

demonstrated by a series of recent major disasters—which the Democrats are working hard to support.

We must remain committed to rebuilding disaster-stricken communities, replacing crumbling infrastructure, and developing and deploying the infrastructure needed to connect us like never before, including through 5G.

We cannot allow the Senate and this administration to impede our efforts to make American infrastructure better, safer, and more resilient.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The 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 January 9, 2020, at 9:28 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1228.

That the Senate passed S. 1611.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 583.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 83, IRAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 781 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 781

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities in or against Iran. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SEC. 2. Section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546) shall not apply during the remainder of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress to a measure respecting Iran.

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 Texas (Mr. BURGESS), 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.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 781, providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 83 under a closed rule. The resolution also provides 1 hour of general debate, controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee on Foreign Affairs.

Madam Speaker, the question before us today is very simple: Should President Trump be allowed to send the United States hurtling toward war with Iran without prior congressional approval?

It is a question we must wrestle with following the President's actions last Thursday. That is when he ordered the lethal drone attack on Iraqi soil that killed Iranian General Soleimani. The outgoing Prime Minister has said the strike was carried out without Iraqi permission or knowledge. It was done without any plan for the consequences in the region or the world. And, more troubling still, it was carried out without any input from the people's Representatives here in Congress.

Think about that.

Madam Speaker, just a month ago, Iran was staring down some of the most intense antigovernment protests in a decade. Thousands took to the streets of Tehran to express growing frustration and anger with their leaders.

But what a difference a month makes. Protestors—men, women, and children—have again taken to the streets of Tehran. Only this time, their anger wasn't directed at their own leaders; it was directed at the United States of America—all because of the President's unilateral decision.

Madam Speaker, that is what happens when monumental decisions of war and peace are made in a vacuum with no regard for the consequences. Things usually don't go very well.

Rather than protect our national security and stabilize the region, President Trump's reckless decision to strike Soleimani united Iran. It has led to retaliatory strikes on two bases used by U.S. and coalition forces in Iraq, and it has put our troops and diplomats serving overseas in greater danger.

Now, make no mistake: This decision has endangered all Americans everywhere. Hardliners are emboldened; 4,000

more U.S. troops have been deployed to the region; operations against ISIS have been suspended; the Iraqi Parliament has voted to kick American troops out of Iraq—all because of the brash decision of one man: the President of the United States.

Madam Speaker, there was no question that Soleimani was a ruthless military commander. He had American, Syrian, Lebanese, Iraqi, and Yemeni blood on his hands. But that is not up for debate today, nor is the question of whether or not killing him was a good or bad idea.

The President of the United States assassinated a high-level foreign military commander without asking or even notifying Congress beforehand.

Madam Speaker, with little evidence, the President claims his actions prevented an imminent threat, but the American people have heard that one before. We remember the stories about weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. We remember the tens of thousands of American soldiers who paid the price for that deception.

Madam Speaker, is this Congress going to sit by and allow that to happen in Iran, or are we going to ensure that this body acts before a war begins that could continue long after President Trump leaves office?

Now, the Constitution is clear; it is crystal clear. Article I, Section 8 gives Congress the power to declare war, but President Trump treated Congress as if it were an afterthought in a decision that has destabilized the region and shaken the world.

More than 4,000 of our brave men and women are now being sent to the Persian Gulf, all without any input from the people's Chamber.

We represent the brave young men and women who are deploying to Kuwait; we represent those deploying to Iraq; and we represent those deploying elsewhere across the Middle East. Each of us speaks for them, and we speak for their families, who are scared sick as their loved ones receive orders to deploy.

Madam Speaker, we must summon the courage to be their voice.

Now, I am glad that the United States and Iran have taken a step back from the brink of war, but what we heard from the President yesterday was more of the same bluster. It is clear, even after the briefing by the administration yesterday that many of us attended, that he has no clue at all—none—about what could come next.

Now, make no mistake: The world is less safe because of Trump's chaotic foreign policy. The impacts of his strikes are still reverberating in the region and across the world, and we cannot sit silently by.

The Constitution makes the President Commander in Chief, but it gives only Congress the power to declare war. The Founders knew that decisions of this magnitude required consultation between the branches of government, no matter who is in the White

House, no matter who controls the majority on Capitol Hill.

Our Democrats don't want war with Iran; most Republicans don't want war with Iran; and the American people certainly don't want a war with Iran. I think that would be catastrophic. We should be stopping costly, endless wars, not creating new ones.

But whatever you believe, have the courage of your conviction, have the courage to vote, and that is what the underlying War Powers Resolution is all about. Congress needs to authorize any additional hostilities with Iran.

Madam Speaker, these decisions aren't easy. I understand that. There is no more consequential vote than deciding whether to send men and women off to war and into harm's way. We weigh that decision knowing that, despite our hopes and prayers, lives are lost in combat.

□ 1245

Mothers and fathers could lose their children. Kids could be forced to grow up without a parent.

But when we were sworn in, each of us took an oath to defend the Constitution, and that means wrestling with this very tough decision when necessary. The only question now is whether we have the guts to uphold that oath.

Madam Speaker, with the Middle East held captive to the whims of a reckless President, and with the Commander in Chief without a clue, I pray that we, in Congress, have that courage.

On behalf of our troops, their families, and the American people, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Today, we consider H. Con. Res. 83 or, technically, we are considering the rule to consider H. Con. Res. 83, a resolution to remove the United States Armed Forces from hostilities in Iran.

But the thing is, we are not engaged in hostilities in Iran. Once again, we are considering a measure that will have no force of law. This is a non-binding concurrent resolution.

There was some debate in the Rules Committee last night on whether a concurrent resolution under the War Powers Resolution is, in fact, non-binding. But in the Senate, a joint resolution has been introduced, making it likely that this House Concurrent Resolution will go no further than the action today.

The Constitution grants Congress the power to declare war. The Constitution also designates the President as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. This sets up a conflict. The courts have not delineated the boundaries of these authorities or deter-

mined gaps between them that would either deny power to a President or to the Congress, one at the expense of the other.

In Federalist Number 69, Alexander Hamilton argued the President's power resides only in the direction of the military as placed by law at his command. Presidents have long argued that their role as Commander in Chief, coupled with their inherent authority over foreign affairs, grants them the power to engage the Armed Forces, short of war, as they see fit.

Since the founding of our country, the Supreme Court has ruled both that the President enjoys greater discretion when acting with respect to matters of foreign affairs and, that absent an authorization of action during wartime, any action by the President was void.

Despite the struggle to maintain the separation of powers with regard to engaging our Armed Forces, the motivation underlying the inclusion in the Constitution of these powers for both the President and the Congress continues to this day: The desire to protect and defend the United States, its persons, and its assets.

Congress passed the War Powers Resolution in 1973, largely in response to the experiences in Korea and Vietnam. The War Powers Resolution authorizes the engagement of the forces of the United States in hostilities when: There is a declaration of war; or there exists a specific statutory authorization; or a national emergency created by attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces.

To assess the current situation, let's examine what has led us to this point.

In June of 2019, Iran shot down a surveillance aircraft that was flying over international waters near the Strait of Hormuz. This was an unmanned aerial drone.

At the time, President Trump was advised by his military advisers to strike back, but the President opted not to strike back because it would have resulted in Iranian casualties, and he felt he could not justify creation of human casualties because of the loss of a machine. I agree with the President in that decision. I think his restraint was remarkable, but, certainly, exemplary.

In September of 2019, Iranian cruise missiles struck nearly 20 targets of critical energy infrastructure in Saudi Arabia. This disrupted a significant portion of Saudi oil production.

In December of 2019, Iranian-backed forces in Iraq targeted military facilities where United States forces were co-located.

On December 27, an Iranian-backed Hezbollah group, a U.S.-designated foreign terrorist organization, attacked a base in northern Iraq, and they killed a U.S. contractor and wounded four U.S. servicemen.

The United States responded, and it launched a retaliatory air strike in Iraq and Syria.

On January 2, 2020, acting on intelligence of imminent threat to American interests, and in response to the persistent attack by Iranian-backed entities, the United States military killed General Qasem Soleimani. Soleimani was the long-time leader of the Iran Revolutionary Guard Corps Quds Force.

The Iran Revolutionary Guard is a U.S.-designated terrorist organization. It has been supporting proxy forces throughout the Middle East and attacking United States interests and allies for over a decade.

Soleimani previously operated under strict security but, in recent years, he has moved much more freely and openly, believing that the United States did not have the willpower to be able to attack him. His atrocities include the deaths of hundreds of Americans and the attempted assassination of a Saudi diplomat in the United States, among other things.

President Obama's former Secretary of Homeland Security, Secretary Jeh Johnson, stated that General Soleimani was a legitimate military target.

I do want to be clear. The last thing that I want to see and I suspect anyone in this body wants to see is our men and women committed to another conflict in the Middle East. We want those conflicts to end, as does the President.

But, Madam Speaker, today the world is a safer place without General Soleimani. And who would want him to come back?

Despite the disagreement in how further to engage in the Middle East, in the country of Iran, be it militarily or diplomatically, the last thing we should be doing is broadcasting our plans to the enemy.

By passing this War Powers Resolution, directing the President to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities with Iran, a point that is, in itself in contention, we are effectively telling the Iranian mullahs that it is okay to push forward with their aggressive posturing. Rather than stating what the President cannot do, perhaps we should be authorizing what the President can do.

Last night, in the Rules Committee, it became clear that both Republicans and Democrats agree that the world is a safer place without General Soleimani, and any war with Iran needs to be authorized by Congress seemed to be general agreement.

Democrats want to maintain the separation of powers, as do I, but the question is, to what extent are we jeopardizing our safety?

I believe Congress does need to authorize military action and maintain the separation of powers as intended by the Founders, but we don't need to broadcast it to the world.

While we may be divided on the need for this resolution, let us recognize the privilege that we enjoy each and every day, being able to stand in this House and debate these issues without fear of

retribution of our government. Those protesters in Iran did not enjoy that freedom. They cut off the internet and eliminated those protesters. That is why you don't see them anymore.

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

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

Let me just respond to the gentleman when he says that this is a concurrent resolution here in the House and it is nonbinding and merely symbolic. Let me point out to him that the law states clearly that this sort of resolution reins in the President. The War Powers Resolution requires the President to stop using American forces and hostilities if Congress so directs by concurrent resolution.

Moreover, the Constitution gives war powers to the Congress, not to the President. And if both Houses pass this resolution, it is a clear statement that Congress is denying the President the authority to wage war, and that the President must come to Congress for an authorization prior to further hostilities.

And by the way, we are not just pursuing a concurrent resolution. Senator KAINE of Virginia, over in the Senate, is pursuing a joint resolution; so we are covering all bases here because we are deeply concerned that we may end up in a war inadvertently here, and that Congress will have no role in it.

Again, I would urge the gentleman to read the War Powers Resolution. I have a copy here, and the accompanying report when this resolution was signed into law. The report, with regard to consultation, is crystal clear that consultation is meant prior to introducing our forces and engaging into hostilities, which is something the President didn't even notify us of.

And in terms of the President's exercising this remarkable restraint, I just have a very different opinion. Have you read his Twitter account? Have you been listening to him on TV as he brags about the shiny, expensive weapons we have that he would love to use? The rhetoric, the threat to bomb cultural sites, which is a war crime? I mean, the gentleman may be totally at ease with all of that, but I am not; and most of the American people are scared as hell of this President's rhetoric when it comes to a potential war with Iran.

All we are saying here is that we ought to stand up for this institution, and stand with the Constitution, and make it very clear that if the President wants to go to war in Iran, that he needs to come to Congress to get that declaration, to get that authorization.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the War Powers Resolution to limit the President's military actions regarding Iran.

As a Member of Congress, one of our most sacred votes is our vote to declare war. We, therefore, have an obligation to study the evidence and share concerns about the administration's decision to engage in hostilities against Iran. We have a duty to question its strategy, or lack of strategy, moving forward.

My expertise, Madam Speaker, is not foreign policy, but I know Iran. I lived there. I worked there as a Peace Corps volunteer many years ago. I have been a student of Iranian history and politics for more than 3 decades.

There is no question about Iran's role in sponsoring terrorism. Soleimani himself was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of Americans and thousands around the world. He actively worked to foment instability across the Middle East on behalf of the government of Iran.

Nevertheless, the President of the United States, in his response to Iran, announced that he would commit a war crime by targeting Iran's extraordinary cultural sites. War crimes. No matter who is President of the United States, when he or she indicates that they are prepared to commit a war crime, then Congress better step up and reassert its authority under the Constitution.

We must demand that the President justify any act, and that is what this resolution does. That is why I support it.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, let me yield myself 30 seconds for the purpose of response before I yield to Mr. COLE.

And my response would be, had the gentleman from Massachusetts yielded to me for a question, my question was going to be, was he asking for unanimous consent to change the concurrent resolution to a joint resolution such that it could align and harmonize with the Senate activity and then, therefore, maybe accomplish something. But he didn't.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Dr. BURGESS, for yielding.

I rise, Madam Speaker, in reluctant opposition, quite frankly, to both the rule and the underlying legislation.

As my good friend, Chairman MCGOVERN knows, we have actually worked together to try and expand and reclaim war-making authority for the Congress of the United States, and I would offer and continue to work with him in that partnership. I think that is something that needs to be continued.

I also think we have no difference that if we were to engage in a war with Iraq, it would require congressional authorization. And frankly, last night, in the Rules Committee, I offered a process whereby we could work together in a bipartisan fashion; that is, let's just follow the War Powers Resolution.

Let's submit something to the committee of jurisdiction, which is actually the Foreign Affairs Committee. We have a deadline or a timeline laid out in the War Powers Act; they could operate within that. Within a matter of a few weeks we would then, in a very bipartisan manner, bring something to the floor.

Let's contrast that with how this particular resolution came to the floor. We got it about 45 minutes before the Rules Committee meeting. It is written in the Speaker's Office; rewritten in the Speaker's Office, and it is sent down here to make a political point, not to actually do something that would substantively restore congressional war-making power. This is all politics; that is all it is.

□ 1300

The political aim here is for our friends to suggest that the President either wants war with Iran or has acted hastily, precipitously, and recklessly. Neither of those things is true.

Frankly, our latest dispute with Iran begins with the decision by this administration appropriately to withdraw from the very ill-advised Iranian nuclear deal, a deal, by the way, that the majority of this House and the majority of the United States Senate opposed, but President Obama went ahead with it anyway.

What has been the Iranian response to our withdrawal? A series of provocations to which, as my good friend Mr. BURGESS pointed out, the President, by and large, has acted with remarkable restraint. Let's just go through some of those provocations.

First, it was attacks on ships in the Strait of Hormuz in the gulf. What was the President's response? Well, let's organize an international flotilla to defend these ships. He did not attack Iran.

Next, as my good friend from Texas pointed out, we see strikes into Iraq itself. Particularly, we see an attack on Saudi Arabian oil refineries. What is the President's response? Well, let's not attack Iran. Let's send defensive capabilities from our country there and protect those sites.

Then, we see attacks on American forces in Iraq. What is the President's response? As my friend pointed out, let's go after the Shia militias. Let's not attack Iran.

Finally, after that, when the President responds, we see another attack. In that attack, as my friend pointed out, an American contractor died, and four American servicemembers were wounded. Again, the President responds by attacking Shia militia.

Then, the next response, our embassy is assaulted. Thank goodness, no loss of life, but I think the President had had enough.

By the way, just after that assault happens, who magically shows up in violation of a U.N. resolution in Iraq? Our good friend General Soleimani, a designated terrorist for 13 years, a person who has killed hundreds of Americans, wounded thousands more, not to

mention the tens of thousands across the region. What does the President do? The President takes out a legitimate terrorist target. In Iran? No, the President doesn't want to do that. He does it in Iraq.

Now, how anybody could have any doubt about the President's desire to, number one, strike at a terrorist, and, number two, avoid war, I will never know.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, passing this resolution, as my good friend Dr. BURGESS suggested, sends the wrong message to the wrong people at precisely the wrong time.

The President did the right thing here. He has acted in a restrained manner. He has endured, and our country has endured, endless provocations.

We should reject this rule. Frankly, we should have a regular process where we actually go back to the committee of jurisdiction. We should absolutely reject the underlying resolution.

Before I conclude, I want to mention I know my friend is very sincere in his opinions on expanding congressional war power. There is no doubt in my mind about it. We have worked on that before. I look forward to working with my friend on that issue again. This is the wrong vehicle, the wrong place, the wrong time, the wrong consequences for our own country to pass this kind of legislation.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I look forward to working with him on the war powers and other issues related to the executive branch encroaching on legislative powers in the future. I hope we can work in a bipartisan way and make some progress here.

I include in the RECORD a January 4 New York Times article entitled "As Tensions With Iran Escalated, Trump Opted for Most Extreme Measure."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 4, 2020]

AS TENSIONS WITH IRAN ESCALATED, TRUMP
OPTED FOR MOST EXTREME MEASURE

(By Helene Cooper, Eric Schmitt, Maggie
Haberman and Rukmini Callimachi)

WASHINGTON.—In the chaotic days leading to the death of Maj. Gen. Qassim Suleimani, Iran's most powerful commander, top American military officials put the option of killing him—which they viewed as the most extreme response to recent Iranian-led violence in Iraq—on the menu they presented to President Trump.

They didn't think he would take it. In the wars waged since the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, Pentagon officials have often offered improbable options to presidents to make other possibilities appear more palatable.

After initially rejecting the Suleimani option on Dec. 28 and authorizing airstrikes on an Iranian-backed Shiite militia group instead, a few days later Mr. Trump watched, fuming, as television reports showed Iranian-backed attacks on the American Embassy in Baghdad, according to Defense Department and administration officials.

By late Thursday, the president had gone for the extreme option. Top Pentagon officials were stunned.

Mr. Trump made the decision, senior officials said on Saturday, despite disputes in the administration about the significance of what some officials said was a new stream of intelligence that warned of threats to American embassies, consulates and military personnel in Syria, Iraq and Lebanon. General Suleimani had just completed a tour of his forces in Syria, Lebanon and Iraq, and was planning an "imminent" attack that could claim hundreds of lives, those officials said.

"Days, weeks," Gen. Mark A. Milley, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said on Friday, when asked how imminent any attacks could be, without offering more detail other than to say that new information about unspecified plotting was "clear and unambiguous."

But some officials voiced private skepticism about the rationale for a strike on General Suleimani, who was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American troops over the years. According to one United States official, the new intelligence indicated "a normal Monday in the Middle East"—Dec. 30—and General Suleimani's travels amounted to "business as usual."

That official described the intelligence as thin and said that General Suleimani's attack was not imminent because of communications the United States had between Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, and General Suleimani showing that the ayatollah had not yet approved any plans by the general for an attack. The ayatollah, according to the communications, had asked General Suleimani to come to Tehran for further discussions at least a week before his death.

Secretary of State Mike Pompeo and Vice President Mike Pence were two of the most hawkish voices arguing for a response to Iranian aggression, according to administration officials. Mr. Pence's office helped run herd on meetings and conference calls held by officials in the run-up to the strike.

Defense Secretary Mark T. Esper and General Milley declined to comment for this article, but General Milley's spokeswoman, Col. DeDe Halfhill, said, without elaborating, that "some of the characterizations being asserted by other sources are false" and that she would not discuss conversations between General Milley and the president.

The fallout from Mr. Trump's targeted killing is now underway. On Saturday in Iraq, the American military was on alert as tens of thousands of pro-Iranian fighters marched through the streets of Baghdad and calls accelerated to eject the United States from the country. United States Central Command, which oversees American military operations in the Middle East, said there were two rocket attacks near Iraqi bases that host American troops, but no one was injured.

In Iran, the ayatollah vowed "forceful revenge" as the country mourned the death of General Suleimani.

In Palm Beach, Fla., Mr. Trump lashed back, promising to strike 52 sites across Iran—representing the number of American hostages taken by Iran in 1979—if Iran attacked Americans or American interests. On Saturday night, Mr. Trump warned on Twitter that some sites were "at a very high level & important to Iran & the Iranian culture, and those targets, and Iran itself. WILL BE HIT VERY FAST AND VERY HARD."

The president issued those warnings after American spy agencies on Saturday detected that Iranian ballistic missile units across the country had gone to a heightened state of readiness, a United States official said on Saturday night.

Other officials said it was unclear whether Iran was dispersing its ballistic missile units—the heart of the Iranian military—to avoid American attack, or was mobilizing the units for a major strike against American targets or allies in the region in retaliation for General Suleimani's death.

On Capitol Hill, Democrats voiced growing suspicions about the intelligence that led to the killing. At the White House, officials formally notified Congress of a war powers resolution with what the administration said was a legal justification for the strike.

At Fort Bragg, N.C., some 3,500 soldiers, one of the largest rapid deployments in decades, are bound for the Middle East.

General Suleimani, who was considered the most important person in Iran after Ayatollah Khamenei, was a commanding general of a sovereign government. The last time the United States killed a major military leader in a foreign country was during World War II, when the American military shot down the plane carrying the Japanese admiral Isoroku Yamamoto.

But administration officials are playing down General Suleimani's status as a part of the Iranian state, suggesting his title gave him cover for terrorist activities. In the days since his death, they have sought to describe the strike as more in line with the killing of Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the Islamic State leader, who died in October in an American commando raid in Syria.

Administration officials insisted they did not anticipate sweeping retaliation from Iran, in part because of divisions in the Iranian leadership. But Mr. Trump's two predecessors—Presidents George W. Bush and Barack Obama—had rejected killing General Suleimani as too provocative.

General Suleimani had been in Mr. Trump's sights since the beginning of the administration, although it was a Dec. 27 rocket attack on an Iraqi military base outside Kirkuk, which left an American civilian contractor dead, that set the killing in motion.

General Milley and Mr. Esper traveled on Sunday to Mar-a-Lago, Mr. Trump's Palm Beach resort, a day after officials presented the president with an initial list of options for how to deal with escalating violence against American targets in Iraq.

The options included strikes on Iranian ships or missile facilities or against Iranian-backed militia groups in Iraq. The Pentagon also tacked on the choice of targeting General Suleimani, mainly to make other options seem reasonable.

Mr. Trump chose strikes against militia groups. On Sunday, the Pentagon announced that airstrikes approved by the president had struck three locations in Iraq and two in Syria controlled by the group, Kataib Hezbollah.

Jonathan Hoffman, the chief Pentagon spokesman, said the targets included weapons storage facilities and command posts used to attack American and partner forces. About two dozen militia fighters were killed.

"These were on remote sites," General Milley told reporters on Friday in his Pentagon office. "There was no collateral damage."

But the Iranians viewed the strikes as out of proportion to their attack on the Iraqi base and Iraqis, largely members of Iranian-backed militias, staged violent protests outside the American Embassy in Baghdad. Mr. Trump, who aides said had on his mind the specter of the 2012 attacks on the American compound in Benghazi, Libya, became increasingly angry as he watched television images of pro-Iranian demonstrators storming the embassy. Aides said he worried that no response would look weak after repeated threats by the United States.

When Mr. Trump chose the option of killing General Suleimani, top military officials, flabbergasted, were immediately

alarmed about the prospect of Iranian retaliatory strikes on American troops in the region. It is unclear if General Milley or Mr. Esper pushed back on the president's decision.

Over the next several days, the military's Special Operations Command looked for an opportunity to hit General Soleimani, who operated in the open and was treated like a celebrity in many places he visited in the Middle East. Military and intelligence officials said the strike drew on information from secret informants, electronic intercepts, reconnaissance aircraft and other surveillance tools.

The option that was eventually approved depended on who would greet General Soleimani at his expected arrival on Friday at Baghdad International Airport. If he was met by Iraqi government officials allied with Americans, one American official said, the strike would be called off. But the official said it was a "clean party," meaning members of Kataib Hezbollah, including its leader, Abu Mahdi al-Muhandis. Mr. Trump authorized the killing at about 5 p.m. on Thursday, officials said.

On Friday, missiles fired from an American MQ-9 Reaper blew up General Soleimani's convoy as it departed the airport.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished chair and my colleague from the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding me this minute.

We begin the new year in turbulent and uncertain times, particularly with regard to Iran and the Middle East. Protecting our national interests and securing the safety and security of the American people must be the highest priorities of our government. I am gravely concerned the recent actions of the Trump administration have destabilized the region and undermined those priorities.

Article I of the United States Constitution vests in the House and Senate the responsibility to declare war, to appropriate money for the national defense, and, in doing so, to ensure no President employs military action without careful consultation of and authorization by Congress.

That is why it is so important that we take action to reaffirm these responsibilities by passing the resolution before us, which I am proud to cosponsor.

The use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities against Iran must come only after thoughtful deliberation and approval by Congress. As we move forward, we must all seek to achieve a peaceful resolution that protects American interests at home and abroad.

I join with all Americans in praying for the safety of our courageous servicemembers and urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), a valuable member of the House Committee on Rules.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, I thank President Trump for making a decisive action to protect Americans. Thank you.

The world now knows that Obama's appeasement strategy policies, including giving billions of dollars to Iran, are over. It didn't work. The world knows that when President Trump says we are not going to cross this red line, they know he means it.

In Rules Committee last night and again today, I listened as my Democratic colleagues claim what this resolution is all about. They claim that it is about making sure Congress exerts its authority to approve future war against Iran. But that is not what this resolution does.

In fact, let's read the title of this resolution. It says: "Directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities in or against Iran." It doesn't say anything about future war.

We do not currently have U.S. Armed Forces engaged in hostilities in or against Iran. If Democrats are serious about making sure Congress has its say in declaring war, they would follow the statutory guidelines as described by Representative COLE. They are already in there. Go to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Instead, Democrats have chosen to short circuit the process yet again to achieve a partisan objective.

As a member of the Rules Committee, I saw the language of the resolution 45 minutes before the Rules Committee started. This is not a serious effort for such a serious subject.

Here are the facts. Iran and Iranian-backed militias have escalated their attacks.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, in June 2019, Iran shot down a U.S. drone. Trump said, no, we are not going to retaliate because no U.S. lives were lost. Iran attacked Saudi oil fields. Iran-backed militia killed a U.S. citizen and wounded four troops. Then, an Iran-backed militia attacked the U.S. Embassy.

Soleimani was a terrorist designated by the Obama administration.

Let me read very quickly what the Joint Chiefs of Staff have said. He has had 40 years of military experience under all different administrations.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. General Milley said the trigger for the drone strike that killed

Soleimani was "clear, unambiguous intelligence indicating a significant campaign of violence against the United States in the days, weeks, and months," and that the administration would have been "culpably negligent" if it did not act.

This is a man who has been in the military for 40 years under different administrations, and you are going to doubt what he has to say?

I thank President Trump for protecting American citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a January 8 Vanity Fair article entitled "There Is No Strategy: Diplomats React to Trump's Erratic, Narcissistic Iran Policy."

[From Vanity Fair, Jan. 8, 2020]

"THERE IS NO STRATEGY": DIPLOMATS REACT TO TRUMP'S ERRATIC, NARCISSISTIC IRAN POLICY

(By Abigail Tracy)

After the American drone strike and Iran's measured retaliation, some State vets worry that Trump is a wild card, the biggest danger: "From a political standpoint," says one, "they have behaved a hell of a lot more rationally and predictably than we have."

In the aftermath of Iran's strike against two airbases, in retaliation for the drone strike that killed Qasem Soleimani last week, a sigh of relief was breathed, but for what? That there had been no casualties from Iran's cruise missiles was a huge reason to be thankful. (U.S. officials have since suggested this was intentional.) But there was also a sense of relief that Trump had stepped back—as if he were the wild card. The developments laid bare what diplomats I spoke with identified as a discomfiting reality in the Trump era. "Up is down and down is up," a former U.S. ambassador in the region told me, noting Iran's decision to notify the Iraqis ahead of the attack on Tuesday and Mohammad Javad Zarif's message of detente in the face of Trump's bluster. "Who would've imagined that it's the American president who is a crazy person gunning for war and the mullahs who are being careful and deliberate and cautious . . . They have done terrible things—I am not going to defend the fact that the country holds hostages and has absolutely supported terrorist groups and those sorts of things—but from a political standpoint, they have behaved a hell of a lot more rationally and predictably than we have," this person added. "Do you take comfort in the fact that Iran is the rational actor or does that scare the bejesus out of you even more?"

A former Foreign Service Officer who worked on Iran under Barack Obama echoed the point. "I think it is interesting that [Iran has taken] every opportunity to show that they're actually more responsible than the U.S. president in executing this conflict," this person said. "It boggles the mind to me that we are almost more concerned, I think, about our own president than we are about the way others may retaliate, which is really scary."

Diplomats I spoke with are clear-eyed in their belief that Iran's retaliation for Soleimani is not complete; they are bracing for—if not further military attacks—subsequent responses, such as cyberattacks or even kidnappings. To a fault, they, too, are not defending Iran's past malfeasance. And Trump's position on the wake of the attacks is welcomed by veterans of Foggy Bottom.

"President Trump made the right decision not to respond to Iran's missile attacks. There were no American casualties and the Iranians are clearly signaling they don't want a war," Nicholas Burns, the former ambassador to NATO, told me. The problem is that Trump has thus far failed to chart a path forward with Iran. Instead, he has shuttled between slamming Iran, slighting his predecessor's signature Iran nuclear deal, and patting himself on the back for the death of Soleimani and Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the former leader of the Islamic State whom the United States killed in October. "His speech was confusing about his strategy. It is not at all clear if he intends to contain Iran through deterrence or to weaken its government and seek regime change," Burns added. "He owes the American public, the Congress, and our allies a much more specific and consistent game plan. Otherwise, it will be difficult for him to gain domestic and allied support."

As I reported in the aftermath of the Soleimani's killing last week, a chief concern within the diplomatic ranks was that the Trump administration, still lacking a coherent foreign policy, had failed to adequately contemplate and prepare for the international and Iranian response to the airstrike against the top Iranian general. Indeed, the Trump administration certainly appeared to be caught flat-footed when the Iraqi parliament voted to expel U.S. troops from the country over the weekend. While asserting that the killing of Soleimani left Americans safer, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo and Defense Secretary Mark Esper have yet to detail the imminent threat they claim the Iranian general posed to U.S. interests. And Trump's remarks on Wednesday arguably raised more questions than they answered. As the former ambassador in the region put it, "There is no strategy. It is satisfying Trump's ego at every step. It's all it is for us, there is zero strategy and it's all strategy on Iran's side."

Beyond his "America First" tagline, Trump has failed to formulate anything resembling a coherent foreign policy. Rather, he has a domestic policy that influences American posturing abroad. The clearest through line in Trump's various foreign policy decisions can largely be summed up as "the opposite of what Obama did." But this lack of coherence is particularly troubling in the Middle East and is amplified by the reality that he's surrounded by hawks with hard-ons for toppling the Iranian regime, like Pompeo. "The most frustrating thing is that this is entirely of his own making. You think about where we were less than five years ago, when we got to the deal. Things certainly weren't perfect by any means. They were still causing a lot of harm and doing things against our interests in the region, but compare that to where we are today and it is so entirely avoidable," the former Foreign Service officer told me. "The lack of a strategy continues to be the most dangerous thing we can do in the Middle East."

A former high-ranking State Department official expressed similar dismay. "Foreign policy isn't well-done on impulse. Because so much is intertwined . . . It requires the ability to understand the trade-offs and possible longer-term impacts. Never easy. But this team has no ability to do that," they told me. "If I were a military family member, I'd really worry that our troops are being sent out with no clear plan or mission. Not a comforting thought."

If Trump really does have an appetite for diplomacy, that's undeniably a positive development. Diplomats stress that now is the time for it, and the Iranians do seem to be signaling a desire deescalate. "Now we're in

the time of intense diplomacy, where around the world leaders are figuring out, 'If you do this, I do that' and 'What will be the response of X if we do Y,'" a former senior U.S. official told me. But, this person added, "The only ones not taking part are the Americans." Instead, "America is content with a two-dimensional policy: We take this act, we stand still and watch what happens. The other countries are at least trying to be three-dimensional, adding the element of time, projecting to the not-too-distant future which advantages are to be gained."

In an ideal world, Burns said, Trump would open a reliable diplomatic channel to Tehran. "We should want to be able to deliver tough and clear messages to its government. And it would be smart to offer Iran a diplomatic off-ramp so that we can end the possibility of a wider war that is in neither of our interests," he said. "Trump's disinterest in real diplomacy is a significant disadvantage for the U.S."

Confronting a president who has repeatedly demonstrated a desire to dive into military conflict before diplomacy, Congress is grappling with how to restrain Trump. California congressman Ro Khanna told me the attacks on Tuesday increase "the urgency for Congress to act. We need to engage in de-escalation and a cease-fire to end the cycle of violence." Currently on the table are a few measures House Democrats hope can curb Trump's authority to attack Iran. Among them are a War Powers Resolution and a bill drafted by Khanna and Senator Bernie Sanders that would defund any offensive action in Iran and require any such action to have Congressional authorization.

Khanna told me that the Democratic caucus is unified and that he has been in talks with Speaker Nancy Pelosi about timing and process. The House is expected to vote on a War Powers Resolution, after which they would push his bill with Senator Sanders. Currently, House leadership is figuring how to craft a War Powers Resolution in a way that would prevent Republicans from attaching a Motion to Recommit, which could prevent it from reaching the Senate floor—as was the case with the War Powers Resolution on Yemen. "That is why it is taking some time," Khanna explained. "It is taking time to figure out the procedural mechanisms with the parliamentarian in the House and the Senate so that what we send over to the Senate doesn't lose its War Powers privileged status. If it loses its privileged status, then [Mitch] McConnell would never call it up."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentlewoman. I urge the gentlewoman, who read a couple of lines from the resolution, as I urge all of my colleagues, to read the entire resolution.

This is pretty simple. Basically, it says that if we go to war with Iran, Congress ought to have a say in it. Congress ought to do what the Constitution requires us to do.

I don't know why that is a radical idea, but if my friends want to go to war with Iran, they have to have the guts to come to the floor to debate it and vote on it.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, the President cannot unilaterally go to war with Iran, nor are we safer since January 2, 2020, after having targeted

and killed the second-in-command of Iran. The American people, as well as our troops, are in more jeopardy.

In 2002, I was here, and I offer these words from my statement on the floor regarding President Bush. "Always a question of the greatest importance, our decision today," in 2002, "is further weighted by the fact that we are being asked to sanction a new foreign policy doctrine that gives a President the power to launch a unilateral and preemptive first strike against Iraq before we have utilized our diplomatic options."

I further went on to say that "our own intelligence agencies report that there is currently little chance of chemical and biological attack from Saddam Hussein on U.S. forces or territories."

Proven right, endless war, continuous loss of life of our treasured young men and women and many injured—this resolution and rule are imperative to assert constitutional authority to ensure the protection of the American people.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), a valuable member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I join my colleagues in expressing the will to have an honest debate of the War Powers Act, should the majority party choose to do so.

Before I move any further, I submit for the RECORD a report from the Director of National Intelligence on Barack Obama's use of drones, an average of 67 drone strikes a year over his first 7 years in office, killing an average of six enemy combatants a week, wherein the majority said absolutely nothing about it at the time.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION REGARDING U.S. COUNTERTERRORISM STRIKES OUTSIDE AREAS OF ACTIVE HOSTILITIES

In accordance with the President's direction and consistent with the President's commitment to providing as much information as possible to the American people about U.S. counterterrorism activities, the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) is releasing today a summary of information provided to the DNI about both the number of strikes taken by the U.S. Government against terrorist targets outside areas of active hostilities and the assessed number of combatant and non-combatant deaths resulting from those strikes. "Areas of active hostilities" currently include Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria.

SUMMARY OF U.S. COUNTERTERRORISM STRIKES OUTSIDE AREAS OF ACTIVE HOSTILITIES BETWEEN JANUARY 20, 2009 AND DECEMBER 31, 2015

Total number of strikes against terrorist targets outside areas of active hostilities: 473.

Combatant deaths: 2372-2581.

Non-combatant deaths: 64-116.

The assessed range of non-combatant deaths provided to the DNI reflects consideration of credible reports of non-combatant deaths drawn from all-source information, including reports from the media and non-

governmental organizations. The assessed range of non-combatant deaths includes deaths for which there is an insufficient basis for assessing that the deceased is a combatant.

U.S. GOVERNMENT POST-STRIKE REVIEW PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

The information that was provided to the DNI regarding combatant and non-combatant deaths is the result of processes that include careful reviews of all strikes after they are conducted to assess the effectiveness of operations. These review processes have evolved over time to ensure that they incorporate the best available all-source intelligence, media reporting, and other information and may result in reassessments of strikes if new information becomes available that alters the original judgment. The large volume of pre- and post-strike data available to the U.S. Government can enable analysts to distinguish combatants from non-combatants, conduct detailed battle damage assessments, and separate reliable reporting from terrorist propaganda or from media reports that may be based on inaccurate information.

DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN U.S. GOVERNMENT AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL ASSESSMENTS

In releasing these figures, the U.S. Government acknowledges that there are differences between U.S. Government assessments and reporting from non-governmental organizations. Reports from non-governmental organizations can include both aggregate data regarding non-combatant deaths as well as case studies addressing particular strikes, and generally rely on a combination of media reporting and, in some instances, field research conducted in areas of reported strikes. Although these organizations' reports of non-combatant deaths resulting from U.S. strikes against terrorist targets outside areas of active hostilities vary widely, such reporting generally estimates significantly higher figures for non-combatant deaths than is indicated by U.S. Government information. For instance, for the period between January 20, 2009 and December 31, 2015, non-governmental organizations' estimates range from more than 200 to slightly more than 900 possible non-combatant deaths outside areas of active hostilities.

Consistent with the requirements applicable to future reporting under Section 3(b) of the Executive Order "United States Policy on Pre- and Post-Strike Measures to Address Civilian Casualties in U.S. Operations Involving the Use of Force," the information we are releasing today addresses general reasons for discrepancies between post-strike assessments from the United States Government and credible reporting from non-governmental organizations regarding non-combatant deaths and does not address specific incidents. There are a number of possible reasons that these non-governmental organizations' reports of the number of noncombatants killed may differ from the U.S. Government assessments, based on the information provided to the DNI.

First, although there are inherent limitations on determining the precise number of combatant and non-combatant deaths, particularly when operating in non-permissive environments, the U.S. Government uses post-strike methodologies that have been refined and honed over the years and that use information that is generally unavailable to non-governmental organizations. The U.S. Government draws on all available information (including sensitive intelligence) to determine whether an individual is part of a belligerent party fighting against the United States in an armed conflict, taking a direct part in hostilities against the United States, or otherwise targetable in the exercise of na-

tional self-defense. Thus, the U.S. Government may have reliable information that certain individuals are combatants, but are being counted as non-combatants by non-governmental organizations. For example, further analysis of an individual's possible membership in an organized armed group may include, among other things: the extent to which an individual performs functions for the benefit of the group that are analogous to those traditionally performed by members of a country's armed forces; whether that person is carrying out or giving orders to others within the group; or whether that person has undertaken certain acts that reliably connote meaningful integration into the group.

Second, according to information provided to the DNI, U.S. Government post-strike reviews involve the collection and analysis of multiple sources of intelligence before, during, and after a strike, including video observations, human sources and assets, signals intelligence, geospatial intelligence, accounts from local officials on the ground, and open source reporting. Information collected before a strike is intended to provide clarity regarding the number of individuals at a strike location as well as whether the individuals are engaged in terrorist activity. Post-strike collection frequently enables U.S. Government analysts to confirm, among other things, the number of individuals killed as well as their combatant status. The information is then analyzed along with other all-source intelligence reporting. This combination of sources is unique and can provide insights that are likely unavailable to non-governmental organizations.

Finally, non-governmental organizations' reports of counterterrorism strikes attributed to the U.S. Government—particularly their identification of non-combatant deaths—may be further complicated by the deliberate spread of misinformation by some actors, including terrorist organizations, in local media reports on which some non-governmental estimates rely.

Although the U.S. Government has access to a wide range of information, the figures released today should be considered in light of the inherent limitations on the ability to determine the precise number of combatant and non-combatant deaths given the non-permissive environments in which these strikes often occur. The U.S. Government remains committed to considering new, credible information regarding non-combatant deaths that may emerge and revising previous assessments, as appropriate.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, if we want to have an honest debate about the War Powers Act, then let's have an honest debate about the War Powers Act.

Why didn't we hear anything from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle about Libya when President Barack Obama took action that led to the death of Muammar Qadhafi? Why not Syria? Why not Yemen? Why is Iran individually spelled out in this resolution?

The only reason Iran is singled out in this resolution is to take a political jab at President Trump for utilizing an airstrike to take out General Soleimani, a terrorist who was responsible for killing thousands of Americans, partner troops, and, yes, Iranians.

While our colleagues are upset with the use of airstrikes to kill General Soleimani, I remind them that the Obama administration, according to

their own Director of National Intelligence, conducted hundreds of airstrikes, averaging more than six kills a week between January 2009 and December 2015, and that was in areas of non-hostilities. That doesn't even include Iraq, Afghanistan, and Syria, which are classified numbers.

Let's just be honest about what this is. This is another partisan attack against the President of the United States for killing General Soleimani, who was a terrorist in an area where the President had the absolute legal authority to operate.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman from Georgia, who I have a great deal of respect for.

Let's be honest here. Many of us, contrary to what the gentleman just said, have been outspoken against unilateral interventions by the executive branch without notifying Congress, without seeking our approval on military authorization under Obama. I, for one, was critical of his drone attacks. I raised issues about our involvement in Syria.

I include in the RECORD a statement that I made, saying that Congress should reconvene and debate and vote on a resolution with regard to what the Obama administration was doing in Libya.

[Press Release, March 23, 2011]

CONGRESSMAN MCGOVERN STATEMENT ON LIBYA

WASHINGTON, DC.—For several weeks now I have been calling for an internationally-enforced no-fly-zone over Libya in order to prevent Colonel Qaddafi from slaughtering his own people. I agree with President Obama that U.S. ground troops should not be committed to this effort, and that our international partners should soon take the lead. Whether or not Qaddafi remains the leader of Libya must, in the end, be up to the Libyan people. I am troubled about pressure to expand the military operation and the many unanswered questions about Libyan opposition forces. I urge the House leadership to call the Congress back into session as soon as possible so that Congress can exercise its constitutional responsibility to clearly spell out the mission and limits of U.S. military engagement in Libya. And I urge the Obama Administration to consult with Congress and to engage us at every possible opportunity as this crisis continues to unfold.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, some of us have been consistent on this through Democratic and Republican administrations. I take great exception when anybody tries to say that we are raising this issue just purely for political purposes.

For me, it is not. For me, I have been consistent on this through Democratic and Republican administrations.

□ 1315

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Massachusetts setting the record straight. The war powers activity, the authorization

of military force has been an issue that a number of us have been concerned with, Republican and Democrat, going back to the Clinton administration and activity in the Balkans, but what my friend from Massachusetts pointed out is that this reckless act by the President of the United States actually makes us less safe.

With one act, he has been able to unite the opposition in Iran. Remember, they were demonstrating in the streets against the regime. And I have heard from friends of mine who have deep roots in Iran that this has probably set back the cause of reform years, if not decades, in Iran.

We are less safe, not more.

I strongly urge the approval of this resolution as a start to rein in the President's worst impulses, but we must also put in additional checks, by passing Representative KHANNA's legislation to ensure no funds are used for an unauthorized war with Iran and Representative LEE's legislation to repeal the 2002 AUMF.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, this is an opportunity for us to get it right. And to take our friend, Mr. COLE's, word, we can move this forward. I see this as a beginning, and we can build on it, but rein in this administration.

Send a strong signal. Approve this resolution.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire the amount of time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 13¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), a valuable member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

Madam Speaker, this resolution is insincere and unserious. It is insincere because this is just: We don't like the President and he took action, and we can't stand it.

It is unserious, because if they really wanted to limit the actions of our government to defend our country and defend those in uniform, this wouldn't be a nonbinding resolution, they would limit it. If they want to limit it, go ahead and do it.

For the people in America that say, "Well, we don't know this Soleimani guy. How come we don't know him?" That is a great question. How come they don't know?

Well, let me introduce folks to him. He got busy with his work as a terrorist in Beirut, killing 241 marines; the Khobar Towers, killing Americans; hundreds of American personnel wearing uniforms dead by EFPs, explosively

formed penetrators; and thousands maimed walking around the United States, walking around the Halls of this Congress. That is Soleimani.

But they don't know him because this body, the executive branch, Republicans and Democrats, have sent their young men and women to war without dealing with this killer, this terrorist, because it was too hard, too hard in Iraq to deal with Iran, because it might make them mad, they might do something about it.

Our colleagues say that the President is reckless, without a plan.

Here is what is reckless: appeasement. Appeasement has gotten Americans killed, has gotten people around the globe killed because of this guy. What is the point of designating him a terrorist if you are not going to do anything about it?

Doing the bidding of Iran on this floor is unacceptable. We don't want to be in a war, that is true, nobody wants to be in a war, but I have got a news flash for everybody: Iran slapped us in the face in 1979 and they have been fighting with us ever since.

Us saying we are not going to defend ourselves does not stop Iran from fighting the war that they have with us. Appeasing Iran will only kill more Americans. It hasn't worked.

That is what is happening here today, Madam Speaker: the defense of the appeasement strategy of the last administration and administrations in the past.

We cannot allow this strategy to continue and Americans to be killed or Iran to have a nuclear weapon.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would just urge my colleagues to read the resolution. This is about the future and it is about whether or not, if we go to war with Iran, whether or not Congress upholds its constitutional responsibility.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

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

The President's policy towards Iran is to tear up diplomacy and embrace so-called maximum pressure.

The most recent strike, far from making us safer, is making us more insecure.

Think about the deliberate consequences from that act:

One, the Iraqi street is demonstrating against the U.S., not against Iran, as they were before;

Two, the Iranian street is demonstrating with the mullahs against the U.S. instead of against their own government;

Three, the Iraqi parliament voted to expel the United States from Iraq, jeopardizing our anti-ISIS mission;

Number four, our military has suspended training for anti-ISIS activities in Iraq because of this strike;

Number five, the Iran nuclear deal that the President tore up that Iranians complied with, they are now re-

nouncing, so we are closer to a nuclear Iran than we were before.

All of this has happened when the likelihood of Iran's further responding is grave.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, the gun is cocked and loaded.

We cannot go to war without Congress being involved in the debate and the President telling us what his policy is going to be.

Mr. BURGESS. 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 provide for immediate consideration of H. Res. 783, honoring the members of the military and intelligence community for carrying out the mission that killed General Soleimani.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment into 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW), my good friend, to explain the resolution.

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

I rise to urge defeat of the previous question so that we can immediately consider my resolution to honor the hard work and dedication of the men and women who made the precision strike on Qasem Soleimani possible.

This is an interesting crossroads we find ourselves in. After the successful response by the United States against the escalating aggression from the world's most active and deadly terrorist, Qasem Soleimani, our great country has found itself divided and unsure of itself.

Instead of unity and resolve in the face of a clear and common enemy, we have division and self-doubt. What is worse, that division has been sourced from the leadership in this very body.

While legitimate questions were raised—what authority was used, what was the reasoning, what sort of intelligence backed this decision—those questions have long been answered clearly and convincingly.

The President has clear authority, a duty in fact, to respond to attacks against American citizens and U.S. forces. That isn't my opinion; that is clear from Article II of the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution.

The case is made even stronger when you consider this occurred entirely within Iraq, a place where we already have a lawful military operational footprint.

The reasoning is quite simple as well: We must make clear that the U.S. will not be attacked indefinitely, that we will respond, and that response will make you regret ever having hit us in the first place.

The long history of General Soleimani's actions against the United States throughout the region, and the killing and maiming of thousands of America's sons and daughters, and indications of his future actions make this point even stronger.

As to the intelligence, our CIA, our Director of National Intelligence, our Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have repeatedly told us that this intelligence was some of the best they had ever seen, and it removed all doubt that Soleimani was planning large scale imminent attacks.

These questions have been answered over and over and over, and yet my colleagues pretend not to hear those answers. After all, the mere thought of agreeing with and supporting our President is repugnant to them even when it is the right thing to do.

So instead of applauding these actions that restored American deterrence, delivered justice to hundreds of dead American soldiers and their families, and severely weakened the terrorist organization IRGC Quds Force, my colleagues wring their hands and express regret and disappointment.

Instead of applauding the men and women of our military standing in harm's way, instead of recognizing the tireless vigilance of our intelligence community, instead of acknowledging those who have spent years confronting the Iranian threat network directly, my colleagues in this Congress seek to undermine them.

I take this personally, since I was one of those servicemembers for so many years.

This threat is not new to us, though it may be new to those politicians who have lived comfortably and safely back home, now casting stones from ivory towers, relying on disingenuous judgments and false premises to make a false, politically-driven case to the American people.

So I offer this resolution today in order to right that wrong. I offer this to demonstrate to the American people and our servicemembers and members of the intelligence community that this Congress does indeed stand by the decision to rid the world of America's enemies and those who seek to do us harm and stands by those who made justice possible.

This resolution simply states the obvious: that General Soleimani was head of one of the most sophisticated terrorist organizations in the world that already committed numerous attacks against the United States and planned to carry out many more within days.

This resolution rightfully congratulates our men and women who disrupted this evil chain of attacks, instead of wrongly suggesting to them that their actions were unauthorized and even immoral.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution and put to rest once and for all the false implication that America cannot defend herself when necessary.

Madam Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, late last week, President Trump ordered the assassination of a high-ranking Iranian official while he was in Iraq.

This action threatens to cascade the United States into an ill-advised, not authorized war with Iran, and is already setting into motion a series of disastrous unintended consequences for American security and interests in the Middle East.

The President trashed the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, which Iran was following and that put in place the first real restraints on Iran's nuclear program. The world and America were safer under the JCPOA framework, period.

Enter Trump, and now we see Iranian rockets firing, U.S. forces being pushed out of Iraq, and alliances strained as we all await further retaliations.

Oh, history is replete with the misery befalling those poor empires who first fight and mistake that for might.

This escalation with Iran must end, Congress must reassert its war powers authority, and I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Committee on Armed Forces.

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Sometimes when I watch the debate, I wonder what happened to the confident America that I remember; that when a failing country threatens us, we actually respond with force instead of fear and run away.

That said, this process argument that we are having is interesting, but as my colleague said earlier, maybe they forgot something.

So I am going to urge defeat of the previous question, because I think in this resolution, something major was forgotten, maybe they can re-craft it, bring it back later, but that is this: I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle say that Mr. Soleimani was a bad guy and they are glad he is dead. However—process argument follows—I think something has been left out of this.

When I was in Iraq in 2008 and 2009, I operated mostly against terrorist networks of a different nature, but about a quarter of my operations were against terrorist networks from Mr. Soleimani.

So these attacks against Americans, we talked about the dead Americans from Iraq, these have been going on for a very long time, and I was part of the response to that.

One of the most important things we can do, if we are going to have this process argument, is appreciate the men and women, not just of the military, but of the intelligence community, of the State Department, of everywhere that has worked to bring the intelligence to bring this evil man to justice.

I heard somebody earlier say we should have just captured him. Well, think of the risk that would have put to our military. So maybe we should at least appreciate the job that they are willing to do. That is going to be essential.

I often hear my friends talk about keeping the military safe, as if that is the end state of the military.

The military's job that they volunteer for every day is to keep the American people safe, and that is exactly what was done a week ago in the death of Soleimani.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can give them an opportunity and pass this resolution appreciating the men and women of the intelligence community and the military. That is the least we can do after this debate on the floor.

□ 1330

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I take my duty to protect and defend our Nation's interests very seriously. The President's reckless and irresponsible actions toward Iran have endangered our servicemembers, diplomats, and allies, and they have worked counter to American security interests. Those include dangerous decisions to pull out of the successful Iran deal and kill Commander Soleimani, drastically ratcheting up tensions in the region.

In the context of the administration's failure to demonstrate an imminent threat to our Nation, there is no authority for such an action without authorization from Congress. What makes this even more dangerous is that the President has no clear strategy.

Under the Constitution, President Trump does not have the authority to unilaterally wage war. That is why, today, I support this rule and the underlying resolution, which directs the President to end hostilities with Iran and to keep our troops in America safe.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ).

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, Qasem Soleimani, as we have discussed, many of us have discussed here today, was a

terrorist and a terrorist supporter, and hundreds of American troops were killed because of him. Many of them are scarred for life.

I don't think we can overstate, in this body, how gruesome, how advanced, how effective the explosive devices that he poured into his militias were. They were deadly. They were manufactured in Iran. They were put in place by Iran. They were trained by Iran. They had the capability to completely penetrate our armored vehicles.

Soleimani worked hand in hand, in addition to this, with Assad in Syria, a serial human rights abuser, and waged even chemical warfare on his own people, literally killing tens of thousands. And because of him, today, hundreds, if not thousands, of families, including Gold Star families, just this past holiday, couldn't open up presents with their loved ones. No longer will they celebrate birthdays or holidays because of this one evil man.

This terrorist, because of his savage actions, I, as a former Green Beret who operated against these thugs for years, am grateful to the intelligence officer, as my colleague Mr. KINZINGER just mentioned, to the members of the military who carried out this mission to prevent more lives from being lost.

Soleimani was actively planning attacks in the coming weeks, in the coming days, in the coming months. According to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, these attacks were imminent, they were clear, and they were a present danger for our troops, to our allies, and to our interests.

From an oversight perspective, the President had a duty to act; and I, for one, would be screaming from the rooftops if he had not taken appropriate action.

So, again, Madam Speaker, I am thankful for his leadership taking this monster out. Frankly, this should have been done a long, long time ago, years ago, by multiple previous administrations. It astounds me that this is up for debate.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. WALTZ. For those of you saying actions have consequences, let me remind you that inaction has consequences. Go to Walter Reed or Arlington, or go visit the American contractor, as though that is some kind of term, the American that was killed just last week. His name was Nawres Waleed Hamid. He is from Sacramento. He is from California, and he was just buried.

I think the answer for most Americans is this was warranted. It certainly was for me.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question and consider this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, the War Powers Resolution simply requires the President to consult with the Congress and with the American public before going to war with Iran.

Our constituents held their breath on Tuesday. Thankfully, no lives were lost in Iran's retaliatory attack, but serious concerns remain about the rationale and the ramifications.

We do not mourn the loss of Qasem Soleimani. He was responsible for actions that harmed and killed American personnel and allies, and I condemn that. But any U.S. military action, especially one that could spark catastrophic consequences, needs to be carefully considered, fully justified within the law.

President Trump failed to consult the Congress, failed to secure specific authorization, failed to cite with specificity the imminent threat. In a classified briefing for Members of Congress, the administration would not, could not provide any specifics about what constituted an imminent threat. They couldn't tell us what the targets were, nor would they divulge any of the timelines for the attack.

It is unprecedented the level at which this administration is seeking to obscure the facts from the Congress and the American people. The rationale is in doubt, the ramifications as well: The U.S. announced it will suspend our fight against ISIS; Iraq's Prime Minister and the legislature moved to expel our troops; the Iranian leaders announced they would no longer abide by the 2015 nuclear deal.

President Trump's actions have dramatically increased the possibility of war with Iran and Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon. Today, America and our allies are less safe as a result of the administration's actions.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Let us reassert the Congress' role to ensure that the President—any President—is complying with the law and is not conducting lengthy military actions without congressional approval.

Let us prevent another unnecessary war. Let us vote for this rule and this resolution.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, the Constitution gave Congress the power to declare war. The Constitution gave Congress the power appropriate money

for war. The Constitution gave us the power to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a Navy.

Why? Why didn't the Framers just give the President the power to declare and wage war? After all, the President is made Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and militias when called into the actual service of the United States. It would have been a lot simpler to say let the President go to war whenever he wants. Why didn't they do that?

Well, the Framers acted against a background of kings and princes plunging their populations into wars of vanity and political advantage to distract their people at home from the political problems of the kingdom, of the monarchy. And our Framers were emphatic that the awesome power of war, the power over life and death of our sons and daughters, the power over our national treasure not be vested in one man alone but, rather, in American democracy itself.

The representatives of the people, the people of Maryland and Virginia and Florida and California and Idaho and Pennsylvania and Michigan and Alaska and Hawaii, that is who the Framers vested the power of war in: the Congress of the United States.

Now, the structural problem is that, if the Nation is actually attacked or there is an imminent attack coming, the President may need to respond in self-defense. Madison anticipated that, and Madison said that might happen.

The Supreme Court, in 1863, in the middle of the Civil War, in the Prize Cases, said that the President can act in those situations. Lincoln embargoed and blockaded the Southern States, and that was attacked as unconstitutional. They said, well, he was acting against a real, imminent threat to the land and the people of the country.

Now, after the Vietnam war, Congress passed the War Powers Resolution in 1973, providing the President may engage our forces in hostilities only with a declaration of war, a statutory authorization, or a national emergency created by an attack upon our people or our Armed Forces.

Now, under the War Powers Act, the President must consult Congress if he thinks that he is acting in imminent self-defense of the country. The President didn't do that. He talked to some other people at Mar-a-Lago. He never talked to the Congress of the United States officially, neither the Republicans nor the Democrats. He didn't contact the so-called Gang of Eight of our top leadership in the intelligence and security field.

He did notify us, in fairness to the President, within 48 hours of his targeted killing, which many see, under international law, as an act of war.

At this point, though, whether you think there was truly an imminent crisis and this was something like Pearl Harbor or you think that the President still has not given us a single compelling justification for why he did it in

acting under imminent self-defense, you think it is more like Gulf of Tonkin, it doesn't make any difference.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RASKIN. All of us, everybody in this Chamber at this point should say that whatever imminent threat existed, whatever emergency there was is gone, and now this country should not go to war without a declaration of war by this Congress or statutory authorization, unless we are attacked in the meantime.

That is the whole point of the War Powers Resolution, to enforce the powers of Congress. We represent the people. We should not be going to war in the name of the United States based on the word of one man. That is not the constitutional design. It must be the Congress itself.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a January 3 CNN article, entitled, "Trump's Huge Iran Gamble Will Have Lasting Impact."

[From CNN, Jan. 3, 2020]

TRUMP'S HUGE IRAN GAMBLE WILL HAVE
LASTING IMPACT

(By Stephen Collinson)

(CNN) President Donald Trump's targeted killing of Iran's ruthless military and intelligence chief adds up to his most dangerous gamble yet with other peoples' lives and his own political fate.

By killing Qasem Soleimani in Iraq, Trump committed the United States to a risky open conflict that at best could stop short of all-out war with Iran that could cause national security and economic shocks in the United States and across the globe.

The administration argues that it has taken one of the world's worst mass murderers and terrorists off the battlefield. But given Iran's easy access to soft targets, the Middle East and even Europe suddenly look a lot less safe for Americans, including US troops Trump may be even more tempted to haul home.

Two days into his re-election year, Trump—who rails against Middle Eastern entanglements—has plunged the United States into another one, with vast and unknown consequences. It challenges a presidency that is already alienating half of his country, following his impeachment and unrestrained behavior in office. Trump may find it impossible to rally the nation behind him to weather the crisis. He has also scrambled strategic and moral expectations of the United States—ordering the killing of a senior foreign leader of a nation with whom the US is not formally at war—albeit an official regarded by Washington as a terrorist.

Reflecting the strike's potential for escalation, a US defense official said the administration would deploy a further 3,000 troops to the Middle East, including 750 who have already deployed to protect the US embassy in Baghdad.

The reverberations of his act on Thursday will last for years.

"Iran never won a war, but never lost a negotiation!" Trump wrote on Friday morning in a tweet that will do nothing to calm critics who worry about the depth of his strategic thinking.

It is too early to know whether Soleimani's death will significantly weaken

Iran and improve the US strategic position, whether it will ignite a regional conflagration and how it will eventually affect Trump's political prospects and legacy. It is also unclear how it will change the political position inside Iran where the regime is besieged by an economic crisis and recently crushed mass protests.

But Iran will surely regard the killing of one of its most significant political leaders as an act of war, so its revenge is likely to be serious and long lasting.

"There are definitely going to be unintended consequences, and for starters I think we better have our embassies pretty well buttoned down," former US Ambassador to Iraq Christopher Hill told CNN.

"Iran simply cannot sit on its hands on this one. I think there will be a reaction and I'm afraid it could get bloody in places."

Trump supporters are celebrating their hard man commander-in-chief. They note that Soleimani orchestrated the deaths of hundreds of US soldiers in militia attacks during the Iraq War. But recent history is marked by spectacular US shock-and-awe opening acts of conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan that cause short-term gloating and long term military and political disasters. A full-on conflict with Iran would be far more complicated than those two wars.

Trump's strike may be the most significant calculated US act in a 40-year Cold War with revolutionary Iran. It's the biggest US foreign policy bet since the invasion of Iraq.

Secretary of State Mike Pompeo told CNN's "New Day" that killing Soleimani "saved American lives" and was based on "imminent" threat intelligence about an attack in the region. Trump echoed his secretary of state later Friday morning, tweeting that Soleimani "was plotting to kill many more" Americans.

But Pompeo refused to give further details. The political bar for an administration that has made a habit of disinformation and lying is going to be far higher than that in such a grave crisis. Eliminating the most powerful political force in Iran short of Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei also destroys the chimera that this White House is not committed to a regime change strategy.

Given Soleimani's frequent travels to Iraq, Syria and other areas in the Middle East this is not the first time that he will have been in US crosshairs. But previous presidents, perhaps cognizant of the inflammatory consequences, chose not to take the shot. In the coming days, the administration will have to explain why it acted now.

The act also likely eliminates possibly for a generation, any hope that the United States and Iran can settle their differences by talking. There will be no desire nor political capital for even Iranian officials often misleadingly described as moderates to sit down with US counterparts.

When Trump took office, there was no immediate crisis with Iran. The Islamic Republic was honoring the Obama administration's nuclear deal though it had not stepped back from its missile development and what the US says is malignant activity in its own neighborhood.

But by ripping up the deal, strangling the Iranian economy and now killing Soleimani, Trump now owns however the confrontation turns out. It's a huge gamble because history suggests that Presidents who bet their careers on the jungle of Middle East politics always lose.

The strike displays Trump's growing infatuation with wielding military power, exacerbates a trend of unchecked presidential authority and forges the kind of ruthless vigilante image he adores.

The question is now whether Trump—an erratic, inexperienced leader who abhors ad-

vice and rarely thinks more than one step ahead—is equipped to handle such a perilous, enduring crisis.

And is his administration, which seems bent on toppling Iran's regime but cannot publicly come up with a plan for the aftermath, ready to handle an Iranian backlash in the region and beyond?

Trump's hubristic tweeting of a US flag following Soleimani's death in a drone strike in Iraq but failure to explain to Americans what is going on may be a bad sign in this regard.

But despite a stream of instant Twitter analysis from pundits suddenly expert in Iranian affairs, no one can be sure what will happen next. That's what makes Trump's strike so unpredictable and potentially dicey.

With the vast network of proxies from Hezbollah to Hamas, Iran has the capacity to strike fast and hard against US allies like Israel and Saudi Arabia and US assets and personnel in its region. It could hammer the global economy by attacking oil tankers in the Strait of Hormuz. US officials and top military officers may be more exposed when they travel abroad. Iran could explode Lebanon's fragile political compact and causes region-wide shocks.

US troops in Iraq, Syria and Afghanistan look especially vulnerable to action by Iranian-allied forces. Politically, the Baghdad government may have no choice but to ask American forces to leave after the attack in a scenario that could effectively deliver the country to Iran's influence or retrigger its terrible civil war.

The killing of Soleimani is a massive symbolic blow to Iran. He was the Godfather of the Middle East who masterminded the country's huge regional influence.

Pompeo claimed that his demise will be greeted by Iraqis and Iranians as a blow for freedom and a sign the United States is on their side. But developments in Middle Eastern politics rarely mirror the optimistic pronouncements of US officials.

DID THE US INFLICT A SERIOUS STRATEGIC BLOW
ON IRAN?

Analysts will be looking to see whether the death of Soleimani robs the Quds force of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps of its coherence and dims its regional power at least at first.

Tehran's strategic response is unclear. While it could lash out, a wave of attacks against US soldiers or terrorist strikes elsewhere may draw it into a direct conflict with a more powerful rival, the United States that it does not seek.

It is not certain that it will strike back quickly. It may have more to gain from making life intolerable for the United States and its citizens in the region in a slow burn approach.

Trump could be especially exposed to a such a military or economic backlash by Iran that casts doubt on his judgment given his quickening reelection race.

His move against Iran could also reshape the dynamics of the presidential election race at home, by opening a lane for Democrats to run as anti-war candidates against him—a position that helped the last two presidents—Trump and Barack Obama—get elected.

Democratic candidate Bernie Sanders on Friday released a video vowing to do everything he can "to prevent a war with Iran."

"Because if you think the war in Iraq was a disaster, my guess is that the war in Iran would be even worse," the Vermont senator said.

And Democratic front-runner Joe Biden immediately swung into sober commander-in-chief mode, positioning himself to profit politically if Trump's Iran venture backfires.

The former vice president offered testimony to Soleimani's record of fomenting bloodshed and instability but added: "President Trump just tossed a stick of dynamite into a tinderbox."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 83.

Our single greatest responsibility is the safety and security of the American people; and as the elected representatives of the American people, it is our solemn duty to ensure that our country only engages in armed conflict that is necessary and that, when we do, there are clear objectives and a strategy for achieving those objectives.

The Trump administration has presented neither evidence that military action is necessary nor a clear outline of their goals and a strategy with respect to Iran.

Any decision to put American troops in harm's way should be debated openly and honestly so that the American people have a say in their future. Nothing in this resolution prevents the administration from seeking authorization for future actions, but it does guarantee, as the Constitution requires, that the American people, through their elected representatives, have a voice in that decision.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Madam Speaker, I was in the class of Congress that was elected right after September 11, 2001, that came into office in 2003.

After coming to office, through press reports and information in various congressional hearings, we got information that Osama bin Laden had declared war on the United States in 1997—I did not know that—and that there had been actionable intelligence and Osama bin Laden could have been taken out prior to the attack of September 11, 2001, but the administration in the 1990s decided not to do so.

Now, yesterday, fast-forwarding to present time, we heard from General Mark Milley clear, unambiguous intelligence indicating a significant campaign of violence against the United States in the days, weeks, and months that the administration would have been culpably negligent if it did not act, all in regards to the killing of General Soleimani.

□ 1345

The President wants to keep the country safe. The President showed remarkable restraint, I thought, yesterday, and I thought the tone in his address to the Nation yesterday was precisely the right tone.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H. CON. RES. 83—DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT PURSUANT TO SECTION 5(C) OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION TO TERMINATE THE USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES TO ENGAGE IN HOSTILITIES IN OR AGAINST IRAN—REP. SLOTKIN, D-MI, AND 134 COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly opposes passage of H. Con. Res. 83, which purports to direct the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces engaged in hostilities in or against Iran or any part of its government or military unless authorized by Congress.

At the President's direction, on January 2, the United States military successfully executed a strike in Iraq that killed Qassem Soleimani, the Commander of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps-Qods Force, a designated foreign terrorist organization. Soleimani was personally responsible for terrible atrocities. He trained terrorist armies, including Hezbollah, launching terror strikes against civilian targets. He fueled bloody civil wars all across the region. He directed and facilitated actions that viciously wounded and murdered thousands of United States troops, including by planting bombs that maim and dismember their victims. In eliminating Soleimani from the battlefield, the President took action to stop a war, not to start a war. He took action to protect our diplomats, our service members, our allies, and all Americans.

Although concurrent resolutions like H. Con. Res. 83 lack the force of law under controlling Supreme Court precedent, *I.N.S. v. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919 (1983), it is nevertheless important to highlight some of its deficiencies.

First, H. Con. Res. 83 is unnecessary because the military actions to which it applies are already authorized by law, including the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243) ("2002 AUMF"). The 2002 AUMF provides specific statutory authorization to engage in military action to "defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq." Public Law 107-243, §3(a)(1). The United States forces that have been threatened by Iranian and Iran-backed attacks in Iraq are there to combat terrorist groups—such as ISIS. Thus, in addition to acting in accordance with his Constitutional authorities as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive, the President also acted against Soleimani pursuant to existing statutory authorization. The 2002 AUMF has always been understood to authorize the use of force for, among other purposes, addressing terrorist threats—like Soleimani and the attacks he was planning and facilitating—emanating from Iraq. This is consistent with actions taken by previous Presidents pursuant to the 2002 AUMF. For example, during the last administration, United States forces frequently conducted operations in response to attacks and threats by Iran-backed militias in Iraq under the authority conferred by the 2002 AUMF. Moreover, the Administration's engagement with Congress on this strike has been fully in accordance with past precedent, including by providing notification consistent with the War Powers Resolution and by briefing Congressional leadership, the full membership of the House and Senate, and appropriate staff.

Second, were provisions like those included in H. Con. Res. 83 to become law, they could undermine the President's ability to defend United States forces and interests in the region against ongoing threats from Iran and its proxies. Iran has a long history of attacking United States and coalition forces both directly and through its proxies, including, most recently, by means of a January 7

missile attack from Iran against United States forces stationed at two bases in Iraq. Over the last several months, Soleimani planned and supported these escalating attacks by Iranian-directed Shia militia groups on coalition bases throughout Iraq. He orchestrated the December 27, 2019 attack on an Iraqi military base, which resulted in the death of a United States citizen and badly wounded four United States service members. Soleimani also approved the subsequent attack later that month on the United States Embassy in Baghdad, which turned violent and damaged the Embassy facility. At the time of the January 2 strike, Soleimani was in Iraq in violation of a United Nations Security Council travel ban and was actively developing plans to imminently attack United States diplomats and service members in Iraq and throughout the region. Subsequently, Iran launched an attack against the United States. Were Congress to attempt to compel the President to adhere to a resolution like H. Con. Res. 83, it could hinder the President's ability to protect United States forces and interests in the region from the continued threat posed by Iran and its proxies.

This concurrent resolution is misguided, and its adoption by Congress could undermine the ability of the United States to protect American citizens whom Iran continues to seek to harm.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, "no" vote on the rule, 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 think what the President did was a grave miscalculation, but we can't change the past. We can only shape the future.

I have raised concerns about executive overreach during the Bush administration; I raised them during the Obama administration; and today, I am here to raise those concerns about the Trump administration.

I hope there is no war with Iran, but we have seen that developments can change day by day, hour by hour. Should tensions escalate again, Congress should have a say before hostilities are launched. It is really that simple.

This should be the easiest vote in the world for Members of Congress. Regardless of what you think about what the President has done, regardless whether you agree with his policies or not, and regardless of your political affiliation, this is about ensuring that we have a say about what may come next.

There is nothing radical about this. The Constitution gives only Congress the ability to declare war. Let's reclaim our power and let's do our jobs.

My friends say they want to honor our troops. Well, talk is cheap. How about honoring our troops by doing our job, by living up to our constitutional responsibilities. War is a big deal. We ought to take it seriously here. I and some of my Republican friends over the years have raised issues with Democratic and Republican administrations about the ease in which they commit our troops to hostilities. Enough is enough.

No more endless wars. Congress has to live up to its constitutional responsibility. Let's reclaim our power. Let's do our job.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the House Committees on the Judiciary and on Homeland Security, as a member serving in this body on September 11, 2001 and throughout the fateful and tragic war in Iraq, and as an original cosponsor, I rise in strong support of the rule governing debate of H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution directing the President to terminate the engagement of United States Armed Forces in hostilities in or against Iran, as well as the underlying legislation.

I thank the gentlelady from Michigan, Congresswoman ELISSA SLOTKIN, for introducing this resolution and Foreign Affairs Committee Chair ELIOT ENGEL for his work on this important resolution.

I also thank Speaker PELOSI for taking swift action to afford the House the opportunity to honor its constitutional duty to keep the American people safe by limiting the President from taking further precipitous military actions regarding Iran.

We know from bitter and heart-breaking experience the truth that while dangerous and bloody battles are fought by the military, it is the nation that goes to war.

And that is why the Framers lodged the awesome power to declare and take the nation to war not in the hands of a single individual, but through Article I, Section, clause 11 in the collective judgment of Congress, the representatives of the American people.

It is true of course that the United States has an inherent right to self-defense against imminent armed attacks and that it maintains the right to ensure the safety of diplomatic personnel serving abroad.

But in matters of imminent armed attacks, the executive branch must inform Congress as to why military action was necessary within a certain window of opportunity, the possible harm that missing the window would cause, and why the action was likely to prevent future disastrous attacks against the United States.

Only after being fully briefed and informed is the Congress in a position to validate and ratify or disapprove and terminate the action.

Madam Speaker, Section 5(c) of the 1973 War Power Resolution, Pub. L. 93–148, provides that whenever “United States Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States, its possessions and territories without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President if the Congress so directs by concurrent resolution.”

The military action ordered on Friday, January 3, 2020 by the President to kill Major General Qasem Soleimani, the head of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, may have rid the world of a major architect of terror but leaves unanswered the critically important question of why the action was taken at that time.

Even at this late hour, members of Congress have not been briefed or been shown compelling evidence by the Administration that the action was necessary to repel a credible, certain, and imminent attack on the United States, its allies, or American civilians or military personnel.

The Administration has yet to provide proof or assuage the concerns of most member of

Congress, and of the American people, that the killing of Major General Soleimani was a necessary action that was the product of a carefully crafted geopolitical strategy developed after extensive discussion within the national security apparatus regarding the short and long-term consequences for the security of the region and our nation and its people.

Similarly, we do not know whether the decision to engage in the hostile action against Iran was made by the President in consultation and agreement with our regional and international allies and whether there is now in place a strategy to ensure that the action taken does not lead to a greater escalation of tensions between Iran and the United States or in the worst case, another war in the Middle East placing at risk the lives and safety of millions of persons.

Madam Speaker, Major General Soleimani was the long-time chief of the Quds Force, the elite special forces battalion of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC), assisted Syrian strongman Bashar al Assad slaughter hundreds of thousands of his own people in the Syrian civil war, helped incite the Houthis in Yemen's civil war, and oversaw the brutal killing of hundreds of Iraqi protesters recently demonstrating against Iranian influence in their country.

Iran's Quds Force, under Soleimani's leadership, has long been suspected by the U.S. Government of involvement in a 2011 plot to assassinate the Saudi ambassador to the United States and bore responsibility for the deaths of more than 600 Americans killed by Iranian proxies since the 2003 inception of the war in Iraq.

Over the past eight months, in response to rising tensions with Iran, the United States has introduced over 15,000 additional forces into the Middle East.

But Major General Soleimani was more than a military leader, he was a high-ranking political leader, second only in power and influence to the Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei.

In fact, Soleimani was regarded by many as a future president of Iran.

It was foreseeable therefore that the killing of Soleimani by American forces was likely to invite retaliation by Iran putting at risk American military and civilian personnel, as well as its allies in the region and across the globe.

It must be remembered, Madam Speaker, the United States has national interests in preserving its partnership with Iraq and other countries in the region, including by combating terrorists, including the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS); preventing Iran from achieving a nuclear weapons capability; and supporting the people of Iraq, Iran, and other countries throughout the Middle East who demand an end to government corruption and violations of basic human rights.

For these reasons it is essential that the Administration have in place a sound, well-considered, and meticulously developed strategy for managing disputes with Iran.

That does not appear to be the case.

There is no evidence that the Administration consulted with Congress or the Gang of 8, no evidence that it enlisted or even consulted our allies in NATO or the region, no evidence that the Administration has a working and well-functioning national security council apparatus.

This is a critical Pottery Barn failure in dealing with the Middle East for as former Sec-

retary of State Colin Powell stated before the Iraq War, “If you break it, you bought it.”

Iran Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei has vowed that a “harsh retaliation is waiting” for the United States as a consequence of the action taken by the Administration.

It is imperative that the Administration have in place a strategy to counter and deescalate any Iranian response and have in place measure to protect the safety of Americans residing or travelling abroad and to protect the security of the homeland.

The deliberate and targeted killing of Major General Soleimani has the potential to be the most consequential assassination of a political leader since World War I was started by the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand Carl Ludwig Joseph Maria of Austria, the heir presumptive of the throne of Austria-Hungary in 1914.

One of the enduring lessons of the Great War too often forgotten but so well documented in Barbara Tuchman's prize-winning history, “The Guns of August,” is that misconceptions, miscalculations, and mistakes result in the tragedy of horrific warfare; among them are overestimating the value of one's economic power, harboring an ill-founded belief in quick victory, and a failure to consider political backlash warfare.

Madam Speaker, the decision to send American men and women into harm's way is the most consequential decision the Constitution vests in the Congress and the President.

Members of Congress must be apprised of all facts material to the decision and have access to relevant documentation, classified and otherwise, and afforded the opportunity to meet in small groups and in secure locations with senior members of the Administration's national security team who can answer detailed and pointed questions and provide requested information.

The Constitution wisely divides the responsibility of deciding when to use military force to protect the nation and its interests between the President and the Congress, the representatives of the American people.

The United States' military involvement in Iraq begun in March 2003 and continuing to this day has taught this nation the importance of having accurate and reliable information when deciding whether to use military force and the painful costs in lives and treasure of acting precipitously or unwisely.

We cannot and dare not repeat that mistake.

That is why I am proud to support and cosponsor H. Con. Res. 83, the concurrent resolution before us, which directs the President to terminate immediately the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities in or against Iran or any part of its government or military, unless Congress has declared war or enacted specific statutory authorization for such use of the Armed Forces; or the use of the Armed Forces is necessary and appropriate to defend against an imminent armed attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces, consistent with the requirements of the War Powers Resolution.

Our constituents, all Americans across the country, and the people of the globe are looking to us to ensure that tensions between the United States and Iran are deescalated, that smart power and diplomacy be employed, and every effort be made to ensure the peace and

safety in America and the region, and the lives of the innocent not be placed at risk.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 781

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 783) honoring the members of the military and intelligence community who carried out the mission that killed Qasem Soleimani, and for other purposes. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 783.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by a 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 191, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—227

Adams	Clyburn	Fletcher
Aguilar	Cohen	Foster
Allred	Connolly	Frankel
Axne	Cooper	Fudge
Barragán	Correa	Gabbard
Bass	Costa	Gaetz
Beatty	Courtney	Gallego
Bera	Cox (CA)	Garamendi
Beyer	Craig	Garcia (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Crist	Garcia (TX)
Blumenauer	Crow	Golden
Blunt Rochester	Cuellar	Gomez
Bonamici	Cunningham	Gonzalez (TX)
Boyle, Brendan	Davids (KS)	Gottheimer
F.	Davis (CA)	Green, Al (TX)
Brindisi	Davis, Danny K.	Grijalva
Brown (MD)	Dean	Haaland
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Harder (CA)
Bustos	DeGette	Hastings
Butterfield	DeLauro	Hayes
Carbajal	DelBene	Heck
Cárdenas	Delgado	Higgins (NY)
Carson (IN)	Demings	Himes
Cartwright	DeSaulnier	Horn, Kendra S.
Case	Deutch	Horsford
Casten (IL)	Dingell	Houlihan
Castor (FL)	Doggett	Hoyer
Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael	Huffman
Chu, Judy	F.	Jackson Lee
Cicilline	Engel	Jayapal
Cisneros	Escobar	Jeffries
Clark (MA)	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Clarke (NY)	Españillat	Johnson (TX)
Clay	Evans	Kaptur
Cleaver	Finkenauer	Keating

Kelly (IL)	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David
Kennedy	Nadler	Sewell (AL)
Khanna	Napolitano	Shalala
Kildee	Neal	Sherman
Kilmer	Neguse	Sherrill
Kim	Norcross	Sires
Krishnamoorthi	O'Halleran	Slotkin
Kuster (NH)	Ocasio-Cortez	Smith (WA)
Lamb	Omar	Soto
Langevin	Pallone	Spanberger
Larsen (WA)	Panetta	Speier
Larson (CT)	Pappas	Stanton
Lawrence	Pascrell	Stevens
Lawson (FL)	Payne	Suozzi
Lee (CA)	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Lee (NV)	Peters	Takano
Levin (CA)	Peterson	Thompson (CA)
Levin (MI)	Phillips	Thompson (MS)
Lieu, Ted	Pingree	Titus
Lipinski	Pocan	Tlaib
Loeb sack	Porter	Tonko
Lofgren	Pressley	Torres (CA)
Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Torres Small
Lowe y	Quigley	(NM)
Luján	Raskin	Trahan
Luria	Rice (NY)	Trone
Lynch	Richmond	Underwood
Malinowski	Rose (NY)	Vargas
Maloney,	Rouda	Veasey
Carolyn B.	Roybal-Allard	Vela
Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Velázquez
Matsui	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
McAdams	Rush	Wasserman
McBath	Ryan	Schultz
McCollum	Sánchez	Waters
McGovern	Sarbanes	Watson Coleman
McNerney	Scanlon	Welch
Meeks	Schakowsky	Wexton
Meng	Schiff	Wild
Moore	Schneider	Wilson (FL)
Morelle	Schrader	Yarmuth
Moulton	Schrier	
Mucarsel-Powell	Scott (VA)	

NAYS—191

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

Stivers	Walberg	Williams
Taylor	Walden	Wilson (SC)
Thompson (PA)	Walker	Wittman
Thornberry	Walorski	Womack
Timmons	Waltz	Woodall
Tipton	Watkins	Wright
Turner	Weber (TX)	Yoho
Upton	Webster (FL)	Young
Van Drew	Wenstrup	Zeldin
Wagner	Westerman	

NOT VOTING—12

Buchanan	Hunter	Loudermilk
Crawford	Kind	McEachin
Diaz-Balart	Kirkpatrick	Serrano
Fitzpatrick	Lewis	Simpson

□ 1413

Mrs. HARTZLER changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 5.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DELBENE). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 193, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—226

Adams	Davis (CA)	Huffman
Aguilar	Davis, Danny K.	Jackson Lee
Allred	Dean	Jayapal
Axne	DeFazio	Jeffries
Barragán	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Bass	DeLauro	Johnson (TX)
Beatty	DelBene	Kaptur
Bera	Delgado	Keating
Beyer	Demings	Kelly (IL)
Bishop (GA)	DeSaulnier	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Deutch	Khanna
Blunt Rochester	Dingell	Kildee
Bonamici	Doggett	Kilmer
Boyle, Brendan	Doyle, Michael	Kim
F.	F.	Krishnamoorthi
Brindisi	Engel	Kuster (NH)
Brown (MD)	Escobar	Lamb
Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Langevin
Bustos	Españillat	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Evans	Larson (CT)
Carbajal	Finkenauer	Lawrence
Cárdenas	Fletcher	Lawson (FL)
Carson (IN)	Foster	Lee (CA)
Cartwright	Frankel	Lee (NV)
Case	Fudge	Levin (CA)
Casten (IL)	Gabbard	Levin (MI)
Castor (FL)	Gaetz	Lieu, Ted
Castro (TX)	Gallego	Lipinski
Chu, Judy	Garamendi	Loeb sack
Cicilline	Garcia (IL)	Lofgren
Cisneros	Garcia (TX)	Lowenthal
Clark (MA)	Golden	Lowe y
Clarke (NY)	Gomez	Luján
Clay	Gonzalez (TX)	Luria
Cleaver	Gottheimer	Lynch
	Green, Al (TX)	Malinowski
	Grijalva	Maloney,
	Haaland	Carolyn B.
	Harder (CA)	Maloney, Sean
	Hastings	Matsui
	Hayes	McAdams
	Heck	McBath
	Higgins (NY)	McCollum
	Horn, Kendra S.	McGovern
	Horsford	McNerney
	Houlihan	Meeks
	Hoyer	Meng
		Moore

Morelle	Richmond	Stevens
Moulton	Rose (NY)	Suozzi
Mucarsel-Powell	Rouda	Swalwell (CA)
Murphy (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Takano
Nadler	Ruiz	Thompson (CA)
Napolitano	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)
Neal	Rush	Titus
Neguse	Ryan	Tlaib
Norcross	Sánchez	Tonko
O'Halleran	Sarbanes	Torres (CA)
Ocasio-Cortez	Scanlon	Torres Small
Omar	Schakowsky	(NM)
Pallone	Schiff	Trahan
Panetta	Schneider	Trone
Pappas	Schrader	Underwood
Pascarella	Schrier	Vargas
Payne	Scott (VA)	Veasey
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Vela
Peters	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Peterson	Shalala	Visclosky
Phillips	Sherman	Wasserman
Pingree	Sherrill	Schultz
Pocan	Sires	Waters
Porter	Slotkin	Watson Coleman
Pressley	Smith (WA)	Welch
Price (NC)	Soto	Wexton
Quigley	Spanberger	Wild
Raskin	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Rice (NY)	Stanton	Yarmuth

NAYS—193

Abraham	Graves (GA)	Palmer
Aderholt	Graves (LA)	Pence
Allen	Graves (MO)	Perry
Amash	Green (TN)	Posey
Amodei	Griffith	Ratcliffe
Armstrong	Grothman	Reed
Arrington	Guest	Reschenthaler
Babin	Guthrie	Rice (SC)
Bacon	Hagedorn	Riggleman
Baird	Harris	Roby
Balderson	Hartzler	Rodgers (WA)
Banks	Hern, Kevin	Roe, David P.
Barr	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Bergman	Hice (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Biggs	Higgins (LA)	Rooney (FL)
Billirakis	Hill (AR)	Rose, John W.
Bishop (NC)	Holding	Rouzer
Bishop (UT)	Hollingsworth	Roy
Bost	Hudson	Rutherford
Brady	Huizenga	Scalise
Brooks (AL)	Hurd (TX)	Schweikert
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin
Buck	Johnson (OH)	Sensenbrenner
Bucshon	Johnson (SD)	Shimkus
Budd	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Burchett	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NE)
Burgess	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Byrne	Katko	Smucker
Calvert	Keller	Spano
Carter (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Stauber
Carter (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Stefanik
Chabot	King (IA)	Steil
Cheney	King (NY)	Steube
Cline	Kinzinger	Stewart
Cloud	Kustoff (TN)	Stivers
Cole	LaHood	Taylor
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Thompson (PA)
Comer	Lamborn	Thornberry
Conaway	Latta	Timmons
Cook	Lesko	Tipton
Crenshaw	Long	Turner
Cunningham	Lucas	Upton
Curtis	Luetkemeyer	Van Drew
Davidson (OH)	Marchant	Wagner
Davis, Rodney	Marshall	Walberg
DesJarlais	Massie	Walden
Diaz-Balart	Mast	Walker
Duncan	McCarthy	Walorski
Dunn	McCaul	Waltz
Emmer	McClintock	Watkins
Estes	McHenry	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	McKinley	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	Meadows	Wenstrup
Flores	Meuser	Westerman
Fortenberry	Miller	Williams
Fox (NC)	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Fulcher	Moolenaar	Wittman
Gallagher	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Gianforte	Mullin	Woodall
Gibbs	Murphy (NC)	Wright
Gohmert	Newhouse	Yoho
Gonzalez (OH)	Norman	Young
Gooden	Nunes	Zeldin
Gosar	Olson	
Granger	Palazzo	

NOT VOTING—11

Buchanan	Kind	McEachin
Crawford	Kirkpatrick	Serrano
Fitzpatrick	Lewis	Simpson
Hunter	Loudermilk	

□ 1422

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

IRAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 781, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities in or against Iran, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 781, the amendment printed in House Report 116-371 is adopted, and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 83

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

SECTION 1. TERMINATION OF USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES TO ENGAGE IN HOSTILITIES IN OR AGAINST IRAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Government of Iran is a leading state sponsor of terrorism and engages in a range of destabilizing activities across the Middle East. Iranian General Qassem Soleimani was the lead architect of much of Iran's destabilizing activities throughout the world.

(2) The United States has an inherent right to self-defense against imminent armed attacks. The United States maintains the right to ensure the safety of diplomatic personnel serving abroad.

(3) In matters of imminent armed attacks, the executive branch should indicate to Congress why military action was necessary within a certain window of opportunity, the possible harm that missing the window would cause, and why the action was likely to prevent future disastrous attacks against the United States.

(4) The United States has national interests in preserving its partnership with Iraq and other countries in the region, including by—

(A) combating terrorists, including the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS);

(B) preventing Iran from achieving a nuclear weapons capability; and

(C) supporting the people of Iraq, Iran, and other countries throughout the Middle East who demand an end to government corruption and violations of basic human rights.

(5) Over the past eight months, in response to rising tensions with Iran, the United States has introduced over 15,000 additional forces into the Middle East.

(6) When the United States uses military force, the American people and members of the United States Armed Forces deserve a credible explanation regarding such use of military force.

(7) The War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.) requires the President to consult with Congress "in every possible instance" before introducing United States Armed Forces into hostilities.

(8) Congress has not authorized the President to use military force against Iran.

(b) TERMINATION.—Pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)), Congress hereby directs the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities in or against Iran or any part of its government or military, unless—

(1) Congress has declared war or enacted specific statutory authorization for such use of the Armed Forces; or

(2) such use of the Armed Forces is necessary and appropriate to defend against an imminent armed attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces, consistent with the requirements of the War Powers Resolution.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed—

(1) to prevent the President from using military force against al Qaeda or associated forces;

(2) to limit the obligations of the executive branch set forth in the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.);

(3) to affect the provisions of an Act or joint resolution of Congress specifically authorizing the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities against Iran or any part of its government or military that is enacted after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution;

(4) to prevent the use of necessary and appropriate military force to defend United States allies and partners if authorized by Congress consistent with the requirements of the War Powers Resolution; or

(5) to authorize the use of military force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be debatable for 2 hours, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 83, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

We are here this afternoon so that this body can exercise one of its most