

and I am proud to stand with those who follow the Nazarene.

#### AMERICA STANDS WITH ISRAEL

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, the war in Gaza continues. Every human life that is killed is a tragedy, particularly those of civilians, but I think it is important to put it in perspective. The fight is not between Israelis and Palestinians. The fight is between Israelis and Hamas, which is a terrorist organization.

Week after week, month after month, year after year, Hamas has lobbed missiles into the Israeli civilian population—killing Israelis, maiming Israelis. Israel is fighting back in order to try to stop the onslaught of Hamas.

What would we do, Madam Speaker, if missiles came over the border from Canada or from Mexico, attacking population areas of the United States? Of course, we would go over the border and attempt to stop the terrorists who were doing that to our civilians.

That is precisely what Israel is doing, and quite frankly, the media coverage of the war in Gaza has been absolutely one-sided against Israel and absolutely disgraceful.

Hamas uses its people as human shields. They build bomb factories and missile factories in heavily populated civilian areas. So, when civilians are killed, it is the fault of Hamas, not the fault of Israel, which has tried to defend its way of life and defend its citizens.

I am proud that America stands with Israel, and we will continue to do so.

□ 1015

#### LET'S GET THE CHILDREN OUT OF HARM'S WAY IN GAZA

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, last night, on the national news I saw the terrible agony and tears of a man whose children had been, according to the report, blown to pieces when a school was hit in Gaza.

Hamas started this war. Israel certainly has a right to defend its people.

In today's Washington Post, Michael Oren, the former Israeli Ambassador to the U.S., said it is "indeed agonizing" to watch the images of the dead and wounded and, I might add, especially the children.

Israel agreed to an Egyptian-sponsored cease-fire. Hamas did not. I rise today to plead for both sides in this war to at least let the little children get out of the war zone.

The United Nations has never been very effective, but it should at least attempt to lead in an effort to get children out of harm's way.

If this fighting, unfortunately, has to continue, our President and State Department should at least do everything possible to get little children out of Gaza and to some safe place away from the bombs and the rockets.

#### REMOVING UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM IRAQ

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of July 23, 2014, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 23, 2014, the amendment numbered 1 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 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. 105

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. PROHIBITION REGARDING UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN IRAQ.

The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization for such use enacted after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

#### SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION

Nothing in this concurrent resolution supersedes the requirements of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend and to submit any extraneous materials for the RECORD on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. I very much appreciate the way in which Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ENGEL, the bipartisan leadership of the House, and the staff of the committee have worked through this issue to bring us here this morning. I thank all of the Members. I also think all of the Members of this body can support this motion.

Earlier this week, the Foreign Affairs Committee heard testimony from sen-

ior officials from the Departments of State and Defense on the situation in Iraq.

Madam Speaker, the situation in this critical Middle Eastern country is precarious. The Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, an al Qaeda offshoot, has taken over most of western Iraq, it has turned its sights on Baghdad, and it may be preparing to launch attacks against the United States.

Never has a terrorist organization itself controlled such a large, resource-rich safe haven as ISIS does today. Never has a terrorist organization possessed the heavy weaponry, the cash, the personnel that ISIS does today, which includes thousands of Western passport holders.

What started as a crisis in Syria has become a regional disaster with serious global implications, including credible threats of international terrorism, humanitarian disaster, and upward pressure on energy prices in a fragile global economy.

The top State Department official told our committee that ISIS represents a growing threat to U.S. interests in the region, local populations, and the homeland, calling it a vital national security challenge. This is a common assessment outside of government as well.

As part of the response to this threat, the Obama administration has deployed additional military assets and up to 475 troops to secure our Embassy, our personnel. A few hundred U.S. military advisers are evaluating how we might best train, advise, and support the Iraqis to take on ISIS.

As the Department of Defense testified this week, these small teams are "armed for self-defense, but do not have an offensive mission." It was noted, these teams are not unlike the missions being carried out by U.S. forces around the world. U.S. forces currently maintain these types of troops in more than 70 countries, in Africa, the Americas, and Asia.

Now, if the President did decide to take more aggressive action in Iraq, Members on both sides of the aisle would be deeply split. Some don't see any role for the U.S. military. Others believe we should be more active in this region, believing that our absence has contributed to a vacuum that is churning the entire region.

But where I think all Members can agree is that if the President of the United States ordered U.S. Armed Forces into sustained combat in Iraq, then he should be coming to Congress to seek an explicit statutory authorization and the backing of this body.

That is the text before us today:

The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization for such use enacted after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

At the same time, this text preserves the flexibility the President may need to respond to the rapidly evolving national security in order to protect our

Embassy, to conduct search and rescue, or target an al Qaeda-type terrorist who poses an imminent threat to the United States, among other things.

Nothing in this text impacts the War Powers Resolution which, of course, requires the President to withdraw U.S. forces from hostilities within 60 to 90 days after introduction, absent an authorization from Congress.

The gentleman from Massachusetts brings a critical issue to the House floor: the use of force by U.S. Armed Forces, and the appropriate role for the Congress in that decision.

Any military officer will tell you that the support of the people is critical to the success of a sustained combat operation. As the representative body, that responsibility falls to us. It is an obligation that I know all of my colleagues take seriously, and it is why I expect overwhelming passage of this motion this morning.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 105. It reaffirms our belief that U.S. troops should not be deployed in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific congressional authorization.

Since last December, the terrorist group ISIS has marched across Iraq with lethal efficiency. Fallujah, Ramadi, and Mosul have fallen to their control. Thousands of Iraqi soldiers have been killed or have laid down their weapons. The military equipment they left behind, some supplied by the United States, is now in the hands of these fanatics.

After erasing the border between Iraq and Syria, ISIS has advanced toward our ally, Jordan. And the leaders of ISIS have declared an Islamic caliphate, promising to rule with a brand of barbarism, such as mandatory female genital mutilation, more suited to the Dark Ages than the 21st century.

Madam Speaker, the threat posed by ISIS is real. Iraq is teetering on the brink, and we cannot allow that country to become a safe haven for terrorists that could be used to launch another 9/11.

While the Hamas terrorists are pushing forth in Gaza, the ISIS terrorists are pushing forth in Iraq.

At the same time, however, we need to make clear to the American people and to the Iraqi government that the U.S. combat mission in Iraq is over. After losing more than 4,000 American lives and spending more than \$1 trillion, we cannot allow ourselves to be sucked into another sectarian quagmire.

The crisis in Iraq cannot be solved through military means alone. The solution will be rooted in real political changes in Iraq, more inclusive policies, and a greater effort to avoid sectarian conflict.

President Obama removed the last American combat troops from Iraq on

December 18, 2011, under an agreement reached by the Bush administration, and he has no intention of sending them back, a position with which I firmly agree.

As the President said last month: "American forces will not be returning to combat in Iraq, but we will help Iraqis as they take the fight to terrorists who threaten the Iraqi people, the region, and American interests as well."

In the last several weeks, the President has expanded intelligence and surveillance efforts. He has sent a contingent of troops to protect our diplomatic personnel at the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad, and he has deployed small military assessment teams to get information about the threat that ISIS poses to Iraq, to the region, and to American interests.

I support these measures. They represent the sort of security cooperation with the Iraqi government that we should be offering to support our own national security interests. But they don't require a sustained presence of American combat troops in Iraq.

At the end of the day, we all know it is past time for the Iraqi government to confront some serious challenges. These will require an Iraqi solution, one based on respect for each other and the rule of law.

I would like to thank Representative MCGOVERN, Representative JONES, and Representative LEE for their tenacity and leadership in sparking this important debate. They have worked with us in the Foreign Affairs Committee, constructively with me and Chairman ROYCE both, along with the House leadership on both sides of the aisle, to ensure that the amendment we are considering today would enjoy broad bipartisan support.

So I hope that the process which brought about today's bill will serve as an example of bipartisan cooperation for the House to follow in the days to come.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the House is debating H. Con. Res. 105. I want to thank the Republican leadership for working with Mr. JIM MCGOVERN, BARBARA LEE, and myself and our staffs to get this language so that we could debate it today.

As James Madison said: "The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature."

Unfortunately, we in Congress have for too long abdicated our constitutional responsibility to authorize the use of military force.

This began, for me personally, with my vote for the 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq, which is one of the biggest regrets during my tenure of Congress in voting for that.

With that vote, we gave up our constitutional authority on one of the most important decisions a Member of Congress can make: the decision to send American men and women into war to possibly die.

□ 1030

Madam Speaker, it is my hope that one day, we in Congress will repeal the 2001 and the 2002 AUMF. Until that time comes, I believe that today represents a strong step toward reclaiming the constitutional power that we each have and are entrusted with, to make decisions about going to war or declaring war.

I cannot emphasize enough that no decision is more important for a Member of Congress than a vote to send young men and women to fight and to die for our country.

The main text of this resolution is simple. The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization.

Madam Speaker, this is what Madison meant when he said, "The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature."

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

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. JONES. The legislature is us, the Congress. This is a monumental step toward reclaiming our constitutional authority.

In closing, I want to thank Representatives MCGOVERN and LEE and all my friends in both parties who have fought with me for the right of Congress to declare war. For years, we have been calling for a debate on the floor of the House with regard to the use of our military.

I also want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL and their staffs for this opportunity today.

May God continue to bless our troops, their families, and may God continue to bless America.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 105, as amended. This important bipartisan bill asserts the important constitutional role of Congress in matters of war and peace, and it is my sincere hope that every single Member of this institution will vote in favor.

It is important for our colleagues to know that this resolution is the result of open discussion and dialogue between both sides of the aisle, and it is an example of what can happen when Members come together and decide they want to accomplish something meaningful.

I want to thank Speaker BOEHNER and the majority leadership, Leader PELOSI and Minority Whip HOYER, Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman

ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL, and I want to thank my good friends who have helped lead this effort, my colleagues Congressman WALTER JONES and Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for working together on the language of this resolution.

I want to send a special thanks to all the staff who spent many hours listening to the views and concerns that spanned the political spectrum of this House about America's engagement in Iraq.

In particular, I want to thank Jen Stewart, Rob Karem, Emily Murry, Wyndee Parker, Dan Silverberg, Doug Anderson, Tom Sheehy, Ed Burrier, Jason Steinbaum, Janice Kaguyutan, Doug Campbell, Mira Resnick, Ed Rice, Jirair Ratevosian, Dan Zisa, Ray Celeste, Cindy Buhl, and Keith Stern on my own staff. I am very grateful for how hard each of them worked to achieve a consensus.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is quite straightforward. It requires an authorization from Congress, should the President determine that the United States should escalate its military presence in Iraq.

It does not change the President's existing authorities to protect and ensure the security of U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel, and it does not alter the requirements of the War Powers Resolution.

This resolution makes one clear statement: if the President decides we should further involve our military in Iraq, he needs to work with Congress to authorize it. I don't know how Congress would respond and vote on such a request. For the record, I want to state in the strongest possible way that I think it would be a grave mistake for the United States to reengage militarily in Iraq.

I want to make clear that the intent of this resolution is not to criticize President Obama. I believe him when he says that he has no intention of significantly expanding our military presence in Iraq, and so far, in each of the three recent deployments to Iraq that he has announced, the President rightfully and formally informed Congress "consistent with the War Powers Resolution."

Nor is this the intent to criticize the Republican leadership—rather, the intent of this resolution is to begin to reestablish Congress' rightful role, under article I, section 8 of the Constitution, when it comes to matters of war and peace.

I believe there is broad bipartisan and growing concern that over the past several decades, Congress has ceded far too much of its power to the executive branch. It has happened under Democratic and Republican Presidents. It has happened under Democratic and Republican control of the House and Senate. It is not really a partisan issue. It is an institutional one. We simply haven't done our job.

My concern all along is that Congress has not lived up to its constitutional

responsibilities to debate and authorize the introduction of U.S. forces where they are engaged in roles related to combat.

So while this resolution clearly puts the President on notice, it also reinforces the institutional role of Congress in matters of war and peace.

Madam Speaker, the time to debate our reengagement in Iraq—should it come to that—is before we are caught in the heat of the moment, not when the first body bags come home, not when the first bombs start to fall, not when the worst-case scenario is playing out on our TV screens.

The time to debate Iraq is when we can weigh the pros and cons of action, the pros and cons of supporting the violent and sectarian policies of the Maliki government or whatever government is cobbled together should Maliki be forced to step down.

So I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution to ensure that further deployment of U.S. troops in Iraq receives the careful debate and authorization it deserves. We owe at least that much to our men and women in uniform and their families, and we owe at least that much to our democracy and democratic institutions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. THOMAS MASSIE.

Mr. MASSIE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 105. Article I, section 8, clause 11 of the U.S. Constitution gives the sole power to declare war to Congress, not the President.

The situation in Iraq is deteriorating as we speak. ISIS, a group of violent fundamentalist Islamic thugs, is terrorizing the people of Iraq and destroying the ancient culture of Mosul.

Some have called for the U.S. to interfere once again, but if we are to do so and to send our brave men and women into harm's way overseas, we must honor the Constitution. Congress must authorize any such military action. It would be illegal for the President to do so alone.

Any future military action in Iraq would constitute a new war, with new enemies—ISIS—and would require a new congressional authorization. The President cannot use the 2002 authorization for the use of force in Iraq to justify any new action.

It is important for those who are quick to rush into another war to remember that wars often have unintended consequences. Iraq is a prime example.

In a recent article in *The Telegraph*, historian Dr. Tim Stanley pointed out that prior to the 2003 Iraq war, there were 1.5 million Christians in Iraq. Today, there are only 400,000.

As Dr. Stanley writes, "The lesson is: 'either leave other countries alone or, if you must intervene, do so with consistency and resilience.' The consequences of going in, messing things

up, and then quitting with a weary shrug are terrible for those left behind."

If we are going to go to war, we must follow the Constitution, have Congress declare it, and fight to win. Anything else is illegal, unconstitutional, and likely to lead to unintended, horrific consequences. That is why I support H. Con. Res. 105, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), one of the leaders on this resolution.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, first of all, let me thank Congressman MCGOVERN for yielding, but also for his tireless leadership on this very important issue.

I am proud to join Congressman WALTER JONES and Congressman MCGOVERN in introducing this bipartisan resolution, and I thank them for their consistent support and work, as great Americans, to address these serious issues of war and peace.

This resolution simply prohibits the President to deploy armed services or to engage in combat operations in Iraq without specific debate and authorization from Congress, but this resolution also seeks to reclaim a fundamental congressional responsibility, the constitutionally protected right for Congress to debate and to determine when this country enters into war.

I also am personally concerned about mission creep. We hear many of the same voices who championed the unnecessary war in Iraq, once again, beating the drum for a renewed war in Iraq today.

Last month, President Obama announced that 300 personnel would be sent to Iraq, including intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support, supported by attack helicopters and drones. A few days later, he announced another 200 personnel were soon to be deployed. There are promises to send many additional Hellfire air-to-surface missiles.

Now, I, too, believe President Obama does not intend to send ground troops to Iraq, but we need to make sure that Congress reasserts its constitutional responsibility on this grave issue.

After more than a decade at war in Iraq and Afghanistan, with thousands of United States lives and billions of dollars lost, the need for Congress to reclaim its war-making powers is more critical than ever.

Let me remind you, it was this absence of full debate that led to Congress passing the overly broad 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force in the wake of 9/11. This law has been used to justify everything from the war in Afghanistan, warrantless domestic and international surveillance, holding prisoners indefinitely in Guantanamo, and conducting drone strikes in countries that we are not at war with.

I couldn't vote for that resolution because I have always believed that such

consequences are grave for the United States' national security interests unless we fully debate these issues and, of course, to our standing in the world. We did not debate that resolution any more than 1 hour, and I have continued to attempt to repeal and address the problematic actions justified under this law ever since.

On July 16, Congressmen MCGOVERN, JONES, RIGELL, myself, and others—over 100 Members of Congress from both parties wrote a letter—and we signed that letter—to President Obama to come to Congress for an authorization before any military escalation in Iraq, exactly what this resolution would do.

I will insert the letter into the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 02, 2014.

President BARACK OBAMA,  
The White House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We join you and with those in the international community who are expressing grave concern over the rise in sectarian violence in Iraq over the last days and weeks. The consequences of this development are particularly troubling given the extraordinary loss of American lives and expenditure of funds over ten years that was claimed to be necessary to bring democracy, stability and a respect for human rights to Iraq.

We support your restraint to date in resisting the calls for a “quick” and “easy” military intervention, and for your commitment not to send combat troops back to Iraq. We also appreciate your acknowledgement that this conflict requires a political solution, and that military action alone cannot successfully lead to a resolution.

We do not believe intervention could be either quick or easy. And, we doubt it would be effective in meeting either humanitarian or strategic goals, and that it could very well be counter-productive. This is a moment for urgent consultations and engagement with all parties in the region who could bring about a cease fire and launch a dialogue that could lead to a reconciliation of the conflict.

Any solution to this complex crisis can only be achieved through a political settlement, and only if the process and outcome is inclusive of all segments of the Iraqi population—anything short of that cannot successfully bring stability to Iraq or the region.

As you consider options for U.S. intervention, we write to urge respect for the constitutional requirements for using force abroad. The Constitution vests in Congress the power and responsibility to authorize offensive military action abroad. The use of military force in Iraq is something the Congress should fully debate and authorize. Members of Congress must consider all the facts and alternatives before we can determine whether military action would contribute to ending this most recent violence, create a climate for political stability, and protect civilians from greater harm.

We stand ready to work with you to this end.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lee; Sam Farr; James P. Moran; Janice Hahn; Peter A. DeFazio; Henry C. “Hank” Johnson, Jr.; Michael M. Honda; Scott E. Rigell; Chellie Pingree; Betty McCollum; John Garamendi; James P. McGovern; Richard M. Nolan; Beto O'Rourke, Members of Congress.

Katherine Clark; Zoe Lofgren; Earl Blumenauer; George Miller; Anna G. Eshoo; Julia Brownley; Hakeem S. Jeffries; Chris Gibson; Jackie Speier; John J. Duncan, Jr.; Judy Chu; Robert C. “Bobby” Scott; Alan Grayson; James A. Himes, Members of Congress.

Michael H. Michaud; John B. Larson; Mark Pocan; Reid J. Ribble; Frank Pallone, Jr.; Karen Bass; Maxine Waters; John Conyers, Jr.; Walter B. Jones; Peter Welch; Jared Huffman; John P. Sarbanes; Ed Pastor; Grace F. Napolitano, Members of Congress.

Alcee L. Hastings; John Lewis; José E. Serrano; Nydia M. Valázquez; Louise McIntosh Slaughter; Andre Carson; Gloria Negrete McLeod; Jim McDermott; Keith Ellison; Lloyd Doggett; Rush Holt; Bobby L. Rush; Emanuel Cleaver; Bennie G. Thompson, Members of Congress.

Lois Capps; Kurt Schrader; Jerrold Nadler; Mark Takano; Collin C. Peterson; Ann McLane Kuster; Justin Amash; Charles B. Rangel; Raul M. Grijalva; Niki Tsongas; Kathy Castor; Michael E. Capuano; Yvette D. Clarke; Matt Salmon; Kyrsten Sinema; Donald M. Payne, Jr.; Lois Frankel; Rosa L. DeLauro; Richard E. Neal; Eleanor Holmes Norton; Alan S. Lowenthal; Stephen F. Lynch, Members of Congress.

Paul Broun; Cheri Bustos; Marcy Kaptur; Sheila Jackson Lee; John Tierney; Henry Waxman; James R. Langevin; Thomas Massie; Carolyn B. Maloney; Tony Cardenas; Steve Cohen; Howard Coble; Donna F. Edwards; David Cicilline, Members of Congress.

Ann Kirkpatrick; Donna Christensen; William Pascrell; Luis V. Gutiérrez; Robin L. Kelly; Marcia L. Fudge; Dave Loebsack; Paul D. Tonko; Mike Doyle; Jan Schakowsky; Chaka Fattah; Suzanne Bonamici; Joseph P. Kennedy, III; William R. Keating, Members of Congress.

Ms. LEE of California. Also, let me remind you that last month, we debated the Defense Appropriations bill. Over 150 bipartisan Members supported my amendment that would have prohibited funds from being used to conduct combat operations in Iraq.

This resolution, which is bipartisan, merely requires the President to come to Congress, should he decide to engage in an escalated combat role in Iraq.

The reality is, though, there is no military solution in Iraq. This is a sectarian war with longstanding roots that were enflamed when we invaded Iraq in 2003. Any lasting solution must be political and take into account all sides.

The change Iraq needs must come from Iraqis rejecting violence in favor of a peaceful democracy and respect for the rights of all citizens.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, the American people agree. After more than a decade of war, thousands of American lives lost, and billions of dollars spent, the American people are rightfully weary.

Before we put our brave servicemen and -women in harm's way again, Con-

gress should carry out its constitutional responsibility and vote on whether or not to get militarily involved in Iraq.

Of course, after we pass this resolution, I urge the Republican leadership to bring up our bill, H.R. 3852, to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

I want to, once again, thank Congressman MCGOVERN for staying the course. He was one of the first Members calling for an end to the war in Iraq and to bring our brave troops home. He has provided tremendous leadership through a variety of legislative efforts. This is just another one of those efforts. So I want to thank you again, Congressman MCGOVERN and Congressman JONES.

I thank all of the Members who are supporting this, including our leadership. Congress should never allow war authorizations to remain on the books in perpetuity. We don't do this for the farm bill. We don't do this for the transportation bill. Sooner or later, we need to repeal the initial authorization.

□ 1045

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ADAM KINZINGER, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I want to say thank you to the chairman for yielding me this time. Thank you to both sides for your hard work. It is rare that we get compromises in Washington, and I appreciate the work you have put in, but I cannot, in good conscious, support this.

I am a veteran of Iraq. I saw many people that fought hard to bring the Iraqi people freedom, and I saw a war that was won in 2011. What we are watching happen in Iraq right now is the worst-case scenario in the Middle East. There is a march of jihadism and extremism that makes al Qaeda look like puppy dogs that is happening in Iraq, a President that is indecisive on what to do. We have genital mutilations ordered in Mosul just the other day by ISIS, and we are here in Washington, D.C., debating what we need to do to hamstring the President who is already indecisive enough about this.

When American military—American Marines and Army—get themselves into sustained combat, they often call on strong air support to help them win the fight. And that is why—as well as the strong Marines and Army we have, that is why we are so good at what we do. We are asking the Iraqi military to take back their country and take land but yet not providing them substantial air power that is needed to destroy this very evil cancer that is growing in the Middle East.

That is what we ought to be here discussing today is how to stop this cancer of jihadism and ISIS that is growing in the Middle East, how to stop that from growing, and ultimately prevent it from coming here to the United

States of America and potentially to our allies.

So while I, again, strongly respect and fully understand what my chairman is doing here and appreciate his hard work, I think instead of giving the President an ability to blame Congress for his indecisiveness, I think it is time that we stand up and say we have to defend our interest and defend people that want to defend themselves.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his comments and for his service to our country. But the gentleman should draft an authorization for war and ask for his leadership to bring it up. That is what the Constitution tells us to do.

What this resolution is about today is not a vote on getting out of Iraq or staying in Iraq or expanding our role in Iraq. This is a vote on whether or not we are going to live up to our constitutional responsibility. This should not be controversial no matter what one's views are on military reengagement in Iraq.

At this point, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA), who has been a leader on this issue.

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 105 having already taken action on this issue that has every American gravely concerned. I opposed our involvement in Iraq in 2002. I opposed it last month, and I oppose it today.

While I intend to support the resolution at hand, I believe we should have required the President to recall any troops that are not in Iraq strictly for diplomatic security. This was the original version of this resolution. Notwithstanding, it is very significant that this House of Representatives will probably pass overwhelmingly this resolution that takes a very firm stand that Congress should be authorizing any further military action in Iraq. We owe it to the people of this Nation.

Let's be clear. The President invoked the War Powers Act under the guise of protecting our embassy. There are now nearly 1,000 U.S. troops in harm's way—Apache helicopters and drones, just to name a few—and we are taking sides in a sectarian civil war. Let's not forget that that is what we are doing.

Congress must reject a new war in Iraq. I urge my colleagues to demand further action and to take further action to withdraw our troops now before our men and women in uniform are again asked to pay too high a price for our inaction.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, Joseph Cirincione wrote an article in *Defense One*, and I want to quote a part of it. He says:

The hard truth is that there is little we can do to save the corrupt, incompetent government we installed in Iraq. If 10 years, mil-

lions of hours of work, and hundreds of billions of dollars cannot build a regime that can survive, it is difficult to imagine any fix that can. Those seeking to blame the Obama administration for the collapse are engaged in a cynical game. There is not a quick fix to this problem. The hard truth is that, like the collapse of the Diem government in South Vietnam a generation ago, there is little we can do to prop up this government. As military expert Micah Zenko tweeted, "Unless the U.S. has bombs that can install wisdom and leadership into Prime Minister Maliki, air strikes in Iraq would be pointless."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I commend the authors of this resolution, Representatives MCGOVERN, JONES, and LEE, for their leadership on this issue of war and peace.

The topic of limiting our future military involvement in Iraq deserves more than 1 hour. It deserves an entire legislative day to discuss this resolution and the larger question: the issue of the war-making powers of Congress. The history of our involvement in Iraq and exactly how we came to this point is of paramount importance in understanding why it is vital that the House pass this resolution. But since time is limited, let me come to the point: no more American soldiers should kill or be killed in Iraq to redeem our past mistakes.

The United States has spent years and billions of dollars trying to rebuild Iraq's armed forces, to no end. Sending 300 or 3,000 or 30,000 advisers to Iraq would be a pointless exercise when the Iraqi Army continues to melt away in the face of rebels.

Unless the Iraqi Government can inspire confidence in Kurds, Sunni, and Shi'a that it is a fair, legitimate government concerned with the welfare of all Iraqis, no amount of money or American advisers will save it. We have already lost more than 4,000 Americans in one war in Iraq. Let's not invoke the insidious and fallacious argument that our previous heavy investment justifies further heavy investment.

Had America not waged an unnecessary war in Iraq starting in 2003, there would be no need for us to debate this resolution now. Like so many misguided military interventions in our history, America's misguided war with Iraq unleashed forces that we cannot now control. We should not compound that error by squandering more lives and money in Iraq.

I hope we can have, beyond this moment now, a fuller debate of the war-making powers of Congress. I hope, as Representative LEE said a few moments ago, that we can have a debate on the repeal of the Authorization for Use of Military Force that was the excuse for much military, paramilitary, and domestic intrusive activities in this country.

But for now we should, I think, recognize the good acts of Representatives MCGOVERN, JONES, and LEE in bringing this resolution to the floor. I think it

will help further the debate greatly. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I am going to reserve the right to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a letter from 33 national organizations in support of this resolution.

JULY 23, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCGOVERN: Representatives Jim McGovern, Walter Jones and Barbara Lee have introduced H. Con. Res. 105, a privileged resolution to direct the President to remove U.S. troops from Iraq within 30 days, or no later than the end of this year. We urge you to co-sponsor and support this important resolution.

This resolution, which provides an exception for those troops needed to protect U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel, is likely to be voted on in the full House before the end of July. The sponsors are using the special procedures outlined under the War Powers Resolution that requires the House to take up this bill after 15 calendar days.

Last month, President Obama announced that 300 personnel would be sent to Iraq, including intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance support, augmented by Apache attack helicopters and drones, after military aggression by the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria. A few days later, he announced another 200 personnel were soon to be deployed. There are promises to send many additional Hellfire air-to-surface missiles.

As the United States knows from past, bitter experience in Vietnam, a small military engagement can escalate into a major military war that is disastrous for the United States. There is little a few hundred or a few thousand troops can do in Iraq that 140,000 could not do at the height of American involvement in Iraq.

President George W. Bush signed an agreement before leaving office to withdraw all American forces from Iraq by 2011. That decision should not be reversed.

Congress has the constitutional responsibility to debate the merits of American military involvement in Iraq before the first American casualties. Whatever your position on Iraq or this resolution, the measure provides an opportunity for sorely needed debate on a very critical issue.

We urge you to co-sponsor and support the resolution, and to oppose what is likely to be a tabling motion before the end of July.

Sincerely,

Fred Azcarate, USAction; Medea Benjamin and Jodie Evans, CODEPINK; Becky Bond, CREDO; Simone Campbell, SSS, NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby; Angela Canterbury, Council for a Livable World; Jeanne Dauray, Progressive Democrats of America; Carolyn Rusti Eisenberg, United for Peace and Justice; Michael Eisenscher, U.S. Labor Against the War; Jenefer Ellington, DC Statehood Green Party; Hannah Frisch, Civilian Soldier Alliance; Anna Galland, MoveOn.org; William Hartung, Center for International Policy; Susan Henry-Crowe, M.Div., DD, The United Methodist Church—General Board of Church and Society; Matt Howard, Iraq Veterans Against the War; Rev. Linda Jaramillo, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; Kevin Kamps, Beyond Nuclear; Aura Kanegis, American Friends Service Committee; David Krieger, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation; Rabbi Michael Lerner, Tikkun Magazine's Network of Spiritual Progressives; Paul Kawika Martin, Peace Action.

Stephen Miles, Win Without War; Andrea Miller, Progressive Democrats of America; Robert Naiman, Just Foreign Policy; Jim O'Brien, Historians Against the War; Jon Rainwater, Peace Action West; Diane Randall, Friends Committee on National Legislation; Susan Shaer, Women's Action for New Directions; Alice Slater, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, NY; Guy Stevens, PeacePAC; Paul Walker, Green Cross International; Jim Wallis, Sojourners; Rabbi Arthur Waskow, The Shalom Center; Jim Winkler, National Council of Churches, USA.

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

Regarding the term "sustained combat role," this resolution specifically states that nothing in this language supersedes the War Powers Resolution. The War Powers Resolution lays out very clear timeframes, beyond which we should consider troops to be deployed for a sustained period. "Combat role" implies the many roles that our troops might be engaged in or supporting combat operations in Iraq. I think, however, that this resolution is based on the President and the Congress acting in good faith and working together to authorize any deeper involvement in the ongoing conflict in Iraq.

I want to again acknowledge that this is an important resolution, and this is an important moment for this institution. We have bipartisan collaboration on this language. We have bipartisan agreement that we ought not to give up our constitutional responsibilities when it comes to declaring war or getting into wars.

Again, I want to thank Speaker BOEHNER. I want to thank Leader PELOSI, and I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL and everybody who is involved in working together and understanding that no matter what your view is on what we should be doing in Iraq, that we all agree that we have a responsibility here and that we matter in this debate.

I think it is also important to realize that we are coming together to acknowledge that it is important to debate this issue before we get into the heat of battle, and I hope that it never comes to that. For too long, I think this institution has not done what it is supposed to do when it comes to war, both under Democratic Presidents and under Republican Presidents.

As I said in the beginning, this is not a critique of President Obama. I believe the President when he says he does not want to see any more combat troops deployed in Iraq. I believe him when he says he does not want to re-engage militarily in yet another war. But I also know from history that there is such a thing called the slippery slope and there are events that happened that sometimes overtake people's original positions, and then we find ourselves in a situation that we did not expect to be in.

What we are saying here is that, if, in fact, the President, for whatever rea-

son, decides to escalate our military involvement, Congress needs to debate it and Congress needs to authorize it. It is that simple.

This resolution is not as strong as some of us would want it to be, and it is not as weak as some would want it to be. This represents a compromise. I also think it is important to point out that every once in a while this place works; and I think this is one of the moments where we can point to that the Congress is working, and we are working on an issue that I think is of incredible importance.

Madam Speaker, I will just close by saying, like so many of my colleagues here, I have been to countless funerals of soldiers who have been killed not only in Iraq but in Afghanistan. I have talked to parents, I have talked to brothers and sisters, and I have talked to grandparents during very difficult times when they have lost a loved one.

It is important that we recognize that going to war, deploying our troops in hostilities, is a big deal. We ought to be very clear that this is important and that we ought not to go down that road lightly. I am grateful that this resolution makes it clear that we are going to debate these issues, that we are going to authorize these issues, and that we are going to respect the Constitution.

So, with that, Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mr. ROYCE. I want to thank everybody who has been involved in this. This is an important statement, and I am very hopeful that we will get strong, bipartisan support.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, Madam Speaker, let me begin by saying I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts' spirit of cooperation. Mr. MCGOVERN and I have worked on a number of issues from victims' rights to trying to stop the exploitation of child soldiers in Africa, and so I appreciate that spirit on his part.

As I noted in my opening testimony, my opening statement here, the threat of ISIS is real, and I do think we should reflect on that as we debate this issue.

□ 1100

Never has a terrorist organization itself controlled so much territory, especially such a large, resource-rich safe haven, as ISIS has in this caliphate, as they perceive it, now. Never has a terrorist organization possessed the heavy weaponry and cash and personnel as ISIS does today, and this includes thousands of Western passports and thousands of individuals who are passport holders from the West.

One militant engaged in this battle recently returned to Europe and attacked a museum in Brussels, so more of that is coming as a result of ISIS. And let's not take this debate to mean that we should not be doing anything to offset that organization.

I think the President has failed U.S. national security interests by not, for example, authorizing or accepting the request made by the government in Iraq and by our personnel in our Embassy for drone strikes on these terrorist ISIS camps. Remember, this is a situation where the drone can actually see the ISIS combatants with the black flag of al Qaeda waving as they move across the desert or as they are encamped. This was an opportunity to hit them when they were vulnerable, before they began that city march across the desert, as they began to take those cities with their armed columns.

I do think, as the U.N. reported yesterday, that there are going to be consequences to these fatwas that come down from ISIS. The one yesterday specifically—according to the U.N., ISIS is requiring female mutilation in the new caliphate it is establishing, at least in the Mosul area and around that area. That is about 4 million females that would be subject to this, if they are as doctrinaire as they have been on other issues. So we will be wrestling with what to do about ISIS, what we can do.

What this resolution says, and I think the overwhelming majority of us in Congress agrees with this, is that if the President of the United States ordered U.S. Armed Forces into sustained combat in Iraq, then he should be coming to Congress to seek an explicit statutory authorization and the backing of this body, and that is the text before us today.

It says, again:

The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization for such use enacted after the date of adoption of this concurrent resolution.

That is the position of the Members of Congress, as the representative body, frankly, and as any military officer will tell you, support of the people is critical to the success of a sustained combat operation. As the representative body, that responsibility falls to us. It is an obligation that I know all of my colleagues take seriously. And, again, it is why I expect overwhelming passage of this motion this morning.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 105, a resolution prohibiting the President from deploying or maintaining United States Armed Forces in sustained combat roles in Iraq unless specifically authorized by Congress by statute enacted after the date of adoption of the resolution.

The war in Iraq caused a lot of unearned suffering in Iraq and here at home. This is the same war, Madam Speaker, whose proponents misrepresented to the nation would last no more than six months and likely less than six weeks.

This same war in Iraq, we were led to believe by the Bush Administration, would cost less than \$50 billion and would be paid out of



the ample revenues from Iraq's oil fields. The war in Iraq, the American people were promised, should have ended years ago with Americans troops greeted as liberators by jubilant Iraqis throwing rose petals at their feet.

As I and my colleagues in the Progressive Caucus and the Out of Iraq Caucus forecast at the time, the starry-eyed, rosy scenarios laid out by President Bush, Vice-President Cheney, and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld would come to pass in fantasy land, but not in the cold, hard world of reality which they refused to live in.

The war in Iraq lasted longer than America's involvement in World War II, the greatest conflict in all of human history. But there was a difference. The Second World War ended in complete and total victory for the United States and its allies.

But then again, in that conflict America was led by FDR, a great Commander-in-Chief, who had a plan to win the war and secure the peace, listened to his generals, and sent troops in sufficient numbers and sufficiently trained and equipped to do the job.

As a result of the colossal miscalculation in deciding to invade Iraq, the Armed Forces and the people of the United States suffered incalculable damage.

The war in Iraq claimed the lives of 4,484 brave servicemen and women. More than 24,600 Americans were wounded, many suffering the most horrific injuries. American taxpayers paid more than \$800 billion to sustain this misadventure.

The depth, breadth, and scope of the misguided, mismanaged, and misrepresented war in Iraq is utterly without precedent in American history. It was a tragedy in a league all its own.

And it must never be repeated. That is why I strongly support H. Con. Res. 105 and urge all my colleagues to join me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 23, 2014, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution, as amended.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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.

#### CHILD TAX CREDIT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 680, I call up the bill (H.R. 4935) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). Pursuant to House Resolution 680, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, an

amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-54 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 4935

*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 "Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014".*

#### SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN CHILD TAX CREDIT; INFLATION ADJUSTMENT OF CREDIT AMOUNT AND PHASEOUT THRESHOLDS IN CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) *ELIMINATION OF MARRIAGE PENALTY.—Section 24(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "means—" and all that follows and inserting "means \$75,000 (twice such amount in the case of a joint return)."*

(b) *INFLATION ADJUSTMENT OF CREDIT AMOUNT AND PHASEOUT THRESHOLDS.—Section 24 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:*

*"(g) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—"*

*"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2014, the \$1,000 amount in subsection (a) and the \$75,000 amount in subsection (b)(2) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—*

*"(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by*

*"(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2013' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.*

*"(2) ROUNDING.—Any increase determined under paragraph (1) shall be rounded—*

*"(A) in the case of the \$1,000 amount in subsection (a), to the nearest multiple of \$50, and*

*"(B) in the case of the \$75,000 amount in subsection (b)(2), to the nearest multiple of \$1,000."*

*(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.*

#### SEC. 3. SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER REQUIRED TO CLAIM THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:*

*"(5) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO TAXPAYER.—"*

*"(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year unless the taxpayer includes the taxpayer's social security number on the return of tax for such taxable year.*

*"(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the requirement of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as met if the social security number of either spouse is included on such return."*

(b) *OMISSION TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR.—Subparagraph (1) of section 6213(g)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:*

*"(1) an omission of a correct social security number required under section 24(d)(5) (relating to refundable portion of child tax credit), or a correct TIN required under section 24(e) (relating to child tax credit), to be included on a return,"*

(c) *CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (e) of section 24 of such Code is amended by inserting "WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING CHILDREN" after "IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT" in the heading thereof.*

(d) *EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.*

#### SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) *STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.*

(b) *SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4935.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, if one thing has been consistent about the Obama administration, it is the failure of its economic policies. The President's economic policies make it harder for American families to get by every day. A record number of Americans are unable to work, and those who can find work are unable to secure full-time employment and instead are forced to accept only part-time jobs. This last quarter, the economy actually shrunk, and real wages—what Americans use to pay their mortgages and put their kids through school—are continuing to fall.

Worse yet, the cost of raising a family is only getting more expensive. The cost of clothing, food, child care, and schooling all continue to climb. According to the Department of Agriculture, since 1960, the cost of raising a child has increased by about 4.4 percent per year. But more recently, since 2004, the cost of children's clothing has gone up 89 percent; the cost of food since then 21 percent; and the cost of child care since 2004 107 percent. And since then, the child tax credit has remained unchanged.

Currently, our Tax Code helps ease some of this burden by providing a child tax credit. The credit, which has been around since the 1990s, now provides a \$1,000 tax credit for each child. Unfortunately, that credit is not, and has not, been indexed for inflation. So while the cost of raising children continues to rise, the value of the child tax credit actually decreases.

Today's legislation, H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014, will fix this problem by indexing the child tax credit to inflation. Making a commonsense change like this will ensure that families can make every dollar count. The current child tax credit also disadvantages those who file jointly compared to those who file as single individuals, creating what is known as a marriage penalty. This