

ability to share burdens with our partners—for 18 months in some cases—it undermines our entire security strategy and the important bilateral partnerships we worked so hard to establish and grow. For that reason, I oppose the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close debate on this measure.

I will wrap up quickly, as we have two more of these measures to consider.

It is important that we pass this measure now, along with the two we will soon consider, because these deal with weapons that could soon be on their way across the ocean.

I think the Iranian regime is dangerous. I think the Houthis are dangerous. No one is denying the Saudis the right to go after them. What we are saying is, don't go after them and kill thousands of civilians in the process with American weapons.

And also, separation of powers, the President cannot try to get around Congress with phony emergencies. I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 491, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. 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.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED EXPORT TO THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES OF CERTAIN DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 491, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 37) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 491, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 37

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the issuance of an export license with respect to any of the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, or France is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1425 (EC-1425) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of 44,000 GBU-12 Paveway II Kits and the proposed transfer of 16,000 GBU-10 Paveway II Kits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include in the RECORD extraneous materials on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the second resolution we are debating is very similar to the first. But in this case, it would nullify the administration's phony emergency being used to transfer 60,000 precision-guided bombs to the United Arab Emirates. That is on top of the 40,000 we estimate the Emiratis already have on hand.

I won't rehash the same argument, but I would like to make a point why, when we see what is going on in Yemen, it is so important for the United States to take a stand.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things the Foreign Affairs Committee has focused on this year is trying to put American values back at the center of our foreign policy: Democracy, human rights, the rule of law.

Frankly, this administration has acted like it cannot be burdened with these fundamental things that make America America. It just boggles the mind that any great country can throw weight around, but we are not China. We are not Russia. Our foreign policy should show the world the character of our country, our compassion, our belief that people everywhere should be able to live prosperously, productively, and have healthy lives.

These ideas go hand in hand with promoting our security. We want more

stable, secure countries and communities. Democratic countries are stronger partners for the United States on the world's stage. And if we are serious about those values, it means speaking out when we see them trampled, whether they are trampled by an adversary or by a friend.

When we turn our back on these ideals; when we strip the word "democracy" out of the State Department's mission statement; when we look the other way when friendly regimes carry out horrific human rights abuses; when we slash investments in the diplomacy and development efforts that help us build bridges of friendship and understanding; when we walk away from all of that, what signal does it send to the world?

What does it say about the sort of behavior that we are willing to tolerate? I have supported our partners and our partnerships in the Gulf region. I think they are an important counterbalance to the threat Iran poses, and I recognize that our partners face real threats from Iranian-backed Houthis who are themselves guilty of serious human rights abuses.

But that doesn't mean we should just look the other way in the face of violence and slaughter of civilians perpetrated by our partners. It doesn't mean we look the other way and let the President ride roughshod over Congress so there is no separation of powers and whatever the President wants, he gets, and Congress just rubberstamps it. It can't be that way.

So even if this administration will not stand up for values, the Congress should, and the Congress will. These measures, along with much of the Foreign Affairs Committee's work this year, sends a strong message that our values must guide our foreign policy.

So, again, it is important for us to help Saudi Arabia. It is important to realize Iran is making trouble. It is important to note the Houthis are not good people. But it doesn't mean that we give Saudi Arabia or any other country a blank check to do whatever they want, dropping bombs indiscriminately on school children, on buses. We can't just sit idly by and let that happen and continue to send weapons that are perpetrating these crimes.

So, this is a strong message, I think, that our values must guide our foreign policy, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, just a quick point on that. We don't like when innocent people are bombed, and when we look at Yemen, I think it is really incumbent on us to see what is happening.

A legitimate government in Yemen was overthrown by Iranian-supported rebels, and Iran, who has not sent one dollar of humanitarian aid to support the people who have been killed. What we are talking about in this specific resolution is actually UAE.

So, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 37. Since the emergency declaration to

expedite arms sales to the Saudi-led coalition to defeat the Houthi rebels, Congress has debated the President's exercise of the emergency clause of the Arms Export Control Act.

This joint resolution of disapproval, along with 21 other JRDs, intends to stop transfers to Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and Jordan.

S.J. Res. 37 specifically blocks the transfer of Paveway precision-guided munitions to the United Arab Emirates. This technology converts dumb bombs, like the ones used by Russia to kill innocent men, women, and children in Syria, into precision-guided munitions, ones that are intended to avoid civilian casualties.

We can debate whether shipments that aren't ready to be delivered require an emergency declaration, but at the end of the day, some of the munitions that we are discussing today have already left the shores of the United States and are en route to the UAE. In fact, the first tranche is en route now, and the second tranche will be leaving in September.

Mr. Speaker, this JRD and the two up for debate today are not about timelines for shipment. We have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle argue that these arms could be used in Yemen to target civilians. Yet, there are reports that the UAE has already withdrawn from Yemen.

The UAE serves as a bulwark against Iranian aggression, the ongoing threat of al-Qaida, and other terrorist groups wishing to harm the United States, our allies, and our interests.

In contrast, the Iranian-backed Houthis, through missiles and UAE strikes, are a threat to stability in the region. Iran and the forces it supports, like the Houthis, are a threat to our national security and the security of our allies. They are the number one contributor to human suffering in Yemen.

We have seen the Iranian regime threaten international shipping in the Strait of Hormuz, including ships belonging to the U.K., Japan, and Norway. They have shot down an expensive military asset flying in international airspace.

Prior to the President's emergency declaration, the head of Iran's Quds Force called on terror groups to prepare for a proxy war with United States and our allies. Since then, we have seen these proxies become emboldened in their actions. Yet, we are here today debating arms sales to the UAE on the basis that these arms transfers may be used by our strategic ally in Yemen.

While there is no guarantee that these weapons will ever be used in Yemen—will ever not be used in Yemen either—there are facts that show exactly why we must continue to provide these arms to the UAE.

As a former Air Force pilot and a current pilot in the Air National Guard, I am proud that our government would not send our Air Force to fly sor-

ties without the munitions needed to defend themselves. Similarly, we should not have an ally flying our F-16s without the necessary tools it needs to complete its mission.

The Iranians have shown that they have the capacity and ability to fire upon military aircraft with no regard for whether the platform is manned or unmanned. When our allies are in a dogfight, we can't leave them without the means to defend themselves and our shared interests.

I also want to point out that there is a lot of discussion about offensive or defensive weapons. A bomb can be used defensively or offensively. I can't think of many weapons that are actually defensive in nature because they are used to destroy an enemy. So it is all about how you employ that weapon.

Saying that we want to send only defensive weapons, shows our allies to be weak against an Iran that is shown that it wants to go on the offensive continually. I can name basically every country in the Middle East and show Iranian influences there.

On the broader picture, we have got to debate how this went out. I fully agree with everybody on that. But we cannot leave our allies in the lurch. We cannot leave them unprotected because our big, chief enemy is Iran. I know there is broad-based agreement on that, and we cannot show weakness in the eyes of that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a senior member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

□ 1345

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this and many other issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S.J. Res. 37 which would prevent the transfer of Paveway precision-guided munitions to the United Arab Emirates.

There are numerous reasons to oppose this resolution. Let me list three:

First, and most obviously, some Paveways have already left the U.S., and this fact alone shows that this resolution is more about messaging than action and demonstrates the urgent need the UAE has for these munitions.

Second, the UAE is a steadfast partner against Iran. Tehran is our foremost opponent in the region right now and a critical threat to our interests there. I would note that the very flawed Iran deal put millions—in fact, billions and billions—of dollars of cash into the pockets of Iran, and they are now using those dollars to support terrorism, foment instability, put mines on ships, and attack ships in international waters. So they are now a threat not just in the region but a threat around the world. So, thank God, President Trump had the good

sense to get us out of that terrible deal.

If we want the UAE's continued help, we need to make sure that we are a reliable partner and that they are properly armed.

The third item is that the U.S. needs to continue its leadership in the region. If the UAE and Saudi Arabia cannot buy arms from us, that doesn't mean they won't get arms. It just means that they will buy them from the Russians. This will diminish our standing, weaken our leverage with our partners, and call into question our reliability as a partner.

For these reasons and others, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend on the other side of the aisle. It is a good debate here. The bottom line on this is, I think if the concern is Saudi Arabia—I understand the concern, I may not share it in the same level of depth—then vote “no” on the last resolution or vote for the last resolution.

This one is on UAE, and whether it is Saudi, UAE, or Jordan, I think it is important for us, Mr. Speaker, to constantly show that we have our allies' back, especially an ally like UAE.

We know that Iran likes to go on the offensive. We know that the only thing that stops Iran from broader encroachments in the Middle East is the United States and our allies. We know that a good offensive posture is the best defensive posture to prevent a shooting war from ever happening.

So, again, we can all debate the process and how this went down, but the bottom line is we must reject this resolution. This is a resolution that I think is a result of political pressure, and we must send this back to the Senate where it belongs, or if this passes then I am sure the President will veto it.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the debate, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Again, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I certainly respect my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the points they have raised. We have similar concerns, but I think the way we handle it or the way we have proposed to handle it is a little bit different.

That is why I am saying if we don't pass this measure, then these bombs will be on their way to the Emirates very soon.

If we do pass this resolution, then it will go to the President's desk and it will put him on the spot to answer whether he agrees that our values need to be central to America's work around the world.

Again, I am very concerned and aware of the malign role that the Iranians play in the region. I am very concerned about the Houthis who also play a bad role in the region. But that

doesn't mean that we should just give blank checks or give them arms. I think it would just be a mistake to let them think that they don't have to have any conduct in trying to conduct this war into diminishing civilian casualties.

The other point I want to raise, again, is the fact that, Mr. Speaker, do you remember when you were a kid in school and you learned how a bill became a law?

Well, there is something called separation of powers, checks and balances. It is not right for the President to declare an emergency when there really is no emergency in order to get around Congress' disapproval of something. So I feel it is important to fight for the institution as well.

So, again, if we do pass this resolution, it will go to the President's desk, and it will let him answer whether he agrees that our values need to be central to our work around the world.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 491, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. 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.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED EXPORT TO THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA OF CERTAIN DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 491, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 38) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 491, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 38

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in*

*Congress assembled,* That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1422 (EC-1422) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support the manufacture of the Aurora Fuzing System for the Paveway IV Precision Guided Bomb Program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include in the RECORD extraneous materials on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this final measure we will consider would stop the transfer of fuses for precision-guided munitions—critical components that allow these weapons to be armed and detonated. Like the bombs, these components have already been manufactured, and we need to act quickly to stop their shipment.

As we wrap up this debate, Mr. Speaker, I want to make an appeal to my friends on the other side of the aisle: You can be for or against these weapons sales and still understand that these resolutions are the right thing to do, if for nothing else than the integrity of this body.

I spoke earlier about the rule of law. This phony emergency declaration is a message to the Congress and to the American people that when the law gets in the way, this administration is just going to find a way around it. They will twist the law into pretzels or just throw it out the window entirely if it allows them to sidestep Congress. We cannot stand for that.

This administration should have played by the rules, and we could have done that and probably still gotten these sales through. They could have sent up a notification and allowed Congress to have a debate. But instead, they want to shut us out of this process.

With these resolutions, we are taking some of that power back. We are saying that we won't allow the laws written in this body to be ignored. If nothing else, this is an opportunity to stand up and say: We took an oath to uphold the Constitution, and that means Congress remains a coequal branch of government.

Let me say that again: that means Congress is a coequal branch of government. We will not be a rubberstamp for any administration, not only this administration, but any administration. Congress has its duties. We will not be a rubberstamp.

I have felt for a long time that administrations of both parties, quite frankly, have ignored Congress when it comes to foreign policy and national security. We shouldn't stand for it any longer. No more do we give a blank check to any President of any party who wants to cut Congress out of the decisionmaking and subvert the Constitution.

So, Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't agree to it, we shouldn't stand for it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 38. And I want to focus my remarks on the rationale behind the President's emergency declaration and ask that we think about the definition of the word "declaration", what that means to each of us.

My friends on the other side of the aisle would prefer to forget that these arms sales were expedited for a very specific reason. They are omitting this information because it doesn't fit into their narrative that the President is doing a favor to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. I can tell you that defense is no favor.

The threat that emanates from Iran that precipitated this emergency declaration is very, very real, and, as a result, so is the need for the weapons sales to our partners.

So let's think about it: Are these situations emergencies?

Do they pose an immediate risk to life—an immediate threat to life?

In May in the days leading right up to this emergency declaration, Iran and its proxies executed several attacks throughout the Middle East over just 2 weeks.

Four oil tankers were attacked in the Gulf of Oman. I would say that is an emergency and a threat to life.

Armed drones struck Saudi oil fields. I would say that is an emergency and a threat to life.

The head of the Quds Force called on terror groups to prepare for a proxy war. I would certainly call that an emergency and a very direct threat to life.

A rocket was launched near the U.S. embassy in Baghdad. I would call that an emergency and a threat to life.

A bomb-carrying drone was launched by Houthi rebels targeting a Saudi airport on May 21. I would say that is an emergency and a threat to life.

Now in the weeks since the emergency declaration, Iran has only ramped up its attacks and it is precipitating the need to have this emergency declaration.

Houthi rebels have continued attacks on civilian airports in Saudi Arabia. That is an emergency and a direct threat to life.