

Every veteran should have the opportunity to include their spouse on their own tombstone should they wish to do so.

I would like to thank my colleague from California (Mr. PANETTA), a veteran himself, for joining with me to correct this oversight in a bipartisan effort. Honoring the families of our veterans is something that everyone can and should support.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 13, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 13, 2019, at 11:40 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 47.  
That the Senate passed S. 461.  
With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

#### BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, in the next few days, we are going to be asked to take another step on our journey to securing our border.

The Congress has to take this very seriously because we have tens of thousands of people dying every year from drug overdoses with a lot of those drugs crossing our southern border. Just a few weeks ago we seized hundreds of pounds of fentanyl, a drug that can kill millions of people and, in fact, has taken tens of thousands of lives.

We know our border is unsecured. We have to do whatever we can to give the President and the Department of Homeland Security the ability to protect our southern border.

#### MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, I rise in memory of the 17 students killed nearly 1 year ago today at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School. They deserve more than our remembrance, though. They deserve action and the promise that we as a country will do better. I speak today as a father, as a soldier, as a sportsman, and as a resident of Aurora, Colorado.

I respect the Second Amendment and our heritage of responsible gun owner-

ship, but I learned while serving our country that citizenship comes with duties to our fellow Americans. One of those duties is to ensure that our fellow citizens can live without fear and safely pursue their dreams and ambitions. I was sent here to speak the truth, and the truth is we are not fulfilling that duty to one another.

So let us be the generation who has the courage to stand up to the gun lobby and to the special interests. Let us be the generation that recognizes that citizenship comes with responsibility. I know we can be that generation.

The question is: Can we be that Congress?

I call on my colleagues to pass H.R. 8 and reinstitute the ban on assault weapons to keep our kids and our communities safe.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable KEVIN McCARTHY, Republican Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 8, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker of the House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to H. Res. 6 Sec. 104(a), I am pleased to appoint the following Member to the House Democracy Partnership to serve as the Ranking Republican Member:

The Honorable Vern Buchanan of Florida.  
Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN McCARTHY,  
Republican Leader.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 37, REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS; WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 122 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 122

*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 joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. All

points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. After general debate the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original joint resolution for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-4. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such 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 amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the joint resolution or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of February 17, 2019, relating to a measure making or continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of February 17, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 4. The chair of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the Congressional Record not later than February 17, 2019, such material as she may deem explanatory of measures making or continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend, who is the ranking member of the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

## GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1215

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on Monday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 122, providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 37, under a structured rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It also provides same-day authority for fiscal year 2019 appropriations measures, suspension authority, and authority for the Appropriations chair to insert explanatory language into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, all through February 17.

Madam Speaker, the Constitution specifically empowers Congress with the responsibility to declare war; and for more than 4 years, there has been a Saudi-led, U.S.-supported conflict happening in Yemen that is a war by any logical definition.

Nearly all of the bombs that have fallen say the same thing: “Made in the United States of America.” They fall on weddings. They fall on hospitals and on homes. They fall on funerals, refugee camps, and school buses. It is an aerial bombing campaign that hammers children, families, and civilian neighborhoods every single day.

The U.S. military has supported this reign of terror with logistics, intelligence, ground support, midair refueling of bombers, and the sale of bombs and munitions dropped on Yemen.

The Armed Conflict Location and Event Data Project estimates that more than 60,000 civilians and combatants have been killed in Yemen over the last 2 years. This total is increasing by more than 2,000 people every single month.

Madam Speaker, 85,000 children under the age of 5 have died from hunger and disease; 18 million people there are food insecure; and 75 percent of Yemen’s population is in need of humanitarian assistance.

The United Nations has said Yemen is suffering from the fastest growing cholera epidemic ever recorded, as well as the world’s biggest food emergency.

These are not abstract numbers. These are human lives—tens of thousands of children lost.

Given all of this, Americans would be forgiven for believing that Congress actually declared our involvement in this war, but we have not. We abdicated our responsibility to the executive branch instead, across multiple Presidents, Democratic and Republican alike.

Some may dance around this fact by calling what is happening there a conflict, but let’s call it what it is. It is a

war. And our involvement in this war is unconstitutional.

Despite being one of the world’s worst humanitarian crises, others, like the President, don’t mention Yemen at all. In his State of the Union Address last week, President Trump, right here in this Chamber, discussed his ineffective wall with Mexico, encouraged Congress to stop upholding our oversight responsibilities over his administration, and highlighted how Americans will once again be sent into space.

It was the longest State of the Union Address in nearly 20 years, but the President didn’t utter the word “Yemen”—not once. He couldn’t even spare 2 minutes to update this Congress and the American people on our involvement there. Are you kidding me?

The President may not want to talk about it, but a free press has been delivering the grisly details day after day, in spite of the roadblocks the Saudis have thrown up to limit media access to Yemen.

Perhaps none spoke more vocally than the late Saudi dissident and Washington Post reporter Jamal Khashoggi. He called for an end to this conflict in a column titled: “Saudi Arabia’s Crown Prince Must Restore Dignity to His Country—By Ending Yemen’s Cruel War.” That was published in The Washington Post just weeks before his death.

Let’s be honest. What happened to Jamal Khashoggi was a murder. All evidence makes it clear that it was likely at the behest of Saudi Crown Prince Mohammad bin Salman. A recent New York Times article even revealed that American intelligence agencies intercepted a conversation where bin Salman threatened to use a bullet on Mr. Khashoggi if he didn’t end his criticism of Saudi Arabia and this conflict.

Madam Speaker, is this really the kind of regime Congress wants as our Nation’s partner?

There was even a report that Saudis and the UAE are transferring American-made weapons to al-Qaida fighters and other rebels. This would expose sensitive national security technology that could endanger the lives of our military.

President Trump has said of Saudi Arabia: They have been a great ally.

Really? Really? This is a country that is responsible for killing and dismembering a Washington Post reporter.

Madam Speaker, if this is what the President considers a friend, then I would hate to see what he considers a foe.

Even Republicans are angry with this administration’s apparent affinity towards Saudi Arabia. Politico reported: “Senate Republicans are fuming at President Donald Trump for telling lawmakers that he would disregard a law requiring a report to Congress determining who is responsible for the murder of Saudi journalist Jamal Khashoggi.”

No Member of Congress should be okay with a President showing such disregard for the laws that we pass, and we certainly shouldn’t look the other way when it comes to the murder of a resident of the United States.

I say to all my friends on the other side of the aisle: If you want to send a message that United States foreign policy respects human rights, join with us on this resolution.

Prior Republican Congresses have used every legislative trick in the book to prevent this debate. They even took the unprecedented step of stripping war powers resolutions related to our involvement in Yemen of their privileged status—not once but twice.

These tactics may have delayed us, but they did not deter us. Speaker Boehner may have been content ceding our constitutional duties to the executive branch. Speaker Ryan may also have been happy to do so. Thankfully, Speaker PELOSI is not. She is empowering this Congress to do its job.

I am glad that, under her leadership, this Congress has strengthened its political will and is reasserting our Article I constitutional responsibilities. This is the system our Founders intended, and it is what our constituents expect of all of us.

This Congress is not turning a blind eye to U.S. involvement in Yemen. This Congress is not looking away from the civil war the world sees unfolding on its television screens.

I want to thank the Congressional Progressive Caucus and, especially, Congressman KHANNA for leading this matter. Congressman KHANNA has been the conscience of Congress when it comes to our involvement in Yemen. He has pushed us again and again and again to do something as these atrocities mount.

We not only have a constitutional responsibility to pass the underlying resolution, we have a moral responsibility.

No Congress should be complicit in the bombing of children or the bombing of water treatment plants during a cholera outbreak or the decimation of hospitals during a humanitarian catastrophe or the creation of a blockade that leads thousands of people to die by starvation.

Considering this measure in the opening weeks of this Congress represents a clear break from the old ways of doing business, where matters of war and peace were routinely swept under the rug.

I am proud that this is a structured rule that makes in order a bipartisan amendment and a minority amendment. The bipartisan amendment is mine, and, among other things, it says that nothing in this resolution may be considered as authorizing the use of military force and nothing may alter the 2001 AUMF because, as important as this measure is, it is also targeted specifically to our involvement only in and affecting the war in Yemen.

It is something Republicans and Democrats agree on. Members ranging

from conservative Republican TOM MASSIE to progressive Congresswoman BARBARA LEE have signed on as cosponsors. It should not be controversial.

Madam Speaker, there is bipartisan agreement that the U.S. involvement in Yemen needs to end, so I urge all my colleagues to seize this opportunity that we have fought for so long. Vote “yes” on this rule and the underlying joint resolution. Let’s finally end our Nation’s complicity in the greatest humanitarian crisis taking place on our planet today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to thank my good friend, Chairman McGOVERN, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Normally, Madam Speaker, I would be agreeing with my good friend, Mr. McGOVERN, on the issue of congressional war powers, and, frankly, I want to applaud his efforts over the years to reassert congressional war powers.

It is a responsibility, in my view and, I know, my friend’s view, that Congress has abdicated and one which we must work to reclaim in the weeks and months ahead. I commit to work with my friend, as I have in the past, to do just that in the future. But, in my view, this particular issue is not about congressional war powers.

Madam Speaker, we had a spirited debate on this joint resolution in the Rules Committee Monday night, and I expect that today’s debate will be just as spirited. The reason is because this measure concerns one of the most important of Congress’ powers: the power under Article I of the Constitution to declare war and to say when, where, and with whom the American Armed Forces will be committed to combat.

In 1973, Congress passed the War Powers Resolution, which is intended to give Congress and the President procedures to follow when committing U.S. Armed Forces into hostilities and to give Congress a method to instruct the President to remove U.S. forces from hostilities.

Today, the majority is bringing up H.J. Res. 37, a resolution ostensibly arising under Congress’ powers under the War Powers Resolution, to instruct the President to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities in Yemen. Specifically, this refers to United States support for key allies, a coalition led by Saudi Arabia in their intervention in the civil war in Yemen against the Iranian-backed Houthi rebels.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, I believe this resolution is fatally flawed, misstates the facts, and will not accomplish what the majority is promising. For that reason, I oppose this rule and oppose this joint resolution.

Let’s start with the text of the resolution.

Section 2 of the resolution directs the President to “remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities

in or affecting the Republic of Yemen except United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at al-Qaida or associated forces.”

Of course, the problem with this resolution is that, under the terms of the War Powers Resolution, American Armed Forces are not currently engaged in hostilities. Hostilities, under the War Powers Resolution, means firing weapons or dropping bombs.

As we heard on Monday night at rules, the United States is presently providing assistance to the Saudi-led coalition that falls short of actual hostilities. We are providing intelligence and logistics support to an ally, but that is a far cry from the threshold necessary to be considered hostilities for the purposes of the War Powers Resolution.

This came up during Monday night’s Rules Committee debate. I note that even Representative CONNOLLY, who spoke in favor of this resolution at the Foreign Affairs Committee a few weeks ago, stated that “the United States is not technically involved on the ground in hostilities.”

If we are not “technically involved” in hostilities—we don’t have troops on the ground, we don’t have flights in the air, and we are not engaging in combat missions of any kind against the Houthis in Yemen—then what does this resolution actually accomplish?

The majority attempts to get around this by redefining hostilities to mean “in-flight refueling” non-United States aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing civil war in Yemen.”

Even if I did accept, for the sake of argument, that this is a legitimate definition—and I don’t—this is still a false statement. The United States is not currently providing Saudi Arabia with in-flight refueling assistance and has not since early November of last year. That fact is just one of the many problems with the resolution.

I do point out the last administration certainly did that. It is actually this administration that canceled that procedure, which it inherited from the Obama administration.

But even if the statement, again, were accurate, I believe the majority’s resolution raises significant questions that should give us pause.

Across the globe, the United States has security agreements with 117 countries, including Saudi Arabia and other countries in the Saudi-led coalition. We as a nation and the President of the United States have obligations under those security agreements, including to provide them with support when they find themselves in combat situations. The resolution the majority is asking us to consider today is putting all of those security agreements—all 117 of them—into jeopardy.

When the President provides assistance short of hostilities to allies and to countries with whom the United States has a security agreement, the President is generally well within his or her rights as Commander in Chief to do so

and well within his or her statutory authority to do so.

It is only when American troops enter hostilities that the War Powers Resolution applies, and today, in Yemen, American forces are not involved in hostilities.

I think that the majority should sit back and think about the possible consequences of this resolution. For allies around the globe, this resolution should give them pause; and, for our adversaries, this resolution should give them hope.

For the first time, the United States Congress would be saying that the President of the United States no longer has the authority to provide assistance short of hostilities that we have agreed to under our security agreements with these countries. For our allies and NATO, this would put in jeopardy our commitment to the collective defense of Europe.

□ 1230

For our allies in the Pacific, like South Korea and Japan, it would put into question our ability to continue to provide support in the event of a conflict with North Korea.

For potential adversaries like Russia or Iran, this resolution provides the hope that America will not live up to its security commitments and will not support our allies during their time of need.

Perhaps most disturbingly, it would put our ongoing security arrangements with the state of Israel in question. In 1973, shortly before the War Powers Resolution was passed, Israel was subject to a surprise attack. During the resulting Yom Kippur War, while Israel was fighting for its survival, the United States launched an effort to resupply Israel. The United States military airlifted supplies, ammunition, and vehicles to Israel, helping to ensure their continued survival. However, we were never engaged in hostilities. We never committed forces to combat.

If the majority has its say, U.S. assistance to Israel under similar circumstances could be put in jeopardy. Under the type of resolution the majority is putting forward today, Israel would have good cause to question the U.S. commitment to that nation and to question our commitment to providing Israel with support in the future.

Should the United States provide Israel with the support it needs, our allies would have good reason to fear that a portion of the House of Representatives would try to shut off the tap by putting forward a resolution like this. I suggest to my friends that they rethink whether the War Powers Resolution should or even can be used in this way.

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

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

Just so there is no misunderstanding, in this resolution, it is written, Section

3: “Nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to influence or disrupt any military operations and co-operation with Israel.” I mean, it is written here for everybody to see.

Secondly, my good friend talked about the consequences of moving this legislation forward. Let me tell you what the consequences of not moving this resolution forward are. It means that we are totally content to sit back and say nothing and not admit that our government has its fingerprints all over one of the worst humanitarian crises in the world. It means that we will be complicit in the continuing destruction and murder in Yemen.

If this country stands for anything, if the United States of America stands for anything, we need to stand out loud and foursquare for human rights. For too long, especially under this administration, human rights have become an afterthought.

What makes us great is the fact that we do have a high standard when it comes to human rights, that we are there to speak up for those who are being persecuted and those who are being murdered.

This is a statement, this is a signal, to the administration and to the Saudi Government that when it comes to human rights, there are people in this Congress—hopefully, a bipartisan group of people in this Congress—who are not going to be silent, who are going to demand that things change.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from California for their leadership on this matter. They have discussed this over the months, and I have been pleased to join them in this effort.

Madam Speaker, U.S. bombs are bombing school buses of 40 children. U.S. bombs are bombing those in Yemen who are innocent citizens. The violence through bombing has been facilitated with U.S. resources. This is a demand that is without parallel of its necessity.

The question is whether we are engaged without the authorization of the United States Congress, whether we have declared war against Yemen. If the answer is no, then this resolution is appropriate.

Yemen is the poorest or one of the poorest countries in the world. This resolution clearly says that we should stop the hostilities against the Houthi forces. More importantly, we should stop being used by the Saudi forces.

By the way, having gone to Yemen, I know that at least a decade ago, Saudi closed its doors to the Yemen young men, who could find no work in Yemen because of its poverty, to go into Saudi to work there. Without that opportunity, all we ceded was poverty and violence. Now, because of the conflict, we have been bombing Yemen citizens for many years.

This is a constructive resolution. It does not violate the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force. It is one that says that we must take our forces and impact out of Yemen.

Let me also say that I know that we will discuss this further, but I do want to add that it is crucial to take note that we have an agreement on border security and funding the different agencies, so that we do not hold our Federal employees hostage and we don't shut the government.

This resolution, coming back to this resolution dealing with directing the removal of Armed Forces from Yemen, is constructive work of the Democratic Caucus and Democratic Members. We hope our Republican Members will join us in doing the right thing in removing the impact of the United States forces in Yemen.

Stop bombing children.

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

My friends talked a great deal about human rights, and I just want to make the point that I don't believe—I surely don't believe they think that the Houthi rebels in Yemen are great defenders of human rights or that the Iranian forces who are on the ground in Yemen are actually there to advance human rights and are defending them.

Frankly, I think this issue has more to do with whether or not we are involved in hostilities, which we clearly are not.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend, a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I don't know if you have ever tuned in to the Rules Committee when my chairman and my ranking member up there are having a conversation. You get a very different look at what goes on in Congress then, because it is not everybody poking each other with sharp sticks. It is thoughtful, deliberate public servants who are really very close to finding a common way forward that is going to make all Americans proud.

That is my frustration with this resolution today and why I hope my colleagues will reject it.

My friend from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Rules Committee, is working very hard to open up the Rules Committee, add more voices, bring more of a constructive process to the House of Representatives. I admire him for it. I appreciate his effort, and I support him every step of the way.

But we are in some bad habits here on the floor of the House, and we are in the habit of finding ways to make important distinctions instead of making important agreements.

My friend from Massachusetts said just a few moments ago that not to do this resolution is to do nothing, and that is a false choice. There is unanimity on the floor of this House that we must stand up for Article I, that we must stand up against an overreaching

Article II executive branch, that we must speak with one voice on issues of international affairs.

Instead of bringing a bill to the floor that would have brought us together so that we do speak with one voice on behalf of 330 million Americans, we are bringing a bill to the floor that is going to pass on a largely party-line vote. We have done that time and time again in these first 45 days.

We did that with veteran housing last week. We took a bill that passed unanimously in the last Congress to both provide childcare for our veterans and pay for that childcare and, instead, this year, we brought it back where we are going to have to cut some veteran accounts in order to fund that childcare going forward. It made that motion to recommit a party-line vote.

We did that with recognition of Federal employees, Madam Speaker, where we are trying to recognize their service and their sacrifice. Instead of bringing a bill that we would have agreed on unanimously, we brought a bill that divided this institution and made us speak with two voices.

This is another missed opportunity today. My friend from Massachusetts doesn't have control over this entire institution. He can't work his will on this entire institution. He is doing what he can on the House Rules Committee to open up the process and lead to a better product.

Flawed processes produce flawed products. Divided bills on the floor of this House do nothing to unify a divided nation.

We have opportunities. There are plenty of things on which we disagree. When we have things like this on which we agree, I think we need to work harder, Madam Speaker, to bring ourselves together, put our divisions behind us, rather than highlight those divisions in the name of political gain.

This could have been a unifying moment, not just for this Congress, but for the global political entirety as they see America speak with one voice to say, when troops are in harm's way, the United States Congress, not Article II, controls that destiny. I hope we will get to that point sooner rather than later. We only get so many chances, and each time we waste one, it becomes harder.

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

I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia, for his kind words. I have a great deal of respect for him, as I do for the ranking member, Mr. COLE. I am hoping that this week maybe we will have a bipartisan moment where we all stand together and keep the government open and prevent another shutdown.

But on this bill in particular, the bill that we are taking up here today is virtually identical to the bill that passed the United States Senate last year with a bipartisan vote. That bill that

passed the Senate last year was prevented by the then-Republican majority from even being considered on this House floor on at least two occasions. So I can appreciate the fact the gentleman may not agree with the statement we are trying to make today or the bill that we are putting forward here today, but the process, I think, has been pretty good.

It just had a hearing in the committee of jurisdiction. It had a markup. We had a long hearing in the Rules Committee. All the germane amendments were made in order, a bipartisan amendment and a Republican amendment, and we are going to debate it here today under regular order. So the process has been very, very, very good.

I think, for many of us, we are bringing this forward in large part because we believe that this institution has been silent for too long.

I am not here to defend the Houthi rebels or, certainly, to cover up for any Iranian meddling here, but I will say this: We know that 85,000 children under the age of 5 have died of hunger and disease since 2015. Eighty percent of all children in Yemen require humanitarian assistance, according to UNICEF, the U.N.'s children's agency.

We need to do everything in our power to encourage a political solution to this terrible humanitarian crisis. I mean, this is unbelievable. Every person who cares about human rights should be outraged by what is going on.

We are having this debate here today to say that enough is enough and to let the Saudi Government hear loud and clear that we will no longer be complicit in this.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman and the sponsor of this important legislation for the incredible leadership and continuing to be a resolute voice.

The United States support for Saudi Arabia's genocidal war in Yemen, with no authorization from Congress, has resulted in the deaths of tens of thousands of Yemeni civilians. The U.S.-Saudi coalition has dropped bombs on children in school buses, on people in markets, and on families who are celebrating weddings.

They have left millions of Yemeni people on the brink of death from famine, disease, starvation, a lack of access to clean water, sanitation, and healthcare. This has created the worst humanitarian crisis in a generation.

Earlier this week, the Trump administration threatened to veto this critical legislation should it pass Congress, this legislation that would end U.S. support for the Saudi-led war in Yemen, by spreading blatant lies. They have said that this legislation draws "constitutional concerns," and they say it would "affect our ability to prevent the spread of violent extremist organizations."

But here is the truth. First, the United States' support for this war in

Yemen is unconstitutional. Congress has not authorized it. Second, Saudi Arabia is not our ally, and continued U.S. support for this war in Yemen is strengthening terrorist groups like al-Qaida.

A recent CNN report documented how Saudi Arabia is literally taking the U.S. weapons that have been provided to them in this war in Yemen and handing them off to al-Qaida on the ground in Yemen, the very same terrorist group that attacked us on 9/11.

Or to speak of the fact that Saudi Arabia is continuing to spend billions of dollars spreading their Wahhabi-Salafist ideology that is fueling terrorist organizations like ISIS and al-Qaida, causing them to grow stronger.

Congress must take action today. We must reclaim our constitutional responsibility and pass this legislation to stop supporting Saudi Arabia's genocidal war in Yemen and strengthening these terrorist groups that threaten us.

□ 1245

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the text of H.R. 336, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act of 2019. One of the four constituent parts of this bill has already passed the House by voice vote in this Congress, and three of the four constituent parts passed the House by voice vote last Congress.

The four parts of this bill authorize assistance and weapons transfers to Israel, extend defense cooperation with Jordan, establish additional sanctions related to the conflict in Syria, and allows States to divest from entities boycotting Israel. On the whole, unlike the resolution on the floor today, it will preserve and strengthen our relationship with our allies and reaffirm America's commitment to a peaceful and more secure Middle East.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), my distinguished colleague and the chair of the Republican Conference.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I thank very much my colleague, Mr. COLE, for his tremendous leadership on this issue and all others as the leading Republican on the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will move to bring up H.R. 336, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act of 2019. I urge the House to vote on this bill, whose companion passed the Sen-

ate with bipartisan support this month.

Bringing this legislation to the floor, Madam Speaker, is not a partisan maneuver; it is an urgent matter of national security that requires action by this House.

H.R. 336 includes two bills that enhance our security cooperation with Israel and Jordan, key U.S. allies in the Middle East that are active in the fight against terrorist organizations in the region.

H.R. 336 also reaffirms America's unwavering support for Israel with the Combating BDS Act, a bill that empowers State and local governments to counter discriminatory anti-Israel boycotts.

There should be no doubt, Madam Speaker, about the bipartisan nature of each of these bills. The Israel security assistance legislation passed the House by voice vote in September. The Jordan defense cooperation bill passed the House by voice vote last February. The Syria sanctions bill passed the House by voice vote just last month. And last Congress, Senator MARCO RUBIO's Combating BDS Act gained the support of Minority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER and a number of other Democrats on the Senate side.

Most Democratic Members continue to stand with Republicans in rejecting the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions, BDS, campaign. These Members understand, as the Republicans do, that this is a campaign that too often seeks to delegitimize and demonize Israel. So, Madam Speaker, why not hold a vote on H.R. 336 that contains a bill called the Combating BDS Act?

BDS is a campaign whose adherents have time and time again revealed their anti-Semitic motives. This is a campaign that directs its followers to avoid certain products merely because they are made in Israel. Armed with economic warfare tactics, supporters of BDS seek to isolate and punish the only Jewish state. That, Madam Speaker, is the dictionary definition of discrimination.

Opponents of the Combating BDS Act often cite First Amendment objections to this legislation, but the truth is, this bill would not prohibit individuals or companies from speaking out in support of the BDS movement, nor would it prohibit them from boycotting Israel. The Combating BDS Act applies to entities, such as companies, and their conduct.

This bill cements what should be an obvious point: States have the right not to contract with companies that engage in discriminatory conduct against Israel.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Ms. CHENEY. In fact, many States already have laws on the books that promote that right. At its core, the Combating BDS Act protects and empowers States in their efforts to

counter a hateful anti-Israel movement.

There is no reason not to hold a vote on H.R. 336, which also includes legislation that authorizes security assistance to Israel and extends our defense partnership with Jordan. Helping our key allies in the Middle East ensure their security should not be controversial.

Madam Speaker, we are now at a moment in this House, at a moment in this body where we are facing real anti-Semitism from the other side of the aisle. It is time that we all come together as a body in a bipartisan manner to stand against anti-Semitism, to condemn it, to ensure that everyone understands it has no place in this House, in this body, or in our public discourse.

These bills that we are offering today, if the previous question is defeated, are those bills that will recognize and symbolize American leadership and define American leadership. I hope Democrats will choose our security and our closest allies over partisanship and bring H.R. 336 to a vote.

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

First, on process, just so everybody understands, we are bringing a bill to the floor today under a structured rule that has a bipartisan amendment and a Republican amendment.

What my Republican friends are suggesting is that they want to bring up a bill, and all amendments are blocked, with the exception of one if offered by a Republican, sight unseen.

Boy, old habits die hard. This is the way they were in the majority. And thank God they are no longer in the majority, but, wow, what a lousy process this is.

Then secondly, I want to say that we are having a debate about Yemen, about one of the worst humanitarian crises in the world, where the Saudi Government is bombing weddings and funerals and school buses, where thousands and thousands, tens of thousands of people are on the verge of starvation, where children are dying every day.

The previous question has nothing to do with Yemen. I mean, it is as if this entire horrific catastrophe that is now unfolding in Yemen doesn't even exist. I mean, how sad.

This is an important issue, and we have a responsibility to debate and to vote on this issue, because we have been involved in supplying so much assistance to the Saudi Government, and not even a mention, not even a mention of this.

Maybe this doesn't matter to my Republican friends. Maybe they are perfectly fine turning a blind eye to this horrific horror show that is happening in Yemen. But I am going to tell you, I think most people in this country, when they are made aware of what is going on and they are made aware of our involvement, are horrified. This is

not what the United States Government is about.

So, in any event, it is a little bit disappointing.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), the author of H.J. Res. 37, and I want to thank him for his leadership on this.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I want to echo Representative COLE's praise for Chairman MCGOVERN for leading for years in this body in helping Congress reassert its role on matters of war and peace.

I want to just note the difference procedurally of what happened. Every time we introduced this in the last Congress, Speaker Ryan didn't allow a vote. He tied a vote on Yemen with a vote on endangered wolves.

In contrast, Chairman MCGOVERN, not only is he allowing a vote on the resolution of Yemen, he is allowing a vote on an amendment that Representative BUCK has offered that I oppose vehemently, that I went to him and I said, "This is going to gut the entire resolution."

What did Chairman MCGOVERN do? Did he say, "Oh, we will go behind closed doors. Don't worry. We won't allow a vote?" No. He said, "We are going to bring it to a vote on this floor."

I said, "Do we have the votes?"

He said, "I don't know."

Why are we bringing it to the floor? Because that is a democracy. That is what we are supposed to do in a democracy.

We will have the votes. You know how I know we are going to have the votes and it is going to be a bipartisan vote? Because when LINDSAY GRAHAM is quoted saying he may vote in support of the resolution, you know there is going to be an overwhelming vote.

I want to just address one point, because Representative COLE is one of the more thoughtful Members here and I take what he says very seriously, but on the War Powers Act, we just disagree. When you read the plain reading of the War Powers, it says that the United States Armed Forces cannot be assigned to coordinate, participate, or accompany any foreign government's military when they are in hostilities.

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

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, our forces are coordinating with the Saudi forces. I concede to Members we don't have troops there, but the War Powers Resolution was written broadly, precisely because we wanted Congress to have a say.

And, Representative COLE, I am convinced if one of our allies, like Israel or another country, were attacked; I have enough confidence in this body that we would make the right decision. This is a matter of the Congress' right to have a say on matters of war and peace, and I thank Chairman MCGOVERN for bringing this for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and then I will turn to my friend from Texas.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend for his comments. And we do; we just disagree. I do not see this as appropriate for the War Powers Resolution, because we don't have troops in common; we have not committed anybody to hostilities. But the Commander in Chief historically has had broad authority to assist countries that we have agreements and arrangements with that he thinks are important in our own security, short of committing troops into combat. I think that is precisely what he is doing.

Frankly, that is what his predecessor did. It would have been nice if our friends were as equally concerned when President Obama actually was committing us to the kinds of activities we are talking about. I don't recall hearing a lot about it then, but I am happy to discuss it now.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCaul), the former chairman of the Homeland Security Committee and the current ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. McCaul. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Ranking Member COLE for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can consider H.R. 336, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act, under a rule that would allow an amendment to add a section recognizing the dangers of a precipitous withdrawal from Syria and Afghanistan. This amendment would change H.R. 336 to mirror the text of the Senate companion bill S. 1.

S. 1 passed the Senate just last week by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 77-23.

I introduced this House companion in January.

This package of bipartisan bills from last Congress bolsters the security of America and our allies in the Middle East.

This bill authorizes U.S. security assistance to Israel over a 10-year period and updates key elements of our security cooperation to ensure that Israel can respond to the significant threats it faces from its neighbors.

It also reauthorizes the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act, allowing Jordan to remain eligible to receive special treatment for the transfer of U.S. defense articles and services.

Jordan is a critical ally in the fight against ISIS and other extremist groups. We need to make sure that they are adequately equipped to help maintain stability in the Middle East.

H.R. 336 also contains the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act. This bill passed the House earlier this year. It should have been law a long time ago.

This act will impose long-overdue sanctions against Syria's Assad regime and its backers, including Iran and Russia, for their egregious human rights abuses.

Finally, this bill empowers State and local governments in the United States to counter the anti-Israel Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions, otherwise known as BDS, movement's discriminatory economic warfare against Israel.

These provisions have already passed the Senate with bipartisan support. I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on the previous question in order to consider this important bill to shore up U.S. interests and allies in the Middle East and take action against Assad's murderous regime.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for his comments. I just would inform the gentleman that, you know, another bill that passed the Senate with a bipartisan vote is the bill that we are discussing here today on Yemen.

□ 1300

The other thing I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, one of the things that we are trying to do is return to regular order, something that I think a lot of people don't know what it looks like. A number of the bills that the gentleman is referring to had no markup. Let's go through the committee process. Let's do markups, and let's do this the way we are supposed to do it.

I appreciate that my friends don't want to talk about the horrific situation in Yemen, but that is what we are going to do here today because it is horrific, and it is about time that this body take a stand.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

Madam Speaker, I want to begin by acknowledging the extraordinary leadership of the chairman of the Rules Committee and this very transparent and open process.

I stand to support, strongly, H.J. Res. 37, which directs the President to remove American troops from their role in hostilities in Yemen.

By taking up this War Powers Resolution, the House is, finally, reasserting our constitutional authority and responsibility over American military actions and sending an important message both to the Saudi-led coalition and to the Trump administration.

The Iranian-backed Houthis have acted with complete disregard for civilian lives in Yemen, blocking humanitarian aid and mounting attacks into Saudi Arabian cities. There is no question that they bear much of the blame for the current humanitarian crisis.

However, for nearly 4 years, the Saudi and Emirati-backed coalition

has used American bombs, American planes with American logistical support, and, until recently, American refueling to further a conflict that has cost thousands of civilian lives and led to a humanitarian crisis in the country. There is no question in my mind that American involvement, to date, has exceeded the congressional authorization that exists to combat terrorists in the region. For too long, the United States has been directly involved in this war without proper congressional authorization or oversight.

This bill, which passed the Senate last year with bipartisan support, specifically exempts actions that target al-Qaida and any other terrorist activity.

My colleagues opposing this effort seem to forget that we have a responsibility under the Constitution to exercise our oversight authority over American military engagement. Nothing in this legislation prevents the administration from coming to Congress and presenting a strategy and asking for authorization to involve our military in Yemen. That is not something I would support, but they did not even try to make the case.

Instead, we have become embroiled in a humanitarian nightmare and backed a flawed military engagement with no end in sight, all without proper authorization or oversight. It seems pretty obvious that it is time to exert our proper role as Congress.

H.J. Res. 37 is an important first step of what I hope will be a concerted effort to bring the war in Yemen to an end and to reestablish Congress' role in overseeing our military's engagements overseas. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support this resolution.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), my good friend.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of Mr. COLE's amendment so that the House may take up H.R. 336.

The House should immediately bring this legislation up, which is a bipartisan legislative package that would help others fight back against the BDS movement, protect U.S. security in the Middle East by strengthening our alliances with Israel and Jordan, and sanction bad actors like Assad.

The Senate version of this bill, S. 1, passed with strong bipartisan support, 77-23.

The major point of contention for some, regarding this package, is the Combating BDS Act of 2019, a bipartisan bill with over 100 cosponsors last Congress, that would help stop the BDS movement.

It is okay to have a reasonable, legitimate concern with any government, including Israel, as well as our own, but, keep in mind, the founder of BDS was blatantly anti-Semitic, and, on college campuses all across our entire country, we have college students who are being targeted by blatant anti-Semitism in the name of BDS.

The founder of the BDS movement was a raging anti-Semite, who once said: "We are witnessing the rapid demise of Zionism, and nothing can be done to save it, for Zionism is intent on killing itself. I, for one, support euthanasia." That is not all he has said.

This bill would simply allow State and local governments to have the right to counter the BDS movement by ending contracts with companies that boycott Israel. This bill does not impede the right of any American to boycott or criticize Israel. Instead, this bill protects States' rights to divest from countries that boycott Israel and from lawsuits driven by the ACLU.

The BDS movement is designed to hurt Israel by encouraging companies to boycott Israeli goods. The BDS movement is consumed by efforts to delegitimize and demonize Israel.

Numerous incidents are highlighted in my resolution, H. Res. 72, condemning this behavior. For example, at NYU, after the student government passed a resolution supporting BDS, they had to close the Center for Jewish Life in response to threatening Twitter posts by a student who expressed "a desire for Zionists to die."

There are so many other examples on college campuses all across our country. Where the BDS grows, anti-Semitism follows. Yet some Members in the House openly support this movement. House Democrats are holding up this major bipartisan legislation.

This bill would provide \$3.3 billion in security assistance to Israel and authorize the 2016 MOU to guarantee Israel's security for the next 10 years by providing advanced capabilities to protect our greatest ally.

This bill strengthens Jordan's ability to promote regional security and stability by enhancing Jordan's military capacity in the sale of defense articles.

This bill also sanctions those who provide financial assistance or support to prop up the Assad regime, which is responsible for chemical weapon attacks in Syria.

Madam Speaker, I thank, again, Mr. COLE for bringing this amendment, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

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

Madam Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from New York that I appreciate his comments, but that is not what we are talking about here today.

I would just say to him, while we appreciate the cooperation of the minority in the Rules Committee and trying to facilitate a process dedicated more to regular order—and we are going to continue to work that way—that he should make sure that these bills have hearings and markups and that the Members of the House have an opportunity to be able to deliberate on them, and then bring them to the Rules Committee and we can have that debate.

But I am going to say to the gentleman, this is a new day. We, hopefully, will discuss process less and ideas more.

I would also say that we have an emergency right now when it comes to Yemen. It is one of the worst humanitarian crises in the world. I am a little bit struck by the fact that the last couple of speakers haven't even used the word "Yemen" once.

So, in any event, there is a right way to bring legislation to the floor. We want to have regular order. We want to do this the right way. We did this bill the right way. It did pass the Senate. We had a hearing, we had a markup. It came to the Rules Committee. We made in order a bipartisan amendment, a Republican amendment, one that I strongly disagree with; but, nonetheless, we hope we can defeat it on the floor. If not, that is the way it goes.

That is the process we ought to adhere to. And I would say that, if we adhered to a better process, we are going to end up with better legislation and more, hopefully, bipartisan legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to this rule and the underlying measure.

The majority has brought up a resolution under the War Powers Resolution instructing the President to remove the United States Armed Forces from hostilities in Yemen. Unfortunately, this resolution is misguided. United States Armed Forces are not currently involved in hostilities in Yemen, and it is unclear exactly what this resolution will accomplish.

Further, passage of this resolution would likely damage our relationships with our allies, who would have reason to question our commitments to them, and embolden our potential adversaries in the future.

I want to take just a moment to, frankly, reaffirm and thank my friend for his strong assertion of Congress' powers under war powers. I think he has absolutely been a leader in this area, and I have tried to work with him on many occasions.

I want to state for the RECORD, I look forward to working with him in this area again, because I think this body, under both Republicans and Democrats, has far too often abdicated its responsibilities and simply left it to the executive branch to determine when we were at war.

Frankly, when President Bush 41 went to war in the Gulf, he came to Congress and asked for its permission; when President Bush 43 went to war, he came to Congress and asked for its permission in both Afghanistan and Iraq—and they received it.

President Obama never bothered to do that. Whether it was in Libya or whether it was extending the mission, in many cases, he simply did not choose to do that. And, frankly, it was President Obama who began the actions that concerned my friends in Yemen.

So, again, my friend has appropriately tried to pursue, over the

course of his career, the reassertion of congressional war powers, and I commend him for that. This case is not one of those cases.

The President of the United States does have legitimate powers as Commander in Chief to support friends and allies short of war without congressional approval. That has happened time and time and time again in American history.

We have 117 security agreements with various countries around the world. Some of those are with countries we have formal alliances with, some of them are not. They do not commit the United States to hostilities, but they do say, in certain situations, we will be there to render support.

I agree with my friend that there have been atrocities in Yemen. I think he is absolutely right about that. I think, unfortunately, we didn't talk very much about the Iranian role in that. We didn't talk very much about the Houthi role in that. We didn't talk very much about who overthrew a legitimate government and what other countries were involved in that. This is a lot more complex than that.

But, in this case, unlike Libya, for instance, where President Obama did commit us to military activity without coming to this Chamber and asking permission, somehow stretched the NATO alliance to cover our participation in a conflict within a country that had not attacked any member of NATO, let alone the United States of America, that was a time we should have done something like this.

Right now, in my view, whether you agree with him or not, the President is exercising his legitimate authority as Commander in Chief. And it is worth noting for the RECORD, he is actually doing less than his predecessor, President Obama, did. He actually is the person, President Trump, who ordered the cessation of aerial refueling operations with the Saudi Air Force.

Again, there is room for disagreement here. I know, on the underlying issue of congressional war powers, my friend and I agree. I look forward to working with him on that issue as we go forward, as I know we will. But, in my opinion, this is the wrong place and the wrong time to have this debate.

I think the President is operating well within his rights. He has made it clear he will veto this legislation should it pass the United States Senate. None of us know whether it will. But I can assure you this: that veto will have more than enough votes to sustain it.

So, again, I thank my friend for the spirited debate and discussion. It is always thoughtful.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, "no" on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to recognize the work of Ranking Member COLE on

these issues. We may not agree on this specific bill, but we have worked together on matters like the Authorization for Use of Military Force for many years. He is always thoughtful in urging Congress to reclaim authority on matters of war and peace, and I do look forward to working with him in the months ahead.

Let me just remind my colleagues about how this bill came to the floor.

It was introduced in January. There was a hearing in the Foreign Affairs Committee. They held a markup, and the Rules Committee did a hearing and made amendments in order.

Some of my Republican friends may not agree with the underlying bill, but there shouldn't be much disagreement about the process, because this is how the process should work. We even made in order a Republican amendment from Congressman BUCK that I strongly oppose. That amendment would allow the President to maintain unfettered intelligence sharing with any foreign country, even when the sole objective is to help determine which targets to bomb in offensive airstrikes not authorized by Congress.

I don't believe we should preemptively cede our own purview over intelligence sharing, and certainly not as part of a resolution designed to reassert Congress' constitutional war authority.

Maybe this amendment passes—I hope it doesn't—but it will be debated, voted upon, and this House will decide.

Let me say to my colleagues what is happening in Yemen is horrific. It should shake every Member of this institution to their core: bombings of weddings, funerals, and school buses; thousands dead; children starving—a humanitarian nightmare.

I don't know what is going to happen over in the Senate, but I know what this institution should do, and that is to reclaim our responsibilities and make clear that the Constitution matters, that human rights matter; the lives of people in Yemen and the children in Yemen, they matter. This Chamber, under this majority, is going to provide a consequence for the actions of the Saudi Government.

□ 1315

And I hope that this resolution is just our first step in responding to the humanitarian issues across the region. I look forward to the Foreign Affairs Committee holding more hearings and markups and bringing more bills to the Rules Committee.

I have introduced a bipartisan bill with 20 colleagues that will immediately stop all military aid and armed sales to the Government of Saudi Arabia. I think it is the right thing to do when our democratic values are on the line. I would like to see that come up for a vote, but I want to have a hearing and a markup before it comes to this floor.

But, Madam Speaker, this Congress needs to start somewhere so we can step up our response as a country.



Johnson (GA) Meeks Scott (VA) Simpson Thorberry Wenstrup  
 Johnson (TX) Meng Scott, David Smith (MO) Timmons Westerman  
 Kaptur Moore Serrano Smith (NE) Tipton Williams  
 Keating Morelle Sewell (AL) Smith (NJ) Turner Wilson (SC)  
 Kelly (IL) Moulton Shalala Smucker Upton Wittman  
 Kennedy Mucarsel-Powell Sherman Spano Walberg Womack  
 Khanna Murphy Sherrill Stauber Walden Woodall  
 Kildee Nadier Sires Stefanik Walker Wright  
 Kilmer Napolitano Slotkin Stell Walorski Yoho  
 Kim Neal Smith (WA) Steube Waltz Watkins Young  
 Kind Neguse Soto Stivers Weber (TX) Zeldin  
 Kirkpatrick Norcross Spanberger Thompson (PA) Webster (FL)  
 Krishnamoorthi O'Halleran Speier  
 Kuster (NH) Ocasio-Cortez Stanton  
 Lamb Omar Stevens  
 Langevin Pallone Suozzi Allred Kinzinger Taylor  
 Larsen (WA) Panetta Swalwell (CA) Connolly Pingree Wagner  
 Larson (CT) Pappas Takano Dingell Quigley  
 Lawrence Pascrell Granger Ryan  
 Lawson (FL) Payne Thompson (CA)  
 Lee (CA) Perlmutter Thompson (MS)  
 Lee (NV) Peters Titus  
 Levin (CA) Peterson Tlaib  
 Levin (MI) Phillips Tonko  
 Lewis Pocan Torres (CA)  
 Lieu, Ted Porter Torres Small (NM)  
 Lipinski Pressley Trahan  
 Loebssack Price (NC) Raskin  
 Lofgren Underwood  
 Lowenthal Rice (NY)  
 Lowey Richmond  
 Luján Rose (NY)  
 Luria Rouda  
 Lynch Roybal-Allard  
 Malinowski Ruiz  
 Maloney, Carolyn B. Ruppersberger  
 Maloney, Sean Rush Wasserman  
 Matsui Sánchez Schultz  
 McAdams Sarbanes Waters  
 McBath Scanlon Watson Coleman  
 McCollum Schakowsky Welch  
 McEachin Schneider Wexton  
 McGovern Schrader Wild  
 McNerney Schrier Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth

## NAYS—193

Abraham Estes Lamborn  
 Aderholt Ferguson Latta  
 Allen Fitzpatrick Lesko  
 Amash Fleischmann Long  
 Amodei Flores Loudermilk  
 Armstrong Fortenberry Lucas  
 Arrington Foxx (NC) Luetkemeyer  
 Babin Fulcher Marchant  
 Bacon Gaetz Marshall  
 Baird Gallagher Massie  
 Balderson Gianforte Mast  
 Banks Gibbs McCarthy  
 Barr Gohmert McCaul  
 Bergman Gonzalez (OH) McClintock  
 Biggs Gooden McHenry  
 Bilirakis Gosar McKinley  
 Bishop (UT) Graves (GA) Meadows  
 Bost Graves (LA) Meuser  
 Brady Graves (MO) Miller  
 Brooks (AL) Green (TN) Mitchell  
 Brooks (IN) Griffith Moelenaar  
 Buchanan Grothman Mooney (WV)  
 Buck Guest Mullin  
 Bucshon Guthrie Newhouse  
 Budd Hagedorn Norman  
 Burchett Harris Nunes  
 Burgess Hartzler Olson  
 Byrne Hern, Kevin Palazzo  
 Calvert Herrera Beutler Palmer  
 Carter (GA) Hice (GA) Pence  
 Carter (TX) Higgins (LA) Perry  
 Chabot Hill (AR) Posey  
 Cheney Holding Ratcliffe  
 Cline Hollingsworth Reed  
 Cloud Hudson Reschenthaler  
 Cole Huizinga Rice (SC)  
 Collins (GA) Hunter Riggleman  
 Collins (NY) Hurd (TX) Roby  
 Comer Johnson (LA) Rodgers (WA)  
 Conaway Johnson (OH) Roe, David P.  
 Cook Johnson (SD) Rogers (AL)  
 Crawford Jordan Rogers (KY)  
 Crenshaw Joyce (OH) Rooney (FL)  
 Curtis Joyce (PA) Rose, John W.  
 Davidson (OH) Katko Rouzer  
 Davis, Rodney Kelly (MS) Roy  
 DesJarlais Kelly (PA) Rutherford  
 Diaz-Balart King (IA) Scalise  
 Duffy King (NY) Schweikert  
 Duncan Kustoff (TN) Scott, Austin  
 Dunn LaHood Sensenbrenner  
 Emmer LaMalfa Shimkus

Simpson Thorberry Wenstrup  
 Smith (MO) Timmons Westerman  
 Smith (NE) Tipton Williams  
 Smith (NJ) Turner Wilson (SC)  
 Smucker Upton Wittman  
 Spano Walberg Womack  
 Stauber Walden Woodall  
 Stefanik Walker Wright  
 Slotkin Stell Walorski Yoho  
 Smith (WA) Steube Waltz Watkins Young  
 Soto Stivers Weber (TX) Zeldin  
 Spanberger Thompson (PA) Webster (FL)

## NOT VOTING—10

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1350

So the resolution was agreed to.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING VICTIMS OF MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL SHOOTING

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

Mr. DEUTCH. One year ago, Madam Speaker, on February 14, 2018, 17 people were killed in a senseless and horrific act of gun violence at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida.

I ask the Members of the House of Representatives to use this time to center their thoughts on the 17 who were killed, the 17 who were injured, the healing of the Parkland community, and the 40,000 lives lost to gun violence in every corner of this Nation each year.

I ask that we work together, not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans to end this silence with action to make all our communities safer from gun violence.

I ask that this moment of silence not be in vain, and I ask my colleagues to please rise and bow your heads as we remember Alyssa Alhadeff, Scott Beigel, Martin Duque Anguiano, Nicholas Dworet, Aaron Feis, Jaime Guttenberg, Chris Hixon, Luke Hoyer, Cara Loughran, Gina Montalto, Joaquin Oliver, Alaina Petty, Meadow Pollack, Helena Ramsay, Alex Schachter, Carmen Schentrup, and Peter Wang.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MCBAATH). All present will rise for a moment of silence.

---

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.  
 This is a 5-minute vote.  
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 199, answered “present” 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—215

Adams	García (IL)	Neal
Armstrong	García (TX)	Neguse
Arrington	Gomez	Newhouse
Axne	Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross
Bacon	Granger	Ocasio-Cortez
Banks	Green (TX)	Omar
Barr	Grijalva	Pallone
Barragán	Grothman	Panetta
Bass	Haaland	Pappas
Beatty	Hastings	Pascrell
Berman	Hayes	Payne
Beyer	Heck	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Higgins (LA)	Perry
Blunt Rochester	Higgins (NY)	Phillips
Bonamici	Hill (CA)	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan	Hollingsworth	Pressley
F.	Horn, Kendra S.	Raskin
Brady	Horsford	Reed
Brown (MD)	Houlihan	Richmond
Buck	Hoyer	Rodgers (WA)
Bucshon	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Budd	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Bustos	Jayapal	Rush
Butterfield	Jeffries	Sánchez
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Sarbanes
Cárdenas	Johnson (TX)	Schakowsky
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Schiff
Cartwright	Katko	Schneider
Case	Kelly (IL)	Schrer
Casten (IL)	Kennedy	Schweikert
Castor (FL)	Khanna	Scott (VA)
Castro (TX)	Kildee	Scott, David
Chu, Judy	King (IA)	Serrano
Clark (MA)	Kuster (NH)	Sewell (AL)
Clarke (NY)	Lamb	Shalala
Clay	Langevin	Sherman
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Sherrill
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Simpson
Collins (GA)	Lawrence	Sires
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Courtney	Lee (NV)	Smith (WA)
Cox (CA)	Levin (CA)	Soto
Cuellar	Levin (MI)	Speier
Cummings	Lewis	Stanton
Davidson (OH)	Lieu, Ted	Stauber
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Stefanik
Davis, Danny K.	Loebssack	Steil
Dean	Lofgren	Stevens
DeFazio	Long	Stivers
DeGette	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Lowey	Takano
DelBene	Luetkemeyer	Taylor
Delgado	Luján	Thompson (MS)
Demings	Luria	Thornberry
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Titus
Deutch	Malinowski	Tlaib
Doggett	Maloney	Torres (CA)
Doyle, Michael	Carolyn B. F.	Trahan
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	Trone
Engel	McBath	Underwood
Escobar	McCarthy	Vargas
Eshoo	McClintock	Veasey
Espailat	McCullom	Vela
Evans	McBachin	Velázquez
Finkenauer	McGovern	Visclosky
Fleischmann	McNerney	Wasserman
Fletcher	Meeks	Schultz
Fortenberry	Moore	Watkins
Foster	Morelle	Welch
Frankel	Moulton	Wexton
Gabbard	Murphy	Wilson (FL)
Gallego	Nadler	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Napolitano	Yoho

## NAYS—199

Abraham	Bost	Chabot
Aderholt	Brindisi	Cheney
Aguilar	Brooks (AL)	Cicilline
Allen	Brooks (IN)	Cisneros
Amash	Brownley (CA)	Cline
Amodei	Buchanan	Cloud
Babin	Burchett	Clyburn
Baird	Burgess	Cole
Balderson	Byrne	Collins (NY)
Bera	Calvert	Comer
Bilirakis	Carter (GA)	Conaway
Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	Connolly