don't know those answers. We believe that we know, but we have not had those folks come to testify.

Well, what about the FBI? How is this going to impact counterterrorism operations?

Well, we have not had those conversations. We have not had that in an open hearing. We have not had a chance to talk about it.

Well, what does the Pentagon have to say?

Madam Speaker, we have an opportunity to do this in a thoughtful, bipartisan way.

The leadership that the new majority is providing in the House, candidly, gives you an opportunity to do things that might not have been possible in a Republican-led House. After your decade of work on that, I think you have earned that, and it would have been a bipartisan vote.

Instead, we are here today for a partisan exercise, with no input from the minority, that the President has already recommended a veto on.

I think our men and women in uniform deserve better. I think this institution deserves better.

Madam Speaker, I don't know if you were paying attention as the Reading Clerk read. He did not go through and read all the amendments that were offered.

For the very important issue of credit agencies and how we regulate them, the majority, in its wisdom, has made 14 amendments in order. Fourteen different ideas are going to be considered for how we regulate credit reporting agencies.

For the question of war and peace—what should be the wind-down timeline, how quickly should it take effect, who should be affected, what are the impacts of that, should it be replaced, should it just be repealed—for those very complicated life-and-death questions, no committee hearing, not one amendment made in order.

The majority, in its wisdom, has provided 1 hour of debate on the floor of the House.

My friend from Maryland is very adept at quoting our Framers. His knowledge of the Constitution runs deep. Debate has never meant an hour to come down to the House floor in a take-it-or-leave-it fashion. Debate, as our Framers intended it, meant that we were going to engage in dialogue with one another, that we were going to have a conversation about how to get it right together, that we were going to do what you have done for much of your career, in terms of building coalitions. We are doing none of it today.

Madam Speaker, I have 30 minutes on the rule. We will have an hour of a take-it-or-leave-it debate.

For our men and women in uniform, as I hold the veto threat from the White House here, and we are going to produce a partisan outcome with no hope of overriding a Presidential veto, if the Senate were even to take it up, which it won't, we are going to be absolutely no closer to achieving the goal that you and I have striven for together. In fact, I believe we are going to be further away from that goal at the end of this.

I used all the ability I had as a Rules Committee member to try to keep this from going forward last night because I believe it is a missed opportunity. But on a 9–4 party-line vote, I was defeated.

Madam Speaker, the only way to get back to the partnership that our men and women in uniform deserve, the partnership that the efforts that you have brought forward over the years have received, is to defeat this rule today and have the open hearing in the Foreign Affairs Committee, to have that testimony from the experts in this field, and then to move forward, not on a party-line vote that goes nowhere in this House, but in a big, big, big bipartisan vote that moves through the Senate and either receives the President's signature or overrides that veto. This isn't going to get that done.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished chairman of the House Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) for yielding me the time and for his leadership on the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, something has been happening over the last few decades. Power meant to be held in these Halls, granted to us by the Constitution, intentionally given to us by our Founders, has ended up instead in the hands of whoever sat in the Oval Office.

It wasn't stolen by any particular President. No, Madam Speaker. We gave it away.

Congresses run by both parties surrendered it to Democratic and Republican administrations alike year after year after year.

Nowhere is this more pronounced than when it comes to matters of war and peace. Make no mistake, the Constitution is clear on this: The President may be Commander in Chief, but only Congress has the power to declare war. It is right there in Article I, Section 8.

But we abdicated that responsibility. We have been too content to stand on the sidelines and watch as wars were crafted and carried out by the White House with virtually no input from the people's House.

Our troops, the very people we represent, have received orders to deploy. Taxpayer dollars have been shoveled overseas. Policies have changed from one administration to the next. But too often, Congress remained silent, not because we were too engaged on other urgent matters, but because we feared the political risk of a vote.

Many of our colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, have tried to force debates and votes. I have joined many of my colleagues, from ADAM SMITH and BARBARA LEE and RO KHANNA to TOM COLE and Walter Jones and MATT GAETZ.

In fact, I have stood here more than two dozen times and pleaded for the chance to vote on many conflicts, like Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria.

Too often, these simple calls for debate were ignored, but these are precisely the issues our constituents sent us here to debate, the hard ones, the ones where lives are at stake.

Now, I don't care who is President. I don't care who controls the House. When our troops are ordered to engage, they do not do so casually. And once they are deployed, it is not easy for them to withdraw. We all know this. Wars are easy to start but are very, very hard to end.

This is why how they begin is the most crucial decision. It cannot be left to one person. The Constitution enshrines that power in our hands, the people's representatives, the people's voice, and the people's House.

Today, Madam Speaker, the process of reclaiming that authority begins. This rule contains two measures.

The first is a resolution from Congresswoman LEE to repeal the 2002 Iraq

AUMF. For nearly two decades, this AUMF has been used by multiple Presidents to unilaterally engage our troops in conflicts that Congress never imagined when it was first passed.

It was used to justify the recent strike against Iranian General Soleimani.

If you think the consequences are limited, bear in mind that 34 more of our troops now suffer from traumatic brain injuries from Iran's retaliatory strike.

Pay attention to the words of Marine General Frank McKenzie, U.S. commander in the Middle East, who told our troops on Thursday that 20,000 newly deployed troops to the region could be there for ''quite a while.''

Repealing this AUMF isn't just about ensuring that this President cannot use it as justification for asserting military force without proper congressional authorization. This vote is about ensuring that no President can.

The second item included in this rule is legislation from Congressman KHANNA to prohibit funding for military action against Iran that is not authorized by Congress.

The situation with Iran remains volatile. If tensions should escalate again and President Trump wants to use military force, he must come to Congress first, period.

These measures passed overwhelmingly as bipartisan amendments to the House-passed NDAA bill last year. These are not new items or new ideas. Unfortunately, both were stripped out of the bill in final conference.

It is my hope that this House will again approve these measures and that the Senate will recognize the urgency of their passage.

Madam Speaker, I have heard a lot of talk about what it means to support our troops. Let me just say this: We respect their service when we give them an honest, thoughtful debate about their sacrifice, about possible deployments that impact not only them but their families and their loved ones.

Members of our military put their lives on the line for this country. The least we can do is have the guts to vote on their fate.

Let's respect our troops. Let's respect this institution. Let's finally get back to respecting the Constitution, doing our jobs, and voting on issues of war and peace.

I have to tell you, I am just sick and tired of hearing excuse after excuse, not only now, but over the last several years, from my colleagues as to why we can't have these debates, why we can't vote on these issues.

Madam Speaker, it is time now for my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying measure.

□ 1300

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Maryland yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, no, I do not yield for that purpose. All time is yielded for the purpose of debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), because I have seen the gentleman from Maryland change his mind many times over the years when he was on the wrong side of an issue to make himself right.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on this critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Maryland yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. RASKIN. No, I do not. I have yielded for the purpose of debate only, and I would love to have a real debate about the resolution that is before us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Madam Speaker, I share with my friend from Maryland that if the gentleman is interested in a real debate, the gentleman would allow minority voices to be heard.

If the gentleman is not following this, the reason that Members are coming to the floor to make this request is because these resolutions, as they pertain to dealing with Iran, do nothing to protect our ally, our strongest friend in the Middle East, Israel, and we would like to make sure that Israel is protected.

I ask my friend if he would yield for the debate on protecting our friend, Israel, and to have an opportunity for not dozens of minority amendments, but my friends are asking unanimous consent for one single Republican amendment to the underlying bill: a right that has been guaranteed to the minority for over 100 years, but has been turned off by clever procedural tricks in this particular rule today.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, understanding that my friend from Maryland has called for a real debate.

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and her ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we would amend this rule, which then would make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment.

Now, that amendment would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel. I don't think that is asking too much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair would advise Members that even though a unanimous consent request is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such requests constitute debate and will become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure that the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that will ensure the President can protect the understand and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

□ 1315

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

Madam Speaker, your rulings here today follow very clearly the Rules Committee meeting we had just across the Chamber last night that allowed for absolutely no amendment or discussion of any kind on two war resolutions that have received no markup of any kind in the committee of jurisdiction.

I know that seemed like a bothersome and worrisome procedural process to have just gone through. Madam Speaker, in those few minutes that you were ruling those unanimous consent requests out of order, we have just discussed whether or not our commitment to Israel and its safety and security will be hampered by the underlying Khanna amendment in more detail than any committee of jurisdiction has ever done. In these few minutes of Members' asking for a debate and being told no, ironically, when time was yielded for the purpose of debate only, we have discussed the issue more than in any markup in any committee of jurisdiction.

There is not one Member of this Chamber who does not think our Nation's sons and daughters in uniform deserve better. There is not one Member of this Chamber who does not think our ally Israel deserves better.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rarely fail to be moved by my good friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) with his directness, his charm, and his legislative prowess. But I have to say I fail to be moved by this last jack-in-the-box procedural maneuver of people getting up and asking for unanimous consent to do something that my friends failed to do for the last 8 years when they could have had a hearing at any point on the War Powers Act, yet they didn't do it.

Now, I believe that all of my friends who got up in the line were operating under a misapprehension because there was a hearing in the House Foreign Affairs Committee on January 14—that is about 2 weeks ago—called ''From Sanctions to the Soleimani Strike to Escalation: Evaluating the Administration's Iran Policy'' and all the implications in terms of Congress' war powers.

For the life of me, I can't understand why my good friend is not joining us today. I understand that it is always possible to summon up a procedural objection when the substantive task at hand is too difficult to do politically. I understand this would require people to make the President of the United States mad because, like every President before him—and this is a bipartisan issue, as Chairman MCGOVERN said—this President wants to be able to decide for himself whether or not the United States of America is going to be plunged into war.

The very simple proposition that we bring before the House that everybody in the Chamber can speak to right now, and everybody in the Chamber can vote on, is the repeal of the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002.

That was 18 years ago. We have kids who could die in a war against Iran in Iraq, or a war in Iran, based on this resolution, and they weren't even born when this Authorization of Use of Military Force was adopted by Congress.

The real question is: Are we going to have the courage to stand up for the Constitution and to stand up for our constituents and say that we will not go to war unless there is a specific statutory authorization by Congress or a declaration of war or there is an actual attack on the United States such that the President is really acting in self-defense?

Both Democratic and Republican Members of Congress were bewildered and frustrated by the presentation of this administration as to why the United States of America needed to commit that strike when they did.

There were changing stories. About every 20 minutes, we got a new story about why it was necessary. I have not heard a single word on the other side—to their credit—defending any of the justifications or rationalizations or pretexts that were offered by the administration.

So, we come back to a constitutional point that is not difficult, and that is one that came up at that Foreign Affairs Committee hearing a couple of weeks ago. It is one that we talked about in the Rules Committee last night in debate. It is one that every one of us is invited to join in right now on the floor of the House to discuss, which is the one that was made by the chairman of the Rules Committee.

I have to say a word in honor of our great chair on the Rules Committee. He has been invoking the Constitution and the exclusive power of Congress to declare war for two decades, through Democratic Presidents, Republican Presidents, Bushes, Clintons, Obamas, and now Trump. He has been saying the same thing, which is that we should not be committing American troops to wars abroad without a vote of Congress, which was the explicit design of the Framers of the Constitution.

Go back to the Preamble of the Constitution:

> We the people, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and preserve to ourselves and our posterity the blessings of liberty do hereby ordain and establish the Constitution of the United States of America.

The very next sentence in Article I states that the legislative power is vested in a Congress of the United States, a House of Representatives and a Senate. Then, it sets forth all of our powers, including the power to declare war, the power of taxes, the power to appropriate money, the power to raise armies, the power to maintain a navy, and so on. All of that is with Congress.

You go all the way through Article I, Madam Speaker, and then you get to Article II, where the President is denominated the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy in times of actual conflict and insurrection, and the President's core job is to take care that the laws are faithfully executed.

That includes the Constitution itself, of course, and it includes the War Powers Resolution of 1973.

This is a very clear principle. It is a constitutional axiom we are advancing today. We had a hearing on it a couple of weeks ago, but we don't need weeks and months of hearings. Obviously, our good friends didn't think it required any hearings over the 8 years that they were in control of the House of Representatives.

It is a simple proposition, which is that the war power belongs to Congress. We have to declare war. We can't run away from it any more than our brave troops can run away from battle when they have been committed to battle.

All we are saying is that if there is going to be war against Iran, if there is going to be a war against the new government in Iraq—not Saddam Hussein, who is gone and dead—then we have to declare the war; we have to authorize the war; and we have to debate and deliberate over it as contemplated by the Founders of our country. That is our job.

We had a bipartisan vote invoking the War Powers Resolution on January 9. It ended up 224–194, but we had Democrats and Republicans invoking the War Powers Resolution with respect to the situation in Iran.

Again, I am not quite sure why our colleagues don't want to do this with us. I understand it is easier to do it when the opposing party is in the White House, but we have many Members on both sides of the aisle who have demonstrated their courage by invoking the War Powers Resolution and by

standing up for the Constitution. That is what we have to do today, and we have the perfect opportunity and legislative vehicle to do it right now.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Madam Speaker.

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

Madam Speaker, I don't question my friend from Maryland's passion at all. He says that we have the perfect vehicle to get this done today. I refer you back to the rule. That perfect vehicle is called H.R. 550, the Merchant Mariners of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act of 2019.

You haven't heard us talk about merchant mariners or gold medals yet today because, as you know, Madam Speaker, this rule would strip out all the language in the underlying bill that deals with gold medals and merchant mariners and replace it with matters of war and peace.

I will quote the author of one of the amendments that is stuffed into the merchant mariners bill in place of the merchant mariners language, Mr. KHANNA, who said in Politico last week: ''Majority Leader Hoyer has done an excellent job in figuring out a procedure for how we can get a vote on the floor on these bills without an MTR,'' a motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, a motion to recommit is what you heard folks asking unanimous consent for. A motion to recommit in this case would be the only opportunity for any voices to be heard at all on this issue.

My friend from Maryland proudly talks about a single hearing that was held 2 weeks ago, but it wasn't held on this bill. There has been not one markup, not one word, discussed in committee, marked up, and reported to the floor of this House—not one.

My friend from Maryland says that we have to debate and deliberate over matters of this gravity, that that is our job.

Madam Speaker, let's do our job: debate and deliberate.

What does it tell you? That I have been voting with the Speaker on these issues for almost a decade, on issues of war and peace, and I am offended by the process that you are using to bring this to the floor the first time.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

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

Again, just to recapitulate, today's rule provides for consideration of legislation to do two things: one, to limit funding for any military action in or against Iran; and, two, repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force. I do believe it is correct to advocate for Congress to retake Article I powers, and it is correct to negotiate a new Authorization for Use of Military Force.

I was not here in 2002. I was not able to vote on that legislation. However, we should not repeal the existing 2002 authorization without a hearing, without a markup, and without fully assessing how it will affect our troops in the region. Further, we should evaluate whether or not a new Authorization for Use of Military Force should take its place.

In fact, 2 or 3 weeks ago, Democratic leadership of this House brought H. Con. Res. 83. The House passed this earlier this month. In the findings, the majority stated: ''The United States has national interests in preserving its partnership with Iraq.'' Yet, here we are now just a few weeks later considering a repeal of that very authority.

If it was important 3 weeks ago, how did it become unimportant today? We don't know because we haven't had a hearing.

Limiting funding for any military action in and against Iran simply broadcasts our plans or lack thereof to the enemy, potentially inciting further aggression. Weakness is provocative.

I voted for an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act prohibiting funding for authorized military action in Iran because it was offered, considered, and voted on following regular order. But neither piece of legislation addressing war authorities before us today has been marked up or has had committee consideration.

We heard last night in the Rules Committee that there have been hearings focused on Iran and that, in fact, suffices. But, realistically, regional hearings do not allow for the serious discussion required for an Authorization for Use of Military Force and including funding for military action.

In addition, currently, the Democratic majority is using a vehicle that removes minority Republicans' ability to offer that one opportunity to amend the bill that is known as the motion to recommit. That is a long-honored tradition of both sides that there should at least be one opportunity for the minority to be heard.

So, I believe it is wrong to rush to limit war authorities, and it is irresponsible.

Do you know what, Madam Speaker? In a dangerous world, it is downright dangerous. Congress should be authorizing action through a renegotiated Authorization for Use of Military Force rather than passing a resolution prohibiting funding for military activity.

□ 1330

I remember on the floor of this House, a former colleague, Rob Simmons from Connecticut, a Republican, when there was an effort to limit funding during the most kinetic part of the Iraq war. Mr. Simmons had served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam conflict, and he related, from one of these very podia, how, as a young soldier in Vietnam, he had heard that Congress had withdrawn the funding for what he was doing. I will never forget his words. He said: At that moment, I hated the United States Congress.

That is the effect we can have on the young men and women whom we have sent to answer the call of duty, that Congress could and should be working to provide the necessary authorities for our Commander in Chief as he directs these brave young men and women in uniform rather than broadcasting our limitations to the enemy.

Again, weakness is provocative.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer an amendment to the rule that will make in order a bipartisan resolution, an amendment to deal with fentanyl and its listing on schedule I.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) for the purpose of explaining that previous question vote.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend on the Rules Committee for yielding me the time.

Our proposal to defeat the previous question and offer this amendment would do no underlying violence to the two bills—it has nothing to do with them—but it would save lives of all kinds of people in America.

You see, fentanyl is a synthetic, manmade opioid. It is 50 times more potent than heroin. It is 100 times more potent than morphine. It is a scheduled drug under the Controlled Substances Act. However, Madam Speaker, drug traffickers are able to make small changes to fentanyl and its chemical structure, and that creates a new variation of the substance.

Now, these so-called analogues are not on the schedule of controlled drugs. They are outside of the control of law enforcement, and they are incredibly dangerous—may I say, deadly.

For example, one of these analogues, carfentanil, is 100 times as potent as the same amount of fentanyl, 5,000 times more potent than a unit of heroin, and 10,000 times as potent as a unit of morphine.

Now, the creation of analogues outpaced the Drug Enforcement Administration's ability to schedule them, so the DEA used emergency authorities to place all of the analogues in schedule I.

The Controlled Substances Act, the CSA, provides the Attorney General with the authority to temporarily place a substance in schedule I of the CSA for 2 years if he finds that such action is necessary to avoid an imminent hazard to the public safety. In 2018, the Trump administration's DEA used this authority to place fentanyl analogues and fentanyl-like substances on that schedule I.

So here is the issue: The emergency scheduling order expires next Thursday, February 6, and Congress has yet

to extend it. The Senate passed an extension, Madam Speaker, I believe, unanimously; but, so far, Democrats in the House have not acted.

There is no excuse for this. There is no reason for this. Lives will be lost. We have seen a series of delay tactics, and that is leading to an expiration of this incredibly important authority.

With the United States Senate dealing with impeachment, there is no time for the House to generate a new product, a different bill, before this expires. So the House needs to pass the Senate extension this week so law enforcement does not lose or have a lapse on this important capability to fight fentanyl, which is deadly, which is added to heroin, which causes deaths all across America.

We are using this limited tool we have asking for a defeat of the previous question so that we can offer this should-be-unanimous amendment to get it on a vehicle so it can become law.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put the text of our amendment to amend the rule to add S. 3201 in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Everything we have talked about has been partisan and divisive. What you have just heard from the gentleman from Oregon is to say, in the midst of why ever it is the majority has chosen to use this rule today to move partisan priorities, to make statements instead of policy, that we have one opportunity to make policy, actual policy, policy that passed the Senate unanimously, policy that America needs, desires, that is going to expire next week, and that, if we added it today, would go straight to the President's desk for his approval.

I can't count the number of times my colleagues have said that issues deserve debate. I didn't come here to be part of a debating society. I came here to be a part of a getting-something-done group, conscientious men and women who want to do the best they can to serve their constituents.

My friend from Oregon is offering us a chance to do exactly that today, and I would ask my friends—they have seen fit to use a very strange procedure to turn a Congressional Gold Medal for merchant mariners bill into a bill on war and peace. They have seen fit to strip away an opportunity for any voices to be heard on any of those measures whatsoever.

They could, as long as they are setting precedent, go ahead and support our defeat of the previous question today to add one more item so that we don't leave here today having just made a point, so that we can leave here today having made a difference, as my friend from Oregon is giving us the opportunity to do.

Mr. WALDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, the gentleman's passionate statements are all accurate and true. It was not that long ago we came together as a Congress, the last Congress, under my leadership of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and passed nearly 60 pieces of legislation into one, the SUPPORT Act, that deals with the opioid crisis, the substance use disorder crisis in America, and one of the key points of that was dealing with this illegal fentanyl that is coming in.

If we let this authority expire, the real practical consequence is these evil actors, these chemists in their labs, will simply alter the chemical makeup, which they do all the time, create an even more deadly or powerful fentanyl that can go into heroin and other drugs and kill our citizens, and they can do that lawfully because that new substance will not be covered.

Now, we would hope the majority would move the Senate bill. But we have seen no text; we have heard no schedule. This authority expires next week on February 6, and we only have a legislative day or two left.

Madam Speaker, lives hang in the balance. This, we should adopt.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I know my friend from Maryland is prepared to close.

We had a bipartisan pathway forward on credit reporting agencies and reform, but the majority, in its wisdom, saw fit to shut those voices out; and this rule makes in order a partisan pathway forward that will go to the President's desk, if it makes it through the Senate, for a veto.

For decades, you have worked to build bipartisan support for finally reexamining an AUMF that should have been reexamined decades ago. The majority, in its wisdom, has decided to shut out all voices, Republican and Democrat, hold no markups, change language not at all, and make a partisan exercise of what should be a bipartisan issue, a resounding bipartisan issue, in this House; and my friend from Oregon is offering us an opportunity to take what has always been a bipartisan effort to protect our young people from the harms of opioids, to prevent traffickers from making chemical changes that allow them to thwart the law, and move that to the President's desk immediately.

Madam Speaker, defeat the previous question. Defeat the previous question so that we can at least do one thing that we know will make a difference today, one thing that will bring us together, one thing the Senate did unanimously and the President would put a signature on tomorrow. Let's do that one thing: defeat the previous question.

I tell my colleagues, if they won't defeat the previous question, they are going to have to defeat the rule, because they have turned protecting consumers into a partisan exercise, protecting men and women in uniform into a partisan exercise, and all of the goodwill that men and women of this Chamber have put into building for decades becomes a little bit weaker today.

Defeat the previous question; if not, defeat the rule.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank my good friend from Georgia for our robust and active exchange today.

We came to debate matters of war and peace and the reassertion of Congress' essential constitutional powers over the declaration of war and the commitment of our troops and our funds to foreign wars.

These are critical issues that our friends, when they were in charge of the Chamber, routinely ignored; but we are confronting them, and we invite them in enthusiastically to be part of this process of reasserting Congress' war powers.

But the minority's previous question is obviously unnecessary and an irrelevant distraction from the important issues that we have come to address. And I want to be clear about this: It is an unnecessary distraction because the House majority leader committed this morning to bringing up S. 3201, which extends the ban on all fentanyl-based substances. It took place this morning. Check docs.house.gov, which has the complete running explanation of what is taking place. This morning, he scheduled it for the very first item of business tomorrow.

So the bill that my friends are valiantly promising to bring to the floor if we defeat the previous question is already scheduled to be considered as the first item of business tomorrow morning under suspension of the House rules.

And I will remind my colleagues of what defeating the previous question means. It gives control of the floor to the minority. We are not going to do that because we are here to prevent unauthorized war with Iran; to repeal the obsolete and unnecessary 2002 AUMF, which addressed the situation with Saddam Hussein; and to modernize the credit reporting system, which is failing millions of Americans, our constituents.

For all of the reasons that we have discussed during this robust debate, we need to ensure that the whole House gets the chance to vote on all of these things: on the repeal of the 2002 Iraq AUMF and on reforming the credit reporting system so our people have better access to credit and we have real transparency and fairness in people's credit reports and credit scores.

I hope that all of our colleagues, both in the majority and the minority, will join us in voting ''yes'' on the previous question and ''yes'' on this rule so we can move on to serious, thoughtful, deliberate consideration of all of these critical measures that we bring before the Congress and the American people.

I also hope that all of our colleagues will join me in supporting S. 3201, the fentanyl legislation, which our colleague discussed, on suspension tomorrow.

Mr. WALDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RASKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, we agree on the fentanyl issue, I think.

My understanding is that the leader posted this, Madam Speaker, at 11:50 this morning, about a half an hour after we posted our previous question proposal to bring this to the floor.

We are just curious what text, when it is scheduled. We need to resolve this issue, we would agree.

□ 1345

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time. I am thrilled to be able to assure the gentleman that we are taking up the exact Senate bill in its exact verbatim text.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I ask the gentleman when that will occur.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, this will occur tomorrow morning on the first bill at 12:15, 12:30. It is the first bill.

Madam Speaker, let me just say that I hope our friends take yes for an answer, and I hope that this will perhaps usher in their ability to support the underlying legislation here because I know that they agree with us that the Constitution gives the House of Representatives and the Senate the power to declare war. It gives Congress the power to declare war, to spend money on war. We should not allow a President of any party—Democratic, Republican, or anything else—to usurp that power and to engage in unilateral Presidential wars without our specific authorization, without our declaration, unless there is an attack on the land, the people of the United States, or our Armed Forces, as specified in the War Powers Resolution.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. WOODALL is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 811

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (S. 3201) to extend the temporary scheduling order for fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy & Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of S. 3201.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

GLOBAL HOPE ACT OF 2019

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5338) to authorize the Secretary of State to pursue public-private partnerships, innovative financing mechanisms, research partnerships, and coordination with international and multilateral organizations to address childhood cancer globally, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5338

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Global Hope Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Approximately 300,000 children aged 0 to 19 years old are diagnosed with cancer each year.

(2) The most common categories of childhood cancers include leukemia, brain cancer, lymphoma, and solid tumors, such as neuroblastoma and Wilms tumor.

(3) Most childhood cancers can be cured with generic medicines and can be cost-effective for all income levels.

(4) In the United States, the survival rate for children diagnosed with cancer is over 80 percent. In many developing countries, the mortality rate of children diagnosed with cancer is around 80 percent. In some parts of Africa, the mortality rate reaches 90 percent.

(5) In September 2018, the World Health Organization announced a new effort—the Global Initiative for Childhood Cancer—with the aim of reaching at least a 60-percent survival rate for children with cancer by 2030, thereby saving an additional 1,000,000 lives.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress as follows:

(1) The work of the United States on infectious disease remains the core tenet of United States work on global health.

(2) As the United States and international partners continue to succeed in lowering incidences of infectious diseases, global mortality rates of non-communicable diseases will become an increasing burden that must be addressed.

(3) The United States should work to support the goals of the World Health Organization Initiative for Childhood Cancer, helping increase survival rates for children with cancer.

SEC. 4. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

The United States shall seek to—

(1) increase political commitment for childhood cancer diagnosis, treatment, and care globally;

(2) support efforts to increase the survival rate of children with cancer globally;

(3) support efforts to train medical personnel and develop the capabilities of other existing healthcare infrastructure to diagnose, treat, and care for childhood cancer;

(4) improve access to affordable and essential medicines and technologies that treat childhood cancer;

(5) elevate and prioritize efforts to reduce the mortality rate of childhood cancer in international organizations such as the United Nations;

(6) pursue research and research partnerships with international institutions to identify low-cost interventions and best practices to diagnose, treat, and care for childhood cancer in the United States and globally; and

(7) improve partnerships with international health ministries and pharmaceutical companies to facilitate efforts for broader, global clinical trials for medicines to treat or care for childhood cancer in the United States and globally.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION.

The Secretary of State, in coordination with the heads of relevant Federal departments and agencies, is authorized and encouraged to—

(1) pursue public-private partnerships, other research partnerships, and innovative financing mechanisms to address childhood cancer globally; and

(2) coordinate with appropriate agencies of the United Nations and other relevant multilateral organizations to address childhood cancer globally.

SEC. 6. REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report that includes the following:

(1) An assessment of opportunities for United States engagement in global efforts to increase the worldwide survival rate of children with cancer.

(2) An assessment of efforts taken by the United States to support efforts to increase the worldwide survival rate of children with cancer.

(3) An assessment of existing programs funded by the United States that could be expanded to support efforts to increase the worldwide survival rate of children with cancer.

(4) An assessment of how such increased international engagement could positively affect—

(A) survival rates of individuals with childhood cancer in the United States; and