

happened without the direct support of Khamenei and his evil regime and partners, Hamas, Hezbollah, and the Houthis.

Iran is an evil empire—not the people—the Khamenei regime, which controls their great Iranian people and does not allow prosperity. This resolution is pretty simple: for us all to recognize that evil exists, and the Khamenei regime is the epitome of evil.

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

Mr. Speaker, I made very clear that there is no disagreement in Congress that Iran is a bad actor. It is a state sponsor of terror.

□ 1500

I have said it over and over again in my career, and I think every Member of Congress has said it over and over again. That is really not what this concurrent resolution is really about. This resolution really is a stunt meant to try to cast a shadow on the imminent Iran War Powers Resolution debate that is going to follow this. This came up today, just at the last minute, to try to throw it in specifically because of the debate.

Both things can be true, Mr. Speaker. Congress can recognize that Iran is a bad actor, as we have done multiple times, and the President of the United States cannot unilaterally drag our country into war without congressional deliberation, debate, and authorization.

The Constitution of the United States of America says that only Congress can declare war. So that is what the next debate will be all about.

Do we want to live up to what we took an oath of office and take a vote for the American people to see where everyone stands and to be sure that we are not giving away our power to the executive branch of government and that we in Congress are going to do our job that the Constitution states that we should do?

If the Constitution wanted one person to make that decision, then it would have so stated.

Yes, I will be voting for this resolution, absolutely, 100 percent. I have voted for so many other similar resolutions over the years. However, I plan to also do my constitutional duty to take my responsibility, not to give it away to the executive branch of government and not to shrink from my responsibilities. I plan also on voting for the War Powers Resolution on Iran in the debate immediately following this resolution which we have passed numerous times in this House.

It is a stunt, but, unfortunately, that is where we are, as opposed to doing real business.

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

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to respond to some of these comments as well. My

colleague has said things that we agree on: Iran is a bad actor, and Iran is a state sponsor of terror. He said that there is no dispute about these things.

My colleague has also said that he will vote for the upcoming War Powers Resolution. There is not a resolution that is coming before us that gives the President any authority or authorizes the military to defend the United States of America in any way, shape, or form against that threat that there is no dispute about, that bad actor, as it was characterized, that state sponsor of terror that everybody agrees on.

There is no War Powers Resolution coming that says: Go out there, and under these parameters, defend the United States of America.

President Trump is utilizing his Article II authority, his constitutional Article II authority, to defend the United States of America against that imminent threat that we agree upon.

What my colleagues ask is that the President do nothing to defend the United States of America.

My colleague talked about this resolution that outlines all of these historical actions and that we affirm Iran is the largest state sponsor of terror. It does nothing. He acknowledges he has voted on resolutions just like that many times. That is true. Nothing has happened until we have President Trump willing to utilize his Article II authority to defend the United States of America against an imminent threat.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution affirming that Iran is the largest state sponsor of terror. Apparently, many of our colleagues have forgotten that they have voted on that, have forgotten that that is the case, have forgotten that that is the enemy that comes against us, and have forgotten that they pose that imminent threat against us every single day utilizing every single opportunity that they can to attack Americans.

I will close with this, Mr. Speaker: I thank President Trump for the first time avenging every single American who has been killed by the hand of Iran. That was not the purpose of this operation, but it is the purpose of my personal thanks.

Thank you, President Trump, for avenging every servicemember who was killed by the hand of Iran, every contractor, every civilian who has been harmed throughout the Middle East, and every person wrongfully detained.

For every single person killed by that hand of Iran, I thank you, President Trump, for finally stepping up and defending the United States of America.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1099).

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT PURSUANT TO SECTION 5(C) OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION TO REMOVE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM UNAUTHORIZED HOSTILITIES IN THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of March 3, 2026, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 38) directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to remove United States Armed Forces from unauthorized hostilities in the Islamic Republic of Iran, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of March 3, 2026, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 38

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress has the sole power to declare war under article 1, section 8, clause 11 of the United States Constitution.

(2) Congress has not declared war with respect to, or provided a specific statutory authorization for, hostilities involving United States Armed Forces against the Islamic Republic of Iran.

(3) Section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)) states that “at any time that 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 Congress so directs.”

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF THE USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FOR HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN.

(a) **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 from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran or any part of its government or military, unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or specific authorization for use of military force against Iran.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the United States from defending itself from imminent attack.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING INTELLIGENCE SHARING.

Nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to influence or disrupt any intelligence, counterintelligence, or investigative activities relating to threats in or emanating from Iran conducted by, or in conjunction with, the United States Government involving—

- (1) the collection of intelligence;
- (2) the analysis of intelligence; or
- (3) the sharing of intelligence between the United States and any coalition partner if the President determines such sharing is appropriate and in the national security interests of the United States.

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING NO AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(a)(1)), nothing in this concurrent resolution may be construed as authorizing the use of military force.

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

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 60 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration exhausted every single diplomatic effort that they could with Iran, as did previous administrations. Iran would not see reason. Operation Epic Fury is a legal and necessary exercise of Article II authority to address the imminent threat posed by Iran.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in Donald Trump's own words and the Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth's own words, the United States is at war with Iran.

The question is: Did Congress authorize the war as the Constitution requires?

Did the President present anything before Congress?

Did the Congress have any debate?

Did any administrative authority come before the House Foreign Affairs Committee to testify?

The answer to that is no.

The question is: Was there any imminent threat requiring the use of force?

The administration has not presented one. In fact, the word "imminent" does not appear even once in the administration's own war powers notification. Mr. Speaker, you can't find the word "imminent."

□ 1510

Did the Trump administration even bother making the case to the Amer-

ican people or to Congress? Just 8 days ago, during the State of the Union Address, the most visible platform a President has, he could have laid out the rationale for military action, as other Presidents have. Instead, Iran was just a footnote in a record-long speech.

This is a war of choice that was launched by this administration without authorization, without clearly stating objectives or a defined endgame, and without explaining how they intend to keep Americans safe.

The chaos unleashed will not be borne by the President's family. It will be borne by our men and women in uniform who will face retaliation from Iran and its proxy networks. It will be borne by innocent civilians at heightened risk of attacks from Iran's aligned terrorist cells. It will be borne by American families paying more for groceries, for electricity, and for gasoline, all for Donald Trump's war of choice.

Americans woke up on Saturday to the news that the United States is again at war in the Middle East. They don't know for how long because the President has not articulated a clearly defined endgame. Military action without a defined strategy invites escalation, mission creep, and failure. We should have learned this lesson already. Why? We should have learned it already from Iraq, Afghanistan, and Vietnam.

As Benjamin Franklin once said: When you fail to plan, you plan to fail.

This War Powers Resolution is simple. This is not a vote on Authorization for Use of Military Force. This simply demands that the President of the United States come to Congress, as our Constitution demands, to seek authorization for what he, himself, has described as a war.

Just abide by the Constitution. We all bring our hands up and swear when we are sworn in and say we will abide by the Constitution. You would think that the President of the United States would do just that.

This War Powers Resolution does not prevent the United States from defending itself. It does not stop the President from responding to an imminent attack. It does not limit us from protecting our troops.

I have served in Congress for 28 years, and I have been in this Chamber as this body has done its most sacred and serious work deliberating whether to send our American servicemembers into harm's way. It is a difficult vote. It is a serious vote. Probably—without question, the hardest votes that I have ever had to take, but that is my responsibility. I took a pledge to the Constitution that I would follow it.

I was here for the vote after 9/11 to go into Afghanistan, a heavy decision. The President brought information in. We had dialogue. We had conversation. We had debate. We did something else. In the House Foreign Affairs Committee, we had hearings. We had administration officials come in.

I wasn't even the ranking member or the chair or anything else. I was just a member of the committee. I could call the administration and say: I need to speak to a Deputy Secretary or the Secretary, and they would come into my office, and we would have this dialogue to determine whether or not we were going to go into this war.

Has that happened now? For over a year, for all the times, not once, not once have we had a hearing in the House Foreign Affairs Committee. We have asked to have individuals who were negotiating. Unfortunately, some of them are not employed by the State Department, et cetera, like Mr. Kushner and Mr. Witkoff, who all are friends of the President's, basically real estate negotiators who were just half an hour in Geneva, flipping back and forth from two major negotiations. If it was serious, I wouldn't have been in the White House, when the President was supposed to have been honoring individuals after we had lost the lives of six servicemembers, talking about curtains and how I redecorated the White House. This is too serious a decision for me and I would hope for the President of the United States also.

Getting the facts in Iraq, the Secretary of State came before and testified, went before the U.N., talked to the American people. Now, I disagreed because I didn't see the connections after I got the information on Iraq, so I voted no. I agreed on Afghanistan. However, the point here is, the President obeyed the Constitution because he came to Congress first and allowed the Members of Congress to make a determination.

What has happened year after year in my time here, I have watched Congress gradually relinquish its authority on matters of war to the executive branch. We have allowed overly broad Authorizations for the Use of Military Force to remain on the books. We have permitted Presidents of both parties to commit forces without a vote. This war with Iran is the most extreme example of that abdication.

The Framers rejected the idea of a king, meaning one person making a decision without consultation, without giving any reason to this body. It was absolutely rejected. We are not under an authoritarian government, like Russia, for example, where Vladimir Putin can go to war and he doesn't have to worry about the Duma. They are not a body that has the responsibility that we have in this Congress, so he can go on and fight a war that he has created without worrying about having to talk and being accountable to anyone.

Our Founding Fathers did not want that. They didn't want a king. That is why we were created as a body. It is long past time for us to reclaim and stand up for that authority, for I tell you, even though he may want to think he is, Donald Trump is not a king.

If he believes the war with Iran is in our national interests, then he must come to Congress and make the case.

Show the facts. Show what the intelligence says. Come to Congress and allow us to ask the questions.

□ 1520

We have had three scenarios. The so-called Gang of Eight met once. Then they got another phone call right beforehand. Then the so-called Gang of 20 met once. That is all we have heard from the President.

I oppose this war of choice, but guess what, Mr. Speaker, each Member here must make clear with their own vote where they stand on that decision.

The President has initiated hostilities without a clear mission and without a coherent strategy and without a defined endgame.

Some Members of Congress may decide after they see everything—we may not see it together in the same way, but the evidence and the case comes here and then we take a vote. As was the occasion for me back in 2003, I voted one way, and the majority voted another way. The President had the authority. Another time, I voted the way the majority voted. But each time they came to us. That is what this debate is about and that is what we need to do.

Now, as I see this, the President has initiated hostilities without a clear mission, without a coherent strategy, and without a defined endgame. This open-ended, undefined military engagement is precisely what the War Powers Resolution was designed to restrain. We are not the Iranian Parliament. We are not a rubberstamp Congress, or at least we shouldn't be a rubberstamp Congress. However, in this scenario, we see that whatever this President wants, my colleagues on the other side will just rubberstamp it.

We should be a coequal branch of government, and our duty is not optional. It was written in the Constitution. The Framers gave Congress this authority because they believed no single person should have the power to take this Nation to war alone.

Today, we either defend the principle or we surrender it. I choose to defend the Constitution and defend the principle and do my job that I put my hand up and swore I would. Hard votes, easy votes, I will take them all because that is what I swore an oath to do.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague talked about choices. Defending yourself is a choice. It is a choice that not everybody makes. Some people, instead of defending themselves, curl up into a corner and cry and turn their eyes. Some people stand up and step into the fight and make the tough choice of going through the battles that it takes to defend yourself.

I will thank, again, President Trump for defending America from an imminent threat, an imminent threat that no other President has had the guts to stand up to.

What is that imminent threat? What was that imminent threat that President Trump is doing his duty, his constitutional duty, his Article II authority to defend America against?

I will tell you it is something that almost every single Member of Congress has literally agreed upon until President Trump decided to defend America.

Previously, almost every Member of Congress voted to call Iran the largest state sponsor of terror, and tomorrow we will cast a vote on what was just debated about reaffirming that they are the largest state sponsor of terror.

Nearly all Members unanimously voted to condemn their continuous funding of terrorist proxies like Hamas and Hezbollah. What does that mean? It means they give them money. They give them weapons. They give them training. They give them direction on where to find and how to kill Americans, and then they reward them for doing that. Almost every Member of Congress has voted unanimously to condemn that.

It was almost a unanimous vote calling their nuclear program a massive threat to the United States of America. My colleague over there voted in the affirmative on that. Almost every one of us voted to designate the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as a terrorist organization.

Those votes didn't just happen for no reason. We have seen Iran as an imminent threat against America, not just for the last 4 days, not just for the last 4 months, or 4 years, but for the last 40 years.

Why do they continue to be an imminent threat? Because they have never faced an imminent response until President Trump. Instead, we told them—when I say “we,” I could say America, but really it was my Democrat colleagues that told them this. They told them how much uranium they could enrich instead of they can't do it, period. We told them when they could have a nuclear weapon instead of no. On top of that—again, I say “we” because it is America, but it was really my Democrat colleagues—gave them pallets of cash. That is a fact.

I especially, as many of my other colleagues, wouldn't take this away from anybody here. No one wants to see our military go into “combat,” “war,” “conduct combat operations,” “battle,” or whatever word somebody wants to use to describe it. I do not want to see conflicts end in casualties.

I wear many names on my wrist of friends that I have lost, but Iran's terror, which has caused the death of thousands of Americans, has to stop. They don't warn us when they are going to kill Americans. They are an imminent threat. They look for a surprise. They look for an opportunity, any weakness, any moment that they can go out there and attack us. They are an imminent threat. There has proven no other way to stop this imminent threat, not by negotiation, not by accord, and not by summit.

Let us talk about this imminent threat. Three U.S. soldiers killed at Tower 22 a year and a half ago: Sergeant Sanders, Sergeant Moffett, and Sergeant Rivers. This is an imminent threat. Countless civilian vessels targeted by Iranian drones. That is what an imminent threat looks like.

This one just pisses me off beyond belief. Ten U.S. Navy sailors captured and held on their knees at gunpoint by the Iranian Navy. This is an imminent threat.

The October 7 attack, killing 1,200 civilians, including 46 Americans, was supported by Iran. Again, that is an imminent threat.

This is very personal to me. Iran's killing of an estimated one in six American servicemembers in Iraq between 2003 and 2011. That is an imminent threat.

Beyond that, U.S. fighter jets lost, sunk off one of our carriers in the Red Sea because of Houthi attacks. That is an imminent threat. If you ask an American whether they want war or combat—you can ask me that question. I would say no. I don't want it. I have been in it.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, I don't want it for my children. We do want the President to stop Iran's imminent threats.

If I asked if anyone wants combat, anybody with sense would say no.

What do people want us to do if there are 10 American Navy men and women put on their knees at gunpoint by Iran? They want us to take care of that. Do they want us to go into combat? No, they do not.

What do people want us to do if there are three American servicemembers killed at Tower 22 by that imminent threat? They want us to take care of that. This is what taking care of that looks like.

President Trump has been clear, consistent, and transparent. Iran cannot have a nuclear weapon. He made every effort to address this through diplomatic means.

Let me quote directly from a resolution that Democrats, including my colleagues, overwhelmingly supported: “The House of Representatives declares it is the policy of the United States . . . to use all means necessary to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.”

Leader JEFFRIES voted on it. Ranking Member MEEKS voted on it. Speaker Emerita PELOSI voted on it. Did they not believe it when they voted on it? Did they not read it? Did they not understand “use all means necessary to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon”?

We all know Iran poses an imminent threat to the United States. The only difference now is that President Trump is sitting in office.

Right now, our military is shooting down Iranian missiles and drones that are targeting Americans in the region. If Democrats had their way and this

resolution passed, they would force the United States military to pack up, stop shooting down missiles, and tell every American sheltering in place and every ally fighting against this regime that America is no longer there to help.

While this does not fit the narrative of my Democrat colleagues, President Trump had the authority to get the job done under Article II of the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution.

He has been transparent with this Congress. Secretary Rubio, Secretary Hegseth, General Caine, and CIA Director Ratcliffe have all conducted now three specific briefs, making our objective clear: destroy every single piece of Iranian military hardware that can reach out and touch Americans or has been used to reach out and touch Americans.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, all I will say is that if Iran has been an imminent threat for 47 years, the word "imminent" then loses all meaning.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the Democratic leader in the United States House of Representatives, from Brooklyn, New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Queens and the great State of New York, the once and future chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. MEEKS, for his leadership and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the American people, in support of our men and women in uniform, in support of the United States Constitution, and in support of this War Powers Resolution.

As we gather here today on the floor of the House of Representatives, there are mothers and fathers across this country who are in mourning, confronting the heartbreaking loss of their loved ones in uniform.

My prayers are with the families of the six American servicemembers who have been killed overseas in Donald Trump's war of choice. We are thankful for their heroism, their bravery, and their patriotism. May their memories always be a blessing.

Mr. Speaker, every Member who serves in this Chamber has sworn an oath of office. It seems as though many of my Republican colleagues have forgotten that. Let me remind them, in part, as to what it says: "I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic . . . so help me God."

In this remarkable country, the greatest Nation in the history of the world, we don't swear an oath to a king, to a political party, or to a man bent on desecrating the Oval Office. In the Congress, in the courts, and in the military, we swear an oath to the United States Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, when the Framers drafted that glorious document, they feared the rise of a monarch, a demagogue, a tyrant. Today, we are here on the House floor because the Constitution, the binding document that makes us all Americans, is being trampled on by a wannabe king.

As Members of the House of Representatives, the branch of government that the Framers decided would be the closest to the American people, to reflect the hopes, the dreams, the aspirations, the fears, the concerns, the anxieties, the life experiences, and the passions of the American people, we have a solemn obligation.

Democrats and Republicans alike, we are all guardians of the American people and of the Constitution. We swore an oath that compels us to ensure that this President's modern-day injuries and abuses come to an end.

We are at war now in the Middle East, spending billions of dollars to bomb Iran, when Republicans refused to find a dime to make healthcare affordable for the American people and to make sure that everyday Americans can go see a doctor when they need one.

This war has not been authorized by the people's Representatives here in this glorious House. Article I of the Constitution explicitly provides Congress with the sole authority to declare war. There is nothing ambiguous about that.

The Framers made that decision because they were concerned about kings who, throughout time, plunged their people into unnecessary wars, impoverishing them, or imperiling their lives by sending them off to a foreign conflict, often to pillage the resources of others for the benefit of a tyrant and his family. Sound familiar?

That is why the power to declare war was given explicitly to the House and to the Senate. It was given to the people's Representatives.

Abraham Lincoln, as a Member of this House in 1848, once profoundly observed: "The provision of the Constitution giving the warmaking power to Congress, was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons—Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This, our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions; and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us."

That is from then Republican Congressman Abraham Lincoln, 1848.

That is why we have advanced this War Powers Resolution today. Donald Trump intentionally refused to get authorization from Congress for this war of choice, a war that has now exploded to more than 10 countries across the Middle East.

□ 1540

Mr. Speaker, the President has not even bothered to offer a coherent an-

swer to the most basic questions that any Commander in Chief should address when making the solemn decision to take us to war: Why are we doing this? What are our objectives? How will this all end?

Mr. Speaker, if this military action, this war, is so principled, why is the President unwilling or unable to make his case directly to the American people?

If the tremendous cost to American taxpayers in terms of sacred human lives and our Nation's precious resources is so justified, why does the President's rationale and the administration's rationale change every single day?

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake. Iran is a bad actor. They must be confronted for their nuclear aspirations, painful human rights abuses, and repression of its own people, including the slaughter of thousands of civilians during the recent protests.

It is the leading state sponsor of terrorism. It is a brutal regime that presents a serious threat to our allies in the Middle East, including Israel, Jordan, and the Gulf states. Yet, the President has a responsibility to justify plunging America into another war that will cost more American lives and billions of dollars, if not trillions of dollars, in taxpayer resources. That is the President's obligation, and he has fallen woefully short of that responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration has offered at least five different reasons to justify the war, all of which are built on deception and misdirection.

First, Donald Trump claimed that the U.S. would attack Iran to protect the demonstrators who were risking their lives to demand democratic change. He even urged them weeks ago to rise up and seize state institutions. As the regime cracked down brutally, killing tens of thousands of their own citizens, the President did nothing.

Even as Donald Trump urged ordinary Iranians to take greater risks, there was never a viable military option for defending unarmed protesters against a brutal police state without sending hundreds of thousands of American troops into Iran. It was an empty pledge to the Iranian people that the current bombing campaign does nothing to undo.

Second, Donald Trump and his advisers claimed that Iran's unwillingness to negotiate away its nuclear program left no choice but for us to attack.

Mr. Speaker, this is the very same person who told the country last summer that Iran's nuclear program was completely and totally obliterated. This is the same administration whose Department of Defense has said that the Iranian nuclear program was set back several years and whose State Department has said that Iran isn't even enriching uranium today.

Mr. Speaker, was the Commander in Chief confused in June, or is he confused right now?

It was not long ago when America could be sure that we were preventing Iran from pursuing a nuclear weapon. The Iran nuclear agreement successfully did that until Donald Trump recklessly decided to pull the plug because he suffers from Obama derangement syndrome.

The President has spent much of the past year trying and failing to restore the same negotiated safeguards that he abandoned for partisan political reasons, and because of his failure to negotiate the guardrails that he destroyed, he has now taken us to war.

Third, President Trump claims that Iran poses an imminent threat to the United States through its development of intercontinental ballistic missiles that could perhaps someday reach our shores. If Iran is actually on the verge of having that capability, the President should provide the evidence, but no such evidence has been presented to this Congress or to the American people. We could only assume that it does not exist.

Fourth, Donald Trump said that he wanted to achieve regime change. Donald Trump is an individual who promised Americans on the campaign trail that launching regime-change wars in the Middle East has been one of the most foolish and costly things that the United States has ever done. Those are Donald Trump's words on the campaign trail.

Candidate Trump said that, if elected, he would never get our country into an endless regime war. President Trump has now done the exact opposite.

Regime-change wars are among the most expensive things that we can undertake. And yes, Secretary Hegseth, for decades, they have failed to accomplish their objective.

Vietnam was a regime-change war. Afghanistan was a regime-change war. Iraq was a regime-change war. Despite the incredible bravery of our heroes and patriots, due to failed policy decisions, they didn't work out.

Even if the Iranian regime were to fall, we have no way to control what comes next, which most experts believe would be the Iranian Revolutionary Guard-led government rising up and being just as repressive and antagonistic as the current theocracy and perhaps even more committed to the acquisition of nuclear weapons.

Fifth and most recently, Donald Trump said: I "had a feeling" Iran would attack first, as some sort of rationale for going to war. Donald Trump had a feeling that Iran would attack.

The United States Government has initiated a war and put American lives at risk. Six patriots have already been killed. Thousands of American citizens are stranded in the Middle East, and he has plunged the entire Middle East into a war and chaos over a feeling.

It is outrageous. It is unacceptable. It shocks the conscience.

In the last few days, six servicemembers have died, and the Trump adminis-

tration has acknowledged that more of our heroes are going to be killed. We have no concrete justification for why we are putting American troops in harm's way and spending billions of dollars on a foreign war while the affordability crisis rages here at home—a crisis Donald Trump said he would fix on day one but, instead, Republican policies have made worse.

Taxpayer dollars should be used to drop grocery prices, drop housing costs, and drop health insurance premiums. Instead, Donald Trump is spending billions of taxpayer dollars to drop bombs in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, the President's war is unwise. It is unpopular, unauthorized, unlawful, and unconstitutional. In the United States, we serve the rule of law, not the rule of man.

James Madison once wrote in 1788: "The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands . . . may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny."

Our Constitution requires the President get approval from Congress before launching a war. That has not happened, and that is why this bipartisan resolution, led by Democrats, is on the floor of the House of Representatives today.

□ 1550

In their wisdom, the Framers believed that they had made it impossible for a President to do what Donald Trump has just done and that no other President has done before: launched a major war in the Middle East without the approval of Congress.

That is what Donald Trump's time in office has been all about: failure after failure, betrayal after betrayal, disaster after disaster.

In his return to the Presidency, Mr. Speaker, Donald Trump has left America less prosperous, less safe, and less free. He has hurt us again and again, failed us again and again, and now, by launching this unauthorized war of choice, he is setting fire to our Constitution.

The American people deserve better. Democrats are committed to continuing to fight to use American taxpayer dollars to lower the high costs of living, to fix our broken healthcare system, and to clean up corruption.

I stand on the floor here today to make sure that those taxpayer dollars are being used in ways that are designed to make life better for the American people, not launching another endless war in the Middle East that is destined to cost more American lives and waste billions, if not trillions, in taxpayer dollars.

Democrats are here to stand up for the American people. Democrats are here to stand up for our men and women in uniform. Democrats are here to stand up for the rule of law and the United States Constitution. Democrats will not rest until this national nightmare has ended and America can con-

tinue to march toward a more perfect Union.

Vote "yes" on this War Powers Resolution.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I heard a lot there. I didn't hear any discussion of Article II authority. I heard a lot of reminiscing, but I didn't hear any reminiscing about Libya either.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL), the chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in 1979, the Islamic Revolution began, and a dark veil of terror descended upon the Middle East. Since then, Iran has operated as the nucleus to the world's most dangerous terror network.

When the withdrawal from Afghanistan set the world on fire, the regime grew even more emboldened, fanning the flames of chaos and violence beyond its borders. From that moment onward, China, Russia, and Iran have been locked together in an unholy alliance which seeks to destroy Western values and upend the global balance of power.

Iran has played a key role in these malign efforts, arming Russia with lethal drones to massacre Ukrainians and fueling China's military machine through illicit sales of oil. Its terror proxies, Hamas, Houthis, and Hezbollah, have sown terror and instability across the world.

This is a regime that values martyrdom over prosperity and chaos over peace. From their legacy of American bloodshed in Beirut and the USS *Cole* to harboring terrorists after 9/11, to backing Hamas' unprovoked October 7 attacks that killed 46 Americans, a regime this murderous can never be allowed to have a nuclear weapon.

Thanks to President Trump and Operation Epic Fury, the dark shroud that covered the Middle East for nearly five decades has now been lifted. The people of Iran, who have suffered so greatly at the hands of the ayatollah, finally have a chance for freedom.

This is a historic moment, one that could finally put the Middle East on the path to peace. In my judgment, Iran's decision to hit our partners was a severe miscalculation, turning the Gulf nations against Iran. Meanwhile, the regime's so-called allies, Russia and China, have abandoned Iran. Iran is isolated and now an island. Normalization between Israel and the Arab nations, as envisioned in the Abraham Accords, is now at hand.

Despite these truths, Congressional Democrats are seeking to force President Trump to halt Epic Fury mid-operation, risking the objectives of this critical mission, solely for political purposes.

Now is not the time to tie the hands of our Commander in Chief, and it is also not the time to hold up DHS funding.

Even before Operation Epic Fury, the threat landscape was at an all-time

high. President Biden's open border allowed more than 700 Iranian nationals to enter our country and more than 18,000 known or suspected terrorists.

As former chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, I know all too well how sleeper cells can execute foreign-inspired or foreign-directed acts of terrorism within our borders.

I have already seen that happen in my hometown of Austin, where three people were tragically killed over the weekend at the hands of a terrorist.

Operation Epic Fury confronts this threat head-on, severing the tentacles Iran has wrapped around the globe to strangle peace and spread terror.

The ayatollah's reign of terror began with weak leadership from President Carter. It will end with strong leadership from President Trump.

This War Powers Resolution is ill-timed and ill-advised. Congress must stand with the President and our military to finally close once and for all this dark chapter of history and pave the way for lasting peace.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I have to say I heard one of the craziest things from my colleague just a couple of minutes ago: That if something has been going on for 40 years, it can't be imminent. It can't meet the definition of imminent if it has been going on for 40 years. That is one of the most absurd things I have ever heard.

If every day I walk out of my house and get my tail kicked by somebody, that is the exact definition of imminent. It will happen tomorrow and the next day until I finally step up, grow a spine, and prevent it from happening. It is one of the most absurd arguments I have ever heard.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the person who is the greatest Speaker in the history of the United States Congress, the first woman, and the distinguished Speaker Emerita.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his kind words but, more importantly, for his leadership in bringing us together today and for his great statement and that of our distinguished leader, Mr. JEFFRIES, that we heard earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here as former leader, but also as one with 30 years of experience in intelligence. I think this is a very important debate for us to have. There are two debates going on here. One is the debate as to the Constitution of the United States. The other is whether Iran should have a nuclear weapon, which everyone agrees they should not, but that doesn't mean the Constitution of the United States should be a casualty of that because the administration wants to take a shortcut to the war.

I rise in mourning for the brave servicemembers who have given their lives in this conflict. I honor their ultimate

sacrifice and pray for them, their families, and all who were injured in this so far.

I had some veterans in my office, Mr. Speaker, earlier today on two different occasions, and they talked about the fact that having six people killed so early at the beginning of a conflict, an initiation of hostilities is unacceptable. What is our plan? What do we have in mind for them?

Again, everyone agrees Iran should not have a nuclear weapon. To that end, that is why I am so proud about what President Obama did with this. He was masterful in diplomacy and in forging an agreement that verifiably prevented Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

I have this book of statements from our colleagues who told the President: We need to see the substance of the agreement. We need to see the validation and proof of it all. We need the communication to the American people.

The President respected the Congress and came and gave reasons, and this was for an agreement. This President won't even come and give us the data for an action of war.

□ 1600

Let's be clear. This is not a debate about the merits of the war. That is another debate. It is a debate of the Constitution of the United States.

The beauty of the Constitution, central to it, is the separation of powers.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. The separation of powers, Article I, and in that Article I is very importantly the power of the Congress to declare war.

Again, let us be serious about our oath of office to protect and defend the Constitution as we protect and defend the people of our country. That is our responsibility. That is what we will do.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the Constitution and then go on to the debate of whether we should go into Iran or how we go into Iran. I think there will be some mixed views on that, but that is a different subject.

I urge my colleagues to honor your oath of office, honor the vision of our Founders, and honor the sacrifice of our men and women in uniform who have gotten us here today.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I have three quick points.

Number one, it is Article II of the Constitution that gives the President the authority to defend us against the imminent threat of Iran.

I would say that if the Iran nuclear deal was so masterful, why didn't they bring it before Congress and before the Senate?

The final point that I would make is this: Again, last Congress, 354 Members of Congress, including 150 Democrats

and Speaker Emerita PELOSI, who just spoke, all voted "to use all means necessary to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon." That was their vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), the chairman of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, my good friend, Mr. MAST, for yielding and for his leadership on highlighting the error of removing the United States' Armed Forces from a conflict that will bring an end to a 47-year engagement.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it: The Iranian regime is the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world. Despite extensive diplomatic efforts, the regime refuses to give up its nuclear weapon ambitions, its ballistic, cruise, and antiship missile production and proliferation, or its support of terror.

As Secretary Rubio said yesterday: "Iran is run by lunatics, religious fanatic lunatics. They have an ambition to have nuclear weapons. They intend to develop those nuclear weapons behind a program of missiles and drones and terrorism that the world will not be able to touch them for fear of those things."

When these murderous despots tell us that they want to eliminate us from existence, which they have said time and time again over the past 47 years, and now, in a relatively short timeframe, they attempt to sprint to the finish line by significantly hardening their conventional defensive posture, expediting the development of nuclear weapons and showing their desperation by slaughtering thousands of their own people, it is clear that we have reached the point of no return—a point after which it is too late to respond.

We all know that we wouldn't be here today if the President's name weren't Donald Trump. Democrats have been calling for the U.S. to take action against Iran until Donald Trump did so.

Last month, Democrats sponsored H.R. 7380, the IRAN Act, chastising the Iranian regime for repeatedly shutting down internet connectivity and impeding the Iranian people from communicating during emergencies and exercising internationally recognized human rights.

Earlier this year, the Democrat-sponsored H.R. 5912, the DISRUPT Act, would require the executive branch to "develop a whole-of-government strategy to disrupt growing cooperation among the People's Republic of China, the Russian Federation, the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which are the foremost adversaries of the United States, and mitigate the risks posed to the United States."

This Democrat bill even states that the partnering of these four U.S. adversaries "reinforces threats posed by each such adversary individually."

It seems pretty clear to me that the Democratic rhetoric has argued in

favor of cracking down on the brutal Iran regime—of course, until President Trump was the one to initiate the regime's demise.

President Trump has the duty to protect Americans and the United States' interests both at home and abroad. The administration engaged in earnest diplomacy to mitigate the Iranian threat. It became crystal clear, however, that the Iranian regime used the diplomatic process to buy itself time to reconstitute its ballistic missile inventories and nuclear weapons program.

As the threat neared its apex, a point beyond which mitigation would be impossible, President Trump lived up to his duty as Commander in Chief and took decisive action.

On March 2, President Trump notified Congress, consistent with the oft-criticized War Powers Resolution of 1973, of military action used to address this threat to the American people and American interests.

In other words, the President has clearly acted consistent with precedent and has prosecuted this military action in a transparent and forthcoming manner, holding multiple press conferences and sending his Cabinet officials and operational experts to provide multiple classified briefings on the status of the ongoing conflict to all Members of Congress, as well as the appropriate committees and their staffs.

Mr. Speaker, passing the measure today would do nothing to keep America safe. It would do nothing to strengthen Congress. All it would do is put America's safety and all of its allies at risk. It would allow Iran to once again rebuild its murderous regime and terrorize the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no." I thank Chairman MAST for his partnership and leadership.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), the esteemed whip of the Democratic Caucus.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) for yielding.

Donald Trump has taken America to war without authorization, without explanation, and without a strategy or an exit plan.

Six brave servicemembers have already given the ultimate sacrifice. Others have been wounded, and Americans are stranded across the region. What do we hear from our Commander in Chief? He shrugs and says, "That is the way it is" and how about that ballroom?

The American people do not want their sons and daughters shipped to another war in the Middle East when they don't even know what the mission is. They want a country where their children can do better and reach higher than their parents did, where they don't just survive but can actually get ahead and where a doctor's appointment is not a luxury.

What are they getting instead? Republicans have been raiding their

healthcare, their Social Security, and their veterans benefits, all to enrich the billionaire class. Illegal tariffs are jacking up prices. Secret police are murdering Americans in the streets. A corrupt DOJ is covering for pedophiles while denying their victims justice.

Today, you can stand with Americans who are entitled to know what the objective of this war is and what the cost will be. They deserve to know the sacrifice will not fall just on working and military families but will be shared by the wealthy and powerful.

Today, you can join us in telling the President that the Constitution is not just a suggestion; that our country belongs to its people, to the American people; that the power to declare war belongs to the people's Representatives; and that 250 years later, whatever Donald Trump may think, America still has no kings.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to this resolution.

The intelligence is clear that Iran was attempting to rebuild its nuclear program. Iran was developing missiles that could place American bases in the region and our homeland at risk.

The rapid expansion of Iranian missiles and drones posed an immediate threat to U.S. forces and partners in the region.

□ 1610

Iran's missile and drone arsenal acted as a conventional shield to its nuclear program. Faced with this threat, the President sought diplomatic solutions, but the Iranian regime refused to abandon their pursuit of a nuclear weapon. They refused to limit their ballistic missile arsenal, and they refused to rein in their terrorist proxies.

Only when it became clear that Iran would not agree to a peaceful resolution did President Trump take decisive action and lawful action to protect the American people.

As Secretaries Rubio and Hegseth have repeatedly explained, this is a limited military operation with clearly defined objectives.

Those objectives are: Number one, to destroy the Iranian missile drone and defense infrastructure posing a threat to U.S. forces and partners in the region; and, number two, to degrade Iran's industrial capacity to produce additional drones and missiles; and, number three, to destroy Iranian naval assets with the capacity to threaten U.S. forces and the free flow of commerce through the region.

Achieving these objectives will ensure Iran can no longer threaten the U.S. or our allies.

Past administrations have allowed the threat from Iran to grow and fester to the problem we have now. President

Trump took decisive action to end the threat and restore the credibility of American deterrence.

At this time, we should be focused on ensuring our warfighters have the resources and capabilities they need to succeed in this operation. We should not pass any resolution that will end this critical operation before achieving these military objectives. Doing so would needlessly risk the lives of American servicemembers and American allies.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to pray for the safety of our men and women in uniform and honor those who have made the ultimate sacrifice. I also urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), who is the sponsor of this important resolution.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, James Madison wrote to Thomas Jefferson in 1789: "The Constitution supposes, what the history of all governments demonstrates, that the executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the question of war in the legislature."

The Constitution is clear. Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of our Constitution provides Congress initiatory powers for war.

Article II, Section 2, Clause 1 of our Constitution gives the President operational powers of war to wage that war.

Even if this body were to pretend that the 1973 War Powers Resolution supersedes the clear language of the Constitution, the President still has not met the conditions required by that law itself.

The 1973 War Powers Resolution states plainly that the President may only introduce U.S. Armed Forces into hostilities pursuant to three conditions: one, a declaration of war; two, specific statutory authorization; or, three, a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States.

None of those conditions exist today.

Iran has not attacked the United States, Congress has not declared war, and Congress has not granted specific statutory authorization.

Beyond the constitutional question here lies an even more important one: Why are we going to war with Iran?

We owe our military servicemembers a clear mission.

American families in my district want to know: How is this going to help them pay for groceries?

How does this make them any safer in their schools or in their neighborhoods?

How does this help them pay for housing?

Have we learned nothing from the laundry list of wars and regime-change experiments we sparked across the Middle East that have racked up at

least \$8 trillion in debt in Iraq, Libya, Syria, and Afghanistan?

A sustained war with Iran will not stabilize the region. It has already ignited the region. It will radicalize new generations of terrorists, and it will send more swarms of refugees into Europe and the United States.

Iran is not Venezuela. The ayatollah was not a president. He was a religious leader from a region notorious for radical Islamists, and the United States and Israel turned him into a martyr. In the process of doing so, we have already expended billions of dollars, and, more solemnly, six American families must now lay to rest their sons and daughters.

For what?

This administration can't even give us a straight answer as to why we launched this preemptive war. The President says we had to strike first because an Iranian strike was imminent. Meanwhile the Department of Defense conceded there was no evidence of an imminent Iranian strike.

Some told us this war is about nuclear weapons, but 6 months ago, we were assured our last strike on Iran decimated their nuclear program.

So which is it?

I think the most candid answer came from the Secretary of State who told the press that Israel forced our hand and dragged us into this war again. That truth is the very reason why it is Congress that must decide war.

If American lives are to be risked and American blood is to be shed, that decision must be debated and voted on by the Representatives and the American people, and that debate is meant to be arduous and long. That vote is meant to be hard.

I have a theory. I think my colleagues don't want to go on record because we have a terrible track record of meddling in the Middle East. They don't want their name associated with this when it doesn't turn out well. However, Congress cannot be bothered with its constitutional duty because for many in this Chamber it is easier to simply allow someone else's sons and daughters to be sent to combat without their vote.

To be clear, we aren't even here to declare war today. All we are voting on is a War Powers Resolution to reassert the Constitution, which is that Congress must decide questions of war, and if Congress wants war, then the Speaker should hold a vote to declare it.

Some say Congress authorizes war when we pay for it when we pass the budget bill. Here is the problem: We haven't taken on the hard work of defining the mission for our sons and daughters who are going to fight. That is not in the budget bill. It never is.

To the men and women who are engaged in combat, I sincerely thank you, and I pray for your safety. It is for you that I wrote this resolution. It is for you that all of us are here on this floor working so hard to force this vote so that you will have the clear mission

that you deserve and so that you will know that when you achieve it, you can come home.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this resolution.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I urge not supporting this resolution. I am thankful that my colleague at least started to talk about that there is an Article II authority. He actually discussed that.

When is something an emergency?

That is what a real debate can be. I have laid out very clearly a number of reasons why I believe it is a national emergency and why I believe that threat is imminent because of a number of things that have happened. My colleagues over there say that something can't be imminent if it has been going on for years. To me that would be the definition of imminent if it is ongoing for years.

At least my colleague was willing to have that debate, although I disagree with him and urge not passing his legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, for far too long, Iran has held the world hostage with its nuclear threats, unbridled violence and hate, pervasive use of torture and rape, and Nazi-like anti-Semitism.

Iran is the world's worst state sponsor of terrorism. All diplomatic initiatives to secure peace, justice, and reconciliation with the Iranian dictatorship have been fruitless.

President Trump is a man of his word, and he means it when he says that Iran must never be permitted to acquire a nuclear weapon. Despite ample warnings and admonishments to negotiate seriously, which it has never done, Iran has defied U.S. diplomacy to end its decades-long quest to procure nuclear weapons and cease its despicable violence against Americans, Israelis, and the Iranians themselves.

Among the many egregious concessions made in 2015 by President Obama to the Iranians was to get a deal which included removal of a treaty obligation that would have ended Iran's missile program and prevent the production of the ballistic missiles that are today raining down on our American military in the region, Israeli civilians, and our friends in neighboring countries.

In debate on the House floor in 2015, I stood right here and said: Iranian Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei criticized the call for Iran to end its ballistic missile program, characterizing it as a stupid and idiotic expectation, claiming that the Revolutionary Guard should definitely carry out their program and not be satisfied with the present level of missiles.

Khamenei said that they should mass produce those missiles, and mass produce they have, killing thousands and putting millions more at risk. It is

estimated that Iran produces 100 missiles each and every month.

I would remind my colleagues that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action signed by China, France, Germany, Russia, the U.K., and, of course, the United States, the P5+1, had a sunset date of October 18, 2025.

I remember asking for it during debate in committee and on the floor.

Sunset? Did anyone think that in 2015 that Iran would somehow matriculate from a brutal dictatorship to a democracy in those 10 years?

That provided the Iranians the incentive to wait us out because then everything would be lifted even in that flawed deal.

□ 1620

Let me also point out to my colleagues that the Trump administration has refused—I say again “refused”—to have the United States bullied by Iran.

The distinguished chairman before went through one instance after another where they have killed Americans. Even when they bombed us in Lebanon, there was a young man in the Marines from my district who was killed in that brutal act of war by the Iranian dictatorship.

I just say that I am against this resolution. May God bless and protect our courageous servicemembers, as well as the idea of soldiers who are fighting this tyrannical Iranian dictatorship with incredible courage, professionalism, skill, and tenacity.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), the cosponsor of this important resolution.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, the world needs a new moral vision. America needs a new vision.

We are seeing militarism erode the soul of our Nation, leading to a regime change war in Iran and utter human devastation in Gaza.

Simply put, we have lost our way. We are back to the law of the jungle, where might makes right and where the Middle East descends into a Hobbesian war of all against all.

President Eisenhower warned that every warship built, every bomb deployed, every missile launched is a hospital and school forgone. A world in arms, he said, is stealing the hopes of our children.

Today, this vote on Iran is not a procedural vote. It is a profoundly moral vote. It is a vote to direct our resources toward healing our own people, toward healthcare that saves lives, jobs that restore dignity, and housing that shelters families instead of raining destruction on other nations.

It is a vote to renew an America that leads once more through diplomacy, statesmanship, and principle, an America that strives to end cycles of violence rather than ignite them, an America that cooperates with other nations rather than bullying them into submission, an America committed to confronting child poverty, the climate

crisis, and illiteracy, to advance our shared humanity, an America that is respected in the world again.

The world needs an America that finds its moral center, Mr. Speaker. Let us rise to this historic challenge. In this body, let us declare with courage and clarity that we reject this illegal and unjust war in Iran. Let us choose moral renewal over further moral decay.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you why not to trust what was just said as the gentleman walks out. Here is what he voted for: "Iran's ongoing nuclear escalation poses a serious threat to the United States and its partners." That is literally what he voted for. "Use all means necessary to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon." To me, that seems pretty damn imminent.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF), chairman of the Europe Subcommittee.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, I rise here in response to my colleague from across the aisle. I thought we were talking about the War Powers Act and not the Democrats' social programs. That is what I am going to do.

President Trump's decision to strike Iran is not starting a forever war. It is ending a forever war. For half a century, the Islamic Republic of Iran has cast a shadow over the Middle East and trapped the region in a dark age. When the regime chants "death to America, death to Israel," they mean it.

The Islamic Republic is responsible for the deaths of hundreds, if not thousands, of Americans, thousands of Israelis, and tens of thousands of their own people, including up to 30,000 in just the last few weeks. Iran has slaughtered more Americans than any other terrorist regime in the world, and they will continue to kill Americans until they are stopped.

Iran is the number one sponsor of terrorism in the world by nonstate actors, something that is not even contemplated by the War Powers Act. The regime funds, trains, and equips countless Islamic terrorist groups, including the Houthi rebels in Yemen, Hezbollah in Lebanon, Hamas in Gaza, and many others across Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere in the region. For years, Iran has leveraged these terrorists to wage war against and kill Americans and countless civilians throughout the region.

Just last weekend in my home State, a gunman horrifically killed three innocent people and injured four others in Austin, Texas, while reportedly wearing a sweatshirt that read "Property of Allah" and a shirt with an Islamic Republic of Iran flag on it. While law enforcement continues its investigation into a connection with the Islamic Republic, Americans must understand the enemy is within the gates.

The current regime in Iran is the poster child for Islam and sharia law, a culture of violence and domination that is totally incompatible with individual freedoms, our Constitution, and our heritage.

Islam is an existential threat to our constitutional republic. By conducting this joint operation with our partners in the region to defend against tyranny, we are defending Western civilization.

Furthermore, the Iranian people have overwhelmingly demonstrated a clear will to overthrow and change the radical regime. Tens of thousands of civilians have sacrificed their lives as a testimony to this point. By giving the green light to Epic Fury, President Trump is giving the Iranian people a fighting chance to alter the course of history in the Middle East and the world.

As the Article II branch, the President is undertaking his constitutional duty as Commander in Chief to defend the United States from a tyrannical, murderous Islamic regime.

Finally, I would also like to note that since the War Powers Act was enacted, every President, both Republican and Democrat, has agreed that this law is unconstitutional.

Instead of airing personal grievances with the President, the American people and our servicemembers would be better off if Congress focused on reopening the Department of Homeland Security to prevent attacks on American soil and support the President in executing his Article II duty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of North Carolina). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, while I agree that this body should engage in discussions about the War Powers Act, this is not the appropriate time. U.S. troops are currently in harm's way, and they need to have our full-throated support, full stop. I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), an esteemed member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, my name is WARREN DAVIDSON, and I love this country with a soldier's passion.

More than 30 years ago, I enlisted in the infantry. My chain of command later helped me earn an appointment to the United States Military Academy at West Point. I was commissioned as an infantry officer, serving in the 75th Ranger Regiment, the 101st Airborne, Rakkasans, and The Old Guard.

Then and now, I swore an oath to support and defend our Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Make no mistake, Iran is an enemy of the United States. As our military engages them, they do so justly. Unfortunately, they are not yet doing so constitutionally, and that is why we are here today.

For some, this debate will be about whether we should even be fighting in Iran. For me, the debate is more funda-

mental: Is the President of the United States, regardless of the person holding the office, empowered to do whatever he wants? That is not what our Constitution says.

Is he empowered to do whatever he wants for 60 or 90 days? That is not what the War Powers Act says.

Is there any limit to executive authority whatsoever?

I rise in support of this War Powers Resolution today because the moral hazard posed by a government no longer constrained by our Constitution is a grave threat.

The threat to a government no longer constrained by the plain meaning of words is not new for Democrats. Recall that Democrats needed help answering: "What is a woman?" Unfortunately, Republicans now want to claim they can't answer: "What is a war?"

This debate isn't even new. Democratic President Harry Truman obstructed a vote on the Korean war, pretending it was, instead, a U.N. police action. Republican Senator Taft from Ohio insisted in vain that Congress should not shirk its duty to vote on declaring war or at least to authorize the conflict. Instead, Congress then, as it has in the past, passively cut checks to fund the war that they refused to authorize.

This dereliction of duty is commonly mocked as an example of constitutional avoidance, and it contributed to the passage of the War Powers Act.

□ 1630

President Trump's America First message was supposed to be a rejection of the globalist war machine whose endless wars have left America less free, less safe, and more burdened by debt. On the other hand, President Trump has been reluctant to embrace war and has been incredibly successful in diplomacy.

In this case, war may well be necessary, but it is far more pressing that we restore a government small enough to fit within the Constitution. We can afford a government that small and no other. America is a Republic, not an empire.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage everyone to honor their oath and support our Constitution. Vote "yes" on this resolution.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), chairman of the Subcommittee on South and Central Asia.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MAST for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican friend from Ohio knows I deeply respect him, his service to our country, and his consistency, frankly. That is something that we are not seeing from many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and that is to be commended.

We have a different opinion on whether this is legal or not. We all know that the reason we are here is that for nearly half a century, the Iranian regime has terrorized the globe

with acts of cowardly violence through its own forces and proxy militias; namely, Hamas, the Houthis, and Hezbollah, whom they have provided military, political, diplomatic, and monetary aid.

They have killed approximately a thousand Americans and maimed thousands of others, both Americans and Arabs, with roadside bombs and other IEDs. We have seen all the videos online with drones and missiles hurtling into malls, hospitals, and hotels. This has to stop.

During his first term, President Trump imposed a maximum pressure campaign in response to President Obama's lack of action regarding Iran, and that crippled Iran's ability to raise revenues from its oil operations and fund their terror network.

How do I know that, Mr. Speaker? Because as a member of the Financial Services Committee where all of those sanctions originated, I worked on those very sanctions.

However, years later, the Biden administration found those moves too far and harsh on Iran and refused to enforce those sanctions. Sanctions are only as good and useful as their willingness to enforce them.

During this period, Iranian crude production topped 3 million barrels a day, greater by more than a factor of seven during the maximum pressure campaign, allowing the Iranian regime to continue to finance its brutality internationally and domestically.

Congress attempted to reverse course by passing legislation to codify the maximum pressure campaign measures. That is why the House of Representatives passed my bill, the No U.S. Financing for Iran Act, by an overwhelming bipartisan majority during the 118th Congress, to cut off the Iranian regime from the U.S. financial system. My friends who voted for that seem to forget.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle tend to forget that the Iranian regime directed an assassination attempt against the current President of the United States. Whether you like President Trump or not, no sitting President should be allowed to be a target by a foreign country without consequences.

Peace through strength does not mean another open-ended war of the past. Operation Epic Fury is a defensive action using overwhelming force to protect the American people from an imminent and growing threat.

Additionally, it cannot be ignored that Iran was producing conventional drones and ballistic missiles at an alarming rate, until just this past weekend, and to provide a protective layer of defense for its nuclear ambitions and nuclear weapons development.

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

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration has clearly defined the mission, the objective, and the timeline. He has notified and briefed Congress on these operations. Simply put, Iran cannot, under any circumstances, possess the capabilities for having nuclear weapons.

The Biden administration's official policy toward Iran summed up in one word: "Don't." That phrase underpinned one of the most ineffective foreign policy agendas in the 21st century. Give me a break.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution, hoping to score political points by tying the President's hands in the face of danger. It is time that we defend our liberty, our freedom, our neighbors, and this great Nation in the face of Iran's systematic terror.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member of the House Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I am especially concerned about Iran's stockpile of enhanced uranium, which could be used at any time. I know that the President has said that the nuclear capability of Iran had been obliterated.

However, prior to the first Trump administration, the U.S. was able to monitor the status of Iran's uranium under an agreement called the "Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action," the JCPOA. The U.S. negotiated this agreement with Iran in 2015, but Trump withdrew from the JCPOA in 2018. Now, we have no way to track the status of Iran's dangerous uranium stockpile. This war must be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the resolution.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I think the last speaker just said she was worried about Iran's uranium stockpile and that it could be used at any time. That seems pretty damn imminent to me, too.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Intelligence.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the chairman is right. We just pointed to the three key things that you need in order to have lethal force against the United States. One is intent.

I think that Iran and the regime have made it very clear when they are chanting "death to America," the thousands of lives they have changed with either maiming or killing American troops or civilians abroad, but also likelihood.

We know that they are able to build 100-plus missiles a day. We know they had ICBMs. We have now found out they had the hypersonic ballistic capabilities as they targeted over six different countries.

The thing we talk about, the JCPOA, as was just mentioned, Resolution 2231 where the administration tried to come up with an idea of a negotiation that

led to diplomatic and peaceful solutions, was continually violated by this regime as even Secretary-Generals Ban Ki-moon and Guterres had pointed out multiple times as the Iranian regime sent mid-range ballistic missiles to the Houthis and to other areas to continue attacking Americans and the West.

The hypocrisy is what I really want to point out here, not the fact that we already understand the Article II authorities that the President has, which is well within the bounds constitutionally, not to mention the fact that this body, before I came into Congress, was already abdicating the roles and responsibilities under Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 when they started doing things like AUMFs.

Let us point to things like what we saw in Libya. It was very clear in 2011, as we see here in military intervention, that it was without prior congressional authorization, relying instead on a U.N. Security Council resolution and legal justification from the Department of Justice that argued that the administration had limited nonground troop missions and doesn't constitute hostilities. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we have here: no ground troops.

It also goes on further to justify under the United Nations mandates, international mandates, and the legal justification to say that because they were focused on protecting civilians, not sustained fighting and didn't involve ground troops. I don't know about you, but I think 40-plus Iranian civilians, peacefully protesting for a change, being brutally murdered, being raped, being tortured, being slaughtered, being hung from cranes, being persecuted and imprisoned—I think President Trump stopping this after 47 years was protecting civilian lives.

I think it is established that we had no boots on the ground. I think that we have demonstrated the imminence, the likelihood, and intent of an evil regime to try and go ahead and attack Americans and threaten our way of life.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman about to speak on the other side, Mr. RASKIN, also voted to say Iran's ongoing nuclear escalation poses a serious threat to the United States and its partners and to use all means necessary to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. He must have thought it was pretty damn imminent, too.

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

□ 1640

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), the ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, yes, use all lawful and constitutional means. I heard one of our colleagues across the aisle just say: Well, yes, Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 does give Congress the exclusive, plenary, comprehensive power to declare

war and not the President, and we could be debating it, but the President has already taken us to war, so it is too late. It would undermine the cause for us to debate it.

What a humiliating, self-defeating argument for a Member of the Article I branch of Congress to make. Don't my colleagues understand that destroys our power to declare war if any President can plunge us into a war and thereby defeat our exclusive, plenary power over it?

The Framers weren't fooling around when they did that. They knew that the kings were constantly plunging their people into wars of deception, conceit, plunder, imperial avarice, and fantasy. The kings were constantly doing that. They didn't want to leave it up to one person to decide whether to send a whole country to war and to put our sons and daughters at risk.

That is an awesome and solemn responsibility that must be vested in the Representatives of the people, all the people, which is why both the House and the Senate are involved in it.

Whether my colleagues think this war is the most brilliant and strategic breakthrough and moral cause since World War II, or they think it is an absolute strategic blunder built on lies like the last wars in Iraq or the war in Afghanistan, which cost thousands of lives and more than \$1 trillion, wherever my colleagues are on that policy question, can we not agree as Members of the Article I branch that it is up to us? We have to vote on it. We have to debate on it.

I am hearing very interesting and good arguments all over this spectrum on this. That is why it is reposed in the Representatives of the people to decide it. It is not Donald Trump, not JD VANCE, not Tulsi Gabbard, or anybody else in the executive branch. It is our decision. Everybody should vote "yes" on this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have heard it brought up many times that we get to vote to declare war. We do, but it is enshrined in the Constitution that the President gets to defend the United States of America because of national emergencies.

These kinds of emergencies that the last gentleman voted to say to "use all means necessary to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon," that seems like an emergency to me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER), the chairman of the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, President Trump launched military operations against the terrorist Iranian regime, alongside our ally, Israel, killing the Ayatollah and many of his top lieutenants in the IRGC and the council of clerics.

This operation came after almost a year of negotiations to reach a diplomatic solution to end Iran's nuclear

ambitions, ballistic missiles program, and funding of terrorism. Time and again, we were left emptyhanded because of the regime's unwillingness to honestly negotiate in good faith.

After exhausting all potential diplomatic means, only then did the President initiate Operation Epic Fury.

It is also important to point out that this engagement is not a new war. The Iranian regime has been at war with America for 47 years.

They have been attacking Americans, our military, our allies, and our partners. They advocate for death to America. They hate us. They hate America. They hate Israel. They hate Europe. They hate the West. They massacre their own people for simple public dissent and peaceful protest.

They send money to Hamas, Hezbollah, the Houthis, and other terror proxies around the world with the express interest of killing Americans and Israelis. They funded the October 7 terrorist attack that murdered and kidnapped not just Israelis but Americans. The Ayatollah and his conspirators paid the ultimate price.

This is the maximum pressure campaign President Trump advocated for. This is how we secure our national security so that Americans can be free and safe and our allies in the Middle East can be free and safe.

The long-term strategic benefits here in regard to peace and stability are immense. The only way to ensure peace and economic prosperity in the Middle East is to eliminate the single greatest threat to it.

As far as the War Powers Act goes, the President is fully compliant. Congress was notified. Congress was briefed. The fact is that the President has 60 to 90 days to conduct this operation. If Congress sees fit at that time, we will address it.

Mr. Speaker, to try to unilaterally end this operation puts our national security at risk, puts our troops at risk, and puts our allies at risk.

Iran is belligerently striking Arab partners as we speak. They are hitting civilian sites and trying to kill American soldiers. In fact, they have killed six.

Many of my colleagues said nothing when Barack Obama engaged in a 7-month campaign in Libya. In fact, when a War Powers Resolution was on this floor, many opposed it, including CHUCK SCHUMER, the Senate minority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEUSER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that when we look back, Presidents of both parties have acted under Article II and without the express authorization of Congress.

Former Speaker NANCY PELOSI said it best when she said that Barack Obama could conduct the operation in Libya

for 7 months and did not require congressional authority.

Stop being hyperpartisan hypocrites and acknowledge the simple fact that the President is legally justified. Vote "no" on this War Powers Resolution.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), the ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening closely to this debate since it began. The arguments being made by half of the Representatives of the people of the United States, the arguments as to why they should abrogate their constitutionally mandated duty, are bizarre to me.

Most of the arguments have not been arguments. The arguments are that Iran is evil, that they hate the U.S., and that they mean us ill. The majority will find no argument over here that that is true.

Oddly enough, when the Founders wrote the Constitution, they didn't say we shall declare war only when it is not clear that the belligerent is evil or means us ill. It was a categorical demand that the Representatives of the people, because blood and treasure would be consumed, that the Representatives of the people not just be informed but that they provide authorization.

I have heard the majority say that the danger was imminent. I am the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee. I can say with authority that, in the last 10 years, Iran's ability to create mayhem, while still very substantial, is at an ebb.

The President himself said the nuclear capabilities were "obliterated," his word. Hezbollah has been largely rolled up in Beirut by the Lebanese Armed Forces. We have a pretty good sense of what the Houthis are capable of and how to counter them. If the argument is imminence, that is absurd. There was no imminent threat to the United States on Friday or Saturday of last week.

By the way, the argument that my friend from New York just made, which is that Obama did it, is beyond absurd. I wasn't here when Obama did it. We weren't asked to vote on it. I remember telling the Vice President at the time that our Constitution demands congressional assent.

Congress was not notified. It was not briefed. That doesn't matter. What matters is that the Constitution is clear that, with six dead Americans, with our treasure being consumed, we must approve this action.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, it is not about informing.

By the way, this Congress was not informed. Mr. Speaker, eight Members of this Congress were informed.

Set aside, if you will, for a moment the Constitution. Should the Representatives of the people authorize an action that will kill many of those people and that will consume blood and treasure? Our Framers certainly said the answer to that question is yes.

Mr. Speaker, let's not abrogate our constitutional duty or our constitutional power. Vote "yes" on this resolution.

□ 1650

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

Mr. Speaker, let's poke a few holes in the Intelligence Committee ranking member's story here.

"At an ebb." They have been knocking jets off of our aircraft carriers. They have been attacking in places like Syria and Iraq. They killed three U.S. servicemembers at Tower 22 in Jordan, but he can say that it is at an ebb.

Let's poke one more hole in this. As ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, he did not vote to say that Iran's ongoing nuclear escalation poses a serious threat to the United States and its partners. That seems like an odd thing that the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee wouldn't vote for.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this dangerous and misguided War Powers Resolution that would weaken our country and serve as a gift to our enemies.

The radical terrorist regime in Tehran, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, has targeted and killed thousands of Americans since 1979. The United States, Israel, and all of our allies are safer because the Ayatollah is dead.

Since the taking of our hostages from our embassy in 1979 to the infamous 1983 Beirut barracks bombing that killed 241 U.S. Marines, to the attack on the USS *Cole* that left 37 Navy sailors dead, to the maiming and killing of thousands of U.S. military members during the global war on terrorism, the Iranian terrorist regime has always posed a grievous threat to the United States. Operation Epic Fury is neutralizing that threat, and it has been a tremendous success.

President Trump promised that Iran can never obtain a nuclear weapon. He is acting on that promise to make the world a safer place, and he is complying with the law in doing so, not just in complying with the notification requirements of the War Powers Resolution, not only through the consultation provisions, and not only with rou-

tinely updating Congress, but also under the Commander in Chief powers.

As a legal matter, the President of the United States doesn't need the permission of Congress to engage in hostilities to protect the American people. The Commander in Chief Clause gives the President the exclusive power to command the military in operations approved by Congress, and it also gives the President substantial independent power to direct military operations, so long as the President does not infringe on the exclusive powers of Congress.

What are the exclusive powers of Congress? The declaration power—we have been silent on that—and appropriations, the power of the purse. This Congress has appropriated funds to defend the country, and we increased appropriations through the reconciliation bill this year.

The NDAA is the policy of this Congress, which identifies Iran as a threat to our country. The Constitution was clear that Congress has the sole authority to declare war, which changes the legal status of the country. Yet, the Framers did not think that the language meant that the President and Congress have to work together all of the time to turn the keys of the war power.

The Founders were practical men. They understood that Congress is slow to act, and Alexander Hamilton argued in Federalist 70 that energy in the executive is essential for national security, unity, secrecy, dispatch, and decision, and he contended that a single President is vital for defending the country.

Mr. Speaker, Congress' real power is not just the declaration power. It is the power of the purse. If my friends want to constrain the President, they have the authority to do it through the appropriations process. They do not have the constitutional authority to constrain the President from defending this country and defending our national security, advancing our national security, and ridding the world of this menace.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS), the House Foreign Affairs Committee ranking member on the Africa Subcommittee.

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a voice for my generation and for my community in San Diego, the biggest military community in our country.

When Presidents from both sides of the aisle have taken military action, it is our servicemembers, our young people, who are sent into harm's way. They sacrifice their bodies, their mental health, their time with their loved ones, and even their lives for us.

While they are willing to make those sacrifices, we in Congress should be damned sure it is worth it. Too often, it is not. Too often, wars last longer and cost more than promised. Too

often, regime-change plans go awry, like we have already seen with the deaths of six servicemembers, hundreds of civilian deaths, and rising gas prices.

My colleagues will try to claim that voting for this War Powers Resolution hurts our servicemembers, but the opposite is true. We owe our servicemembers a real debate before we send them into harm's way. Voting "yes" is a vote for our military to ensure that their sacrifices won't be in vain.

If any of my colleagues vote "no," they should come to my district, look our servicemembers in the eye, and explain why they believe debating before we risk their lives is a bad thing.

I hope every single one of my colleagues votes "yes" on this War Powers Resolution for our servicemembers.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAUMGARTNER).

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Speaker, the Iranian terrorist regime has been at war with the American people for nearly 50 years through countless terrorist attacks, countless American servicemen and -women injured, and a persistent danger to the United States of America. President Trump's actions are a long time coming, well-meaning, and well-deserved.

I had the opportunity and the privilege to serve with the United States State Department during the Iraq surge, where I participated in putting together a joint U.S.-Iraqi interagency team to suppress Iranian-backed militia groups in Baghdad. These were very, very bad guys.

One of the things that they did was use what is called an explosively form penetrator. Al-Qaida and the Sunni groups would bake a lot of explosives on their roof and make big bombs. What the Iranians would do was make a special kind of bomb with a copper plate that would get an explosive, and it could punch right through our armor.

One day, on a trip to Sadr City, I watched a massive what is called an MRAP, armored personnel carrier, explode in front of me from an Iranian bomb and watched as that hulking metal burned to a crisp as American servicemen and -women sought to deal with the aftermath.

This terrorist regime has killed thousands of their countrymen and killed Americans across the Middle East, and it is time for them to come to an end. This is a partisan political maneuver by the Democrats, and they should be ashamed for what they are doing to put our servicemen and -women in danger.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I remind the gentleman that this is a Massie bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and reasserting Congress' constitutional responsibility.

As the gentleman from Florida stated, the President has the power to

react to an attack on the United States. He does not have the power to start a war.

President Trump's illegal strikes against Iran are dragging the United States into another costly war in the Middle East.

To be clear, I shed no tears over the Ayatollah's death. His brutality was responsible for the deaths of scores of his own people, and he directed terrorist proxies around the world. Yet, his removal is unlikely to bring about the revolution and regime change that the President seeks.

We had a diplomatic agreement with Iran that did contain their nuclear threat with constant verification, but President Trump tore up that agreement.

This unnecessary attack is a clear violation of the Constitution. Kings often plunged their nations into wars for plunder or avarice. The Constitution gave the power to decide on war or peace to Congress so that no President could act as a king.

That is precisely what the President is doing. We must pass this resolution to chastise President Trump and to reassert what the Constitution provides: that only Congress can decide to commit this Nation to war.

I urge Members to vote "yes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FINE).

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I believe in symbolic things at times. It was 47 years ago that Iran began chanting "Death to America." I don't think it is symbolic that the 47th President of the United States is the first to do something about it, but only one number away from that is 46. That is the number of Americans that, thanks to Iran, were killed on October 7, 2023.

□ 1700

I don't think Iran had a meeting where they debated whether they should support Hamas to go and do that attack. They did it, and now America is in the position that we are in.

There was a press conference not too long ago where the Speaker was asked: You are saying that the President did not need authorization initially and still does not need any authorization from Congress? The Speaker of the House answered that question: Yes. That was NANCY PELOSI when asked about an attack on Libya.

President Trump is doing exactly what he is authorized to do: protecting the United States by making sure a

terrorist regime cannot attack us using nuclear weapons.

While there may be some who want to wait until America is nuked to have that discussion, I am not one of them. I support the President. I support his judgment. He has not let us down. He has defined the mission in clear, compelling, and concise ways to make sure they don't get nukes, to make sure they can't develop intercontinental ballistic missiles, and to make sure they don't have a military shield to support them as they do that.

I don't have to have a debate before he does that sort of thing. That is what our Framers intended.

The fact of the matter is I wouldn't trust some of the people in this room to have that debate if we wanted to put handcuffs around him before he did that.

The President is doing the right thing. Congress should stand by him. Congress should trust Trump because he is not letting us down, and he won't let us down.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), the House Committee on Foreign Affairs' ranking member on the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Americans do not want and cannot afford another war in the Middle East.

On Saturday morning, Americans woke up to the shocking news that our Nation was at war again in the Middle East. There was no public justification, no vote to authorize this war in Congress.

Why this war? Why now?

If they say it is about Iran developing a nuclear weapon, just last year, President Trump claimed Iran's nuclear program had been completely and totally obliterated. In fact, Iran is further from perfecting a nuclear weapon now than it has been in years.

Some claim it is to disable air ballistic missile capability, but Iran doesn't have a single ballistic missile that can reach the mainland United States, and we don't expect them to for many years.

Is this about terrorism? It is true that Iran has helped finance and supply groups like Hamas and Hezbollah over the years, but they too are much weaker, much less capable after 2 years of conflict.

Why now? Well, Secretary Rubio told us himself. He said that Israel was going to strike Iran, which would have triggered Iranian strikes on U.S. forces in the region.

Rather than pick up the phone and tell Benjamin Netanyahu to stand down, the President of the United States buckled and decided to join their war.

How is this America First?

For 25 years, a generation of American servicemembers and their families have sacrificed so much because of regime-change wars in the Middle East. President Trump is now asking yet an-

other generation of Americans to sacrifice in the hope that this time it will go differently than Iraq, Afghanistan, or Libya.

This is Donald Trump's war. This is Benjamin Netanyahu's war. Your vote today will determine whether this is your war, too.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, let us be clear about what is happening right now. The United States is confronting a regime that has spent decades chanting "Death to America;" a regime whose proxies like Hezbollah, Hamas, and the Houthis, just to name a few, have been responsible for the deaths of hundreds and hundreds of American troops; a regime that is working relentlessly toward a nuclear weapon.

A nuclear-armed Iran would not just threaten the Middle East. It would threaten the entire world and, yes, civilization as we know it.

Now, at the very moment when decisive action is being taken to dismantle a threat, this resolution would tie the hands of the President of the United States. Congress should not allow this to happen. Congress cannot allow this to happen.

Decisive action against the Iranian regime is about protecting America and about protecting Americans. It is about protecting our troops stationed across the Middle East. It is about protecting our citizens abroad and our allies in the region.

Iran cannot have a nuclear weapon.

For too long, the Iranian regime has acted with impunity as it murders its own people, tortures its own people, and destroys its own people. There is simply no justification for allowing this regime and its leaders to continue to exist.

America will not wait to be hit first and will not gamble with American lives. America will not allow the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism to obtain the most dangerous weapon on the face of the Earth.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. ANSARI).

Ms. ANSARI. Mr. Speaker, the Islamic Republic is a barbaric, corrupt regime that has murdered, imprisoned, and terrorized its own people for decades.

As the daughter of Iranian immigrants who fled this regime, I know personally what its violence means. Members of my family and friends have been brutalized and murdered by the Islamic Republic. My grandfather was imprisoned by the regime, and my family member was beheaded by them. The horror stories go on.

Let me be very clear: I have spent my entire life opposing the Islamic Republic and its brutality, and I celebrate

the death of Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei.

At the same time, as an American Congresswoman, who swore an oath to the United States Constitution, I am deeply concerned by President Trump's decision to launch an illegal war—because it is, in fact, illegal—against Iran without congressional authorization and without presenting a clear plan to the American people.

War carries profound and deadly consequences for our troops, for the American people, and for the entire world. It is the most serious decision that a nation can make. The American people deserve debate, transparency, and accountability before that decision is made.

The Constitution is clear: the power to declare war rests with Congress. I want nothing more than a free Iran and safety and security for innocent Iranians. That requires more than force. It requires seriousness, accountability, and a real plan to support the Iranian people in determining their own future.

Donald Trump has shown at every instance that freedom for the people of Iran is not his priority. Every few hours the administration jumps to a new justification or objective for this war, but never is a democratic transition and self-determination for Iranians a part of the discussion. This was echoed last night by senior administration officials at the briefing to Members of Congress.

Ultimately, this vote is about the legitimacy of our democracy and our Constitution, and that is why I will be voting "yes" on the War Powers Resolution.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, before I reserve again, I would just invite the previous speaker to explain. If Iran posed an emergency, an existential threat to America, I would be happy to hear it.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution.

Donald Trump is unilaterally dragging this Nation into an illegal and unjustified war with Iran.

As someone who has survived the horrors of war, I know that bombs do not build peace or create stability. Military strikes will not make us safer. They will inflame tensions and push the region further into chaos.

Every time people abandon diplomacy, they choose destruction. Congress knows who will bear the cost of this decision: innocent civilians caught in the crossfire and young servicemembers sent into harm's way.

The American people are exhausted by endless wars built on false promises and paid for with American and foreign lives.

Congress must reassert its constitutional authority. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" to stop U.S. involvement in another illegal forever war.

□ 1710

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I heard the same comments about Venezuela. There has been no forever war there, and that did bring peace and stability to the Venezuelan people. I guess we are proving the previous comments wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this resolution.

Directing President Trump to withdraw combat operations in Iran is not only foolish, but it is dangerous. Pulling back now will solidify the regime's brutal grip on the great people of Iran and put American troops in grave danger.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are claiming we must pass this resolution because President Trump acted without an imminent threat to U.S. forces in the region. Are we serious? No imminent threat?

Iran and its proxies have been soaking themselves in American blood for nearly 50 years. Are we to believe that, one, their ballistic missile program is not dangerous; two, their nuclear program is not anything; or, three, their vast proxy network of terrorists all over the world is not an imminent threat to U.S. forces?

Our veterans know the answer to that question. They, unlike most of us, have been fighting Iran well before the start of Operation Epic Fury. They have been under imminent threat for decades. Attack after attack, Iran and its proxies have seldom passed up an opportunity to kill Americans, and the other side of the aisle knows it.

The President is well within his Article II authorities to defend U.S. forces from needless bloodshed. To do so, Iran's offensive military capabilities must be destroyed.

This is not a war of choice. This is an intervention to prevent a future full-scale war in the Middle East that we must avoid.

President Trump knows this and so do my colleagues on the other side. The difference is that President Trump has the foresight to make this difficult but prudent decision.

As we debate in this Chamber, our military is quickly dismantling the Iranian threat. When this is all over soon, we will be much safer for it.

God bless and protect our Armed Forces, and our prayers are with the fallen and their families. We are able to stand here today because of generations of their sacrifice. Semper Fidelis.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the ranking member of the House Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, nobody is defending the Ayatollah. There is no love lost for a brutal government that sponsors terror and murders their people.

Iran has been doing this for decades. Everybody knows that. So my question

is this: Why wasn't Donald Trump in favor of regime change until this weekend? Why did he campaign on swearing he would never send American kids to fight and die in the Middle East?

Republicans can't answer because they were against war with Iran until exactly the second Donald Trump decided to go to war. Now, they are all running around sounding like neocon lunatics.

America can't take this level of gaslighting.

I went to the classified briefing. There was no imminent threat, I guess unless Republicans want to redefine the word "imminent" to mean stretching back 47 years.

This whole thing is just so transparently built on lies. Republicans went from imminent threat to regime change to nukes back to imminent threat in the last 24 hours.

I will tell you what this is, Mr. Speaker. This is Iraq 2.0. I still remember the lies about WMDs. I voted against that war, too. At least George Bush had the decency to lie to people's faces.

By the way, no congressional vote can legitimize this because there was no imminent threat. There was no U.N. Security Council resolution. This war is illegal, no matter what you want to call it.

It is not Donald Trump's kids that will have to fight and die for their draft-dodging dad. It is not the children of the billionaire Epstein class. It is working-class kids who are going to put their lives on the line.

Shame on Republicans. I am sick of this bs. We are spending billions of dollars a day on a war, and we can't even get Republicans to join us to expand healthcare in America.

How the hell is this America First? You guys broke your top campaign promise. Good luck with that. I hope the defense contractor money was worth it. Shame on you all. The mask is off. You are all just a bunch of pathetic neocon warmongers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Ohio). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), vice chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, in addition to the disparaging of the President, the previous speaker implied that this was about money from defense contractors. Shame on anyone who would say that.

I was a first lieutenant about to be a captain when the war was declared against us 47 years ago. Iran has been at war with us and the world for 47 years.

In 1982, I was a young captain when they killed 220 marines with their bombs and their proxies in Lebanon.

Should we say, in fact, this is not defense of America against a country that every day for 47 years has said

that we are the evil ones and must be destroyed? First of all, the right to defend, going back to Thomas Jefferson, has not been a question of the Constitution. It has been an obligation of the President.

To invoke the War Powers Act as though this is not defense and then to imply that there is any purpose other than to recognize that this pervasive threat that has killed Americans and others around the world decade after decade was getting stronger and stronger?

Even though I hear that there was no U.N., no this or that, I have visited Ukraine, where their assembled parts are killing Americans, Russians, Ukrainians, anyone they want because they are an exporter of terror.

The fact is, around the world, we are at war with the country of Iran. In my ancestral country of Lebanon, today, their proxies are firing on Israel in support of their hatred of the little Satan, we being the big Satan.

Am I defending the actions of the President? You betcha. I have defended it for my entire quarter of a century here, regardless of the party.

The only thing I can't defend is the idea that we have placated and empowered Iran time and time again, so that today the job is harder and longer than it otherwise would be.

Lastly, there is no question that if we withdraw or cease at this time, we are saying to the next Ayatollah, the next Supreme Leader, that, in fact, the United States will not see this through. We will be empowering them to spread their terror, to have more American blood on their hands as a result.

Mr. Speaker, I urge "no" on this resolution because it is not only unconstitutional, but it is also ill-advised at a time in which we are defending America.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the next speaker as well, it would appear, voted to say: "Use all means necessary to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon." He clearly thought that there was a pretty damn imminent threat going on there, but I look forward to hearing the remarks.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thought the President would follow the Constitution.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DELUZIO).

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

I support the bipartisan War Powers Resolution. We find ourselves, once again, in a foolish regime change war, much like the one that my generation was sent to serve in Iraq that cost thousands of lives and a trillion-plus dollars.

I have heard lots of justifications on the other side for why this, number one, isn't a war while I heard the gentleman from New York call it a war.

That is what it is. The Defense Secretary has called it a war. That is what this is.

I have seen pointing to different authorities here and there, between the laws, that might justify this.

Congress has not declared war. Congress has not provided a statutory Authorization for Use of Military Force. The third condition of the War Powers Resolution that could allow the President to do such a thing is that the United States is under attack. We, of course, were not under attack when the President started this war that we don't need to fight today.

That is the War Powers Resolution. Those are the three bases that a President can use force under the War Powers Resolution.

Let's not forget that the American people want life to be less of a rip-off here at home. They want healthcare they can afford and housing. I can go on and on.

What they don't want is Americans coming back in flag-draped caskets and billions of dollars spent overseas.

□ 1720

Today I asked the Trump administration officials for the cost of this war. They can't answer the question. Those are the basic things you have to know before you send Americans to fight, Mr. Speaker.

We should support this resolution and put a stop to this now.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership, service, and sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 38 which would limit the President's ability to protect the American people from Iran's terrorist regime. I believe that this resolution—and maybe misunderstood—sends a troubling message to our troops and a perhaps interpreted welcome message to our enemy.

The War Powers Act is very clear. Enacted in 1973, it requires the President to notify Congress within 48 hours of deploying forces, and the President has 60 days before he must seek congressional approval.

President Trump has clearly acted within the provisions of the War Powers Act. President Obama, on the other hand, used these authorities to launch operations in Libya for over 7 months, Iraq, Syria, and Yemen. President Biden invoked the same authorities for strikes against threats in Syria, Iraq, and Yemen. Yet no resolution to limit those Presidents was brought up in this House by our colleagues.

As Secretary Rubio said, and he described in great detail, there was an imminent threat upon the United States and our allies from Iran.

Speaker JOHNSON also warned: The idea that Congress would now take away the ability of the Commander in Chief is dangerous and is a threat to

the safety of the United States of America.

We must remember whom we are dealing with. We are dealing with Iran, which has been a terrorist state for 47 years. Its proxies range from Hezbollah to Hamas to the Houthis, and the list goes on. Directly and through these proxies, Iran has maimed and killed thousands of Americans. They orchestrated the massacre in Israel on October 7. We know this.

They are, in fact, doing their utmost to continue enriching uranium to make it weapons grade. According to Special Envoy Witkoff, just the other day, the Iranian negotiators opened negotiations by bragging about presently controlling 460 kilograms of uranium enriched to 60 percent, enough weapons-grade material for 11 bombs within 4 to 6 weeks.

Because of this regime's reign of terror, their own civilians rose up and protested, Mr. Speaker. Over the last 2 months, there are reports that as many as 90,000 Iranian civilians were murdered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILL of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, President Trump has strategically developed regional trust throughout the Middle East. This is why we have a strong coalition in this region to confront this threat. Today, Iran is an island thanks to the strategy of the Trump administration.

The Iran of the past, one that oppresses and commits terrorism and all kinds of atrocities on its own people and the world, is history.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, from his first day in public office, President Trump has made it clear that he wants to rule America by imperial decree. He didn't want to be king just for a day in America. He wants to be king of the universe. Congress is just a nuisance that can be avoided, the courts are an occasional speed bump, and international law is just a suggestion to this President.

In his decree declaring war on Iran, he glibly responded to the loss of American lives by saying: "That's the way it is."

With no clear objectives, no approval from the Congress, and no commitment to keep the ground troops out, more American deaths and billions of taxpayer dollars wasted will be "the way it is."

We know that in this regard, Trump is not America First. At best, he is America second, as Secretary Rubio confessed this week.

Trump is too weak to follow President Bush's wise example of saying no to Netanyahu. He has dragged us into a war without an imminent threat. He

has committed us to a war that will further destabilize an already unstable region of the world, and in Trump's own words, this war will go on "as long as it takes."

The last war like that cost 4,400 American lives and \$2 trillion of taxpayer money.

While certainly I do not mourn the death of any of these despots in Iran who have done so much harm, under Trump's clueless approach, we may just be replacing one tyrant with another. We already see what is happening to our embassies, our military facilities, and our airports where many Americans are stranded abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of this resolution to stop Trump's forever war. Unless it is approved, Trump will only be encouraged to grab more and more power on his drive for total authoritarian, one-man rule in this country and the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think I figured something out. If my colleagues keep saying that 4 days is forever, then maybe that is why they can't talk about what imminent threat means. They can't figure out the definition of these things.

Imminent threat, I have done pretty well to define what makes Iran an imminent threat. They don't want to speak about that. They don't even want to acknowledge it a little bit that, hey, maybe there is even a little chance that Iran could attack us this day. They don't even want to acknowledge it the slightest bit. They want to paint it as though it is just black and white, no shot whatsoever, no threat at all coming from Iran, even though they voted for things to say: Use all means necessary to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

It is amazing to me, even though they have difficulty defining other words as well.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I never heard Donald Trump say it was an imminent threat.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this War Powers Resolution. This is a war of choice disguised as a war of necessity.

During the last several days, President Trump offered a shifting list of justifications: regime change; retribution; helping protesters; stopping Iran's missile and nuclear weapons program, a program that Trump claimed just last year that he obliterated; and a ballistic missile program that the Department of Defense says is not going to be capable of reaching the U.S. until 2035.

The Secretary of State, Marco Rubio, offered another. He said that we had to

strike first in case Iran might retaliate after a possible Israeli attack.

Think about that. It is not because Iran posed an imminent threat, not because Congress authorized war, but because someone else might attack.

This is not a strategy. This is cherry-picking facts and lying to the American public to justify a predetermined decision to launch a war.

So Americans are asking two questions: Why are we doing this?

And how does it end?

The Constitution is clear. The President cannot start a war alone.

We need to make sure that the people's Representatives are involved.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GOMEZ. That is because once troops are in harm's way, missions expand, and working families get a knock on the door that changes their lives forever.

The cost of this war will not just be measured by dollars spent but in lives lost, bodies broken, and conflicts that rarely stay confined to where they began.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to be clear about what this resolution is not. It is not a vote for or against war with Iran. It is not an authorization for use of military force. It does not prevent the United States from defending itself. It does not restrict our U.S. military from protecting our troops or our assets or our interests.

Mr. Speaker, you may have heard some of those claims on the other side today. They are wrong.

What is the War Powers Resolution?

What is it?

It is simple. It simply requires hostilities to stop unless and until Congress does what the Constitution says it should do: authorize them. That is what the Constitution says. It affirms a basic principle: No President can take this action or take this Nation to war against whomever whenever that President wishes to do it without congressional authorization.

□ 1730

This is a war. The administration has said so themselves. We have heard many Members on the other side of the aisle say this is a war. This is a war, but it is a war of choice, not a war authorized by the United States Congress.

In the administration's own war powers notification—and if you haven't read it, we will give it to you—they do not use or mention the word "imminent" at all, not once. The administration has presented no imminent threat. Why? It is because it cannot.

I want to give my colleagues the definition of the word "imminent." If it was so imminent, Donald Trump didn't do anything when he was the President before.

How long will this war last? We don't know. The administration doesn't seem to know. Their stated objectives are expansive and shifting every day. They seem to shift. One day I heard them say it was regime change. The next day I heard them say it is nuclear weapons. Then after that, it was ballistic missiles, and then we heard the Secretary of State say Israel was going to strike first, and so we felt we had to. Otherwise, Iran would strike first.

Mr. Speaker, this administration's case for war makes the Bush administration's weapons of mass destruction story look like a well-documented Ph.D. dissertation.

Now, to the Members of Congress who disagree with my opposition to this war: I disagree because I have listened and I have heard, and I disagree with this war. But I say to them: If you disagree with this war, it is your prerogative, but you should vote. We should have a vote.

This vote is not about whether or not you support military action. It is about whether you believe Congress should have a say. In essence, it kind of meant should we exist. The Constitution said we should exist. We were created as a country because they were running from a king who did not want a Congress, who didn't have a Congress, who could just do whatever he wanted.

That is why the first thing that the Founders said is Congress should be the only one that had the power. Leader JEFFRIES said—and he went back to a Republican Member of the House of Representatives, Abraham Lincoln, who said: "The provisions of the Constitution giving the war making power to Congress was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons. Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, the good of the people was the object. This, our Convention understood to be the most oppressive of all Kingly oppressions; and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us"—no one man.

We took an oath. We swore to uphold Article I of the Constitution. Our constituents expect us to deliberate on matters of war and peace.

Did we deliberate on it? No.

Have we had hearings in the House Foreign Affairs Committee? No.

Have we had Mr. Jared Kushner here to talk about it? He was supposed to have been negotiating. No.

Have we had Steve Witkoff here? No.

Have we had anyone other than—they came for other reasons; we were able to ask a few questions—than Secretary Rubio come? No.

Has there been not dialogue and conversation? We have the so-called Gang of Eight, and they want to say that is

notification. Well, let's talk about it. We didn't ever debate anything on the floor of the House.

How many times has the Gang of Eight met? Once. Speaker JOHNSON would say that is sufficient. Even in that, this imminent strike was never mentioned. We heard from Mr. HIMES, who is part of the Gang of Eight. The next time the Gang of Eight was heard was only a few hours before the one who wants to be king said he was going to attack. That is the only dialogue and conversation that took place before the strike.

There has been no debate on the floor, no trying to talk to the Members of Congress and, most importantly, the American people because just before the State of the Union, when the President had the whole world, we heard a whole 2-hour speech, the longest in the history of these United States of America, Iran was hardly a mention. If it was an imminent threat, I would think he would want to tell the Nation at that time that we had to do something imminently.

We have soldiers who have died, and the President starts talking about curtains and reconstruction and putting gold things up because he likes it. He told families, Gold Star families now unfortunately, that it wasn't serious enough.

This is a serious situation. Congress is a coequal branch of government. The Framers vested the war powers in this body because they believed no single person should bring this Nation to war alone, and so today we either defend our principles or surrender it. I urge my colleagues to join me in defending it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, my colleague ended with: "This is serious."

This is serious. It is more serious than when my colleagues can't even acknowledge a hint of an emergency, a hint of imminence related to the threat of Iran—there is nothing to see there—even though last Congress so many of them voted, including Ranking Member MEEKS, to say use all means necessary to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

Why would they say "all means necessary"? I guess it is because a year ago they believed it to be that imminent, that important.

It was said by the ranking member, their bill doesn't prevent the U.S. from defending ourselves. It literally does. Let me read the text for you: ". . . directs the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran or any part of its government or military, unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war . . ."

That means the President cannot go out there and defend the United States of America. It is saying the President has no Article II authority to go out there and defend the United States of America. That is literally what they are saying.

□ 1740

He said our hostilities must stop, but I can promise you, the hostilities of Iran will not stop, have never stopped until the United States of America makes this decision to stop them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank President Trump for having the courage, the strength, and the resolve to stop the imminent threat of Iran from attacking the United States of America as they have week after week, year after year for the last 47 years. It is the very definition of imminent.

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 38, Directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to remove United States Armed Forces from unauthorized hostilities in the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran have had an adversarial relationship since the 1979 Iranian Revolution. In 1979, Iranian theocratic revolutionaries removed Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, who was a close U.S. ally, and the current Islamic Republic was declared. The establishment of the Islamic Republic, also known as the Iranian regime, in conjunction with the U.S. Embassy hostage crisis, laid the groundwork for the United States to have no diplomatic relations with Iran beginning in 1980.

Since 1979, the United States has used sanctions and diplomacy to deter, constrain, and encourage the Iranian regime to change its egregious behavior. That behavior includes supporting terrorism at home and becoming the globe's largest state sponsor of terrorism, developing a nuclear weapon program, proliferation activities, destabilizing the region through its ballistic missile and drone development, and attacks directly and indirectly killing Americans for over four decades. That sanction posture is now over four decades old.

In 1979, the Carter Administration imposed sanctions on Iran in response to the U.S. Embassy hostage crisis. In the 1980s and 1990s, Congress expanded sanctions on Iran to deter and compel the Iranian regime to stop supporting international terrorism and its pursuit of advanced weapons, including chemical, biological, and nuclear. In 2002, the United States and our allies learned about previously undisclosed nuclear facilities in Iran. In response, the United States and our allies imposed further sanctions on Iran to convince the Iranian regime to limit its nuclear activities. The Iranian regime did not stop or limit the activities, so in 2006 the United Nations Security Council imposed multinational sanctions preventing trade with Iran. In 2009, the Iranian regime violently cracked down on mass protests over its 2009 presidential election. In response, Congress targeted more sanctions on Iran that aimed at Iran's oil exports and economic sector. Congress determined that to lift those sanctions, the Iranian regime must stop its support of international terrorism and end its proliferation activities. That has never happened, as the Iranian regime is the number one state sponsor of terrorism and has continued to pursue nuclear and advanced weapons.

In 2015, the Obama Administration tried a new approach of appeasement and entered the United States into the disastrous Joint

Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCOPA). This is also known as the "2015 Iran nuclear deal," which required Iran to curb its nuclear program, reduce uranium enrichment by 98 percent, and dismantle most centrifuges. In exchange, the United States, China, France, Germany, Russia, and the United Kingdom agreed to provide significant relief from international sanctions imposed on Iran. This deal was disastrous because Iran continued to enrich uranium and pursue their nuclear weapons goals. In addition to that disastrous policy, the Obama Administration transferred \$1.7 billion in cash to Iran in January 2016. On top of that, the 2015 Iran nuclear deal allowed billions in new commerce to flow into Iran. Again, remember that the Iranian regime is the number one state sponsor of terrorism. That money benefited the Iranian regime's dangerous behavior.

In 2018, President Trump pulled the United States out of the disastrous 2015 Iran nuclear deal and announced that the United States would reimpose sanctions on Iran. With no delay, Iran escalated its regional military activities, which included directly attacking the United States forces in the region.

The Biden Administration was unable to deter the Iranian regime. In addition, the Biden Administration recklessly provided Iran with sanctions relief that gave Iran access to approximately 816 billion in previously frozen funds. Those shortsighted actions of the Biden Administration sadly played a part in the build-up of the October 7th attack on Israel by the Iranian regime-backed terrorist organization, Hamas. In response, Congress passed new sanctions on any foreign financial institution that engages in transactions with the \$6 billion in Iranian funds. In 2024, my bill, the Holding Iranian Leaders Accountable Act, was signed into law to expose the Iranian regime's financial corruption.

In 2025, back in the White House, the Trump Administration renewed a "Maximum Pressure" campaign on the Iranian regime. The actions by President Trump and his Administration recognize that nearly five decades of sanctions imposed bilaterally and by the United Nations have failed to stop Iran's destructive ambitions. The Trump Administration recognizes that years of intensive but ultimately futile negotiations over Iran's nuclear weapons program accomplished nothing and were rightly rejected by bipartisan majorities in both the House and Senate at the end of the Obama Administration.

Today, the House is considering a War Powers Resolution. This War Powers Resolution does not account for the nearly five decades of history. This resolution is not about whether we support the major combat operation that is currently ongoing in Iran—it is about curbing the power of the Executive Branch, specifically the President, to protect the United States from the Iranian regime. Taking away the authorities granted to the President under the War Powers Resolution in the very midst of an ongoing major combat operation is reckless and shortsighted.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose H. Con. Res. 38.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, supportive of this measure which would bring an end to United States involvement in hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran. Decisions of war and peace are some of the most serious and consequential that could be

made by our government, and as such the framers of the Constitution delegated the power to declare war exclusively to Congress, the body meant to represent the will and deliberation of the people themselves. The purpose of this delegation of power was in part to ensure no single person could be influenced by poor judgment to make a deadly miscalculation.

This is precisely what is happening to us today. President Trump, emboldened by a questionable operation in Venezuela and manipulated by Prime Minister Netanyahu, has sacrificed American lives and military resources in a regime change operation. The American people have been very vocal with their elected officials. They are tired of war. They want us to focus our energy and treasure on improving American lives at home.

War in all its forms is Hell. Only occasionally, and after careful consideration, can this Hell on Earth be considered necessary. It is Congress' duty to conduct this deliberation, and to ensure no one person can declare war. Congress must reclaim its constitutional authority to declare war. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired. Pursuant to the order of the House of March 3, 2026, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution.

The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

THANKING THORNTON FIRE DEPARTMENT AND FIRST RESPONDERS

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

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the Thornton Fire Department, the Thornton Police Department, and every assisting first responder who rushed to the scene last week to extinguish a suburban wildfire in my district.

As a former cop and Army National Guard Black Hawk helicopter pilot who fought wildfires, I am proud of these first responders and their continued dedication to protecting our communities. What could have been a devastating disaster resulted in no loss of life or homes thanks to these brave heroes.

However, as the Marshall fire, the worst wildfire in Colorado history, reminds us, suburban wildfires can become catastrophic, and emergency management funding is critical in disaster-prone regions like Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my Democrat colleagues to vote in favor of the Department of Homeland Security's

appropriation bill and restore FEMA funding, emergency management funding, for my constituents and for constituents around the country.

WAR IN IRAN

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, too many Americans cannot afford their health insurance. Medical facilities are facing serious cutbacks and staff shortages. Housing is unaffordable for millions of our people, and the cost of living is getting out of hand.

Instead of addressing any one of these critical issues here at home, this weekend, the Trump-Vance administration singularly launched a regime-change war on Iran. Significant U.S. military forces and hundreds of millions of dollars are being deployed without congressional authorization.

As a cosponsor of the Iran War Powers Resolution, I know that no such vote was called in either Chamber of Congress prior to this profound and unprecedented military action.

As Americans from coast to coast honor the sacrifice of the six brave servicemembers who already lost their lives in this war, our people have a right to hear debate before more U.S. troops and military assets are sent abroad. Billions and billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars are being expended in this war which could last for weeks or months or years.

The economic impact of the closure of the Strait of Hormuz is already being felt. Yesterday, the price of gasoline was bobbing up and down, up and down. The American people deserve affordability, not more foreign wars.

COUNTERING IRAN'S AGGRESSION AND PROTECTING OUR COUNTRY

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

Ms. GILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the Iranian regime as it threatens the United States and our ally Israel.

Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terror, bankrolling the heinous terrorist groups Hamas, Hezbollah, and the Houthis.

The regime and its proxies seek to destroy America and Israel and wreak havoc across the Middle East.

Let me be clear: Iran can never be allowed to obtain nuclear weapons, and the United States must always be prepared to act to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran.

Our Nation is eternally grateful to the brave servicemembers who are keeping us safe, and we mourn those who have been lost in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the administration will come to Congress with a plan and work with us to counter Iran's aggression and protect our country.

CHILDREN'S SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. MOORE of Utah was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be joined by my colleagues this evening.

Before my remarks, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CRANK).

Mr. CRANK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, America often faces difficult moments and difficult choices. Presidents are no different. They often-times have to face difficult decisions, and I hope that Members of this body will think about their vote as they decide whether to support the President in this effort or not and apply the same standard.

I have always thought to try and apply the same standard, whether the President belongs to the Republican Party or the Democratic Party, apply the same standard.

I rise today in support of President Trump's action against Iran. The Iranian regime has been threatening America for nearly 50 years. It has killed countless American citizens, and it has brutally killed our servicemembers.

I had a gentleman in my district come up to me the other day. This was before the President took action, and he said: We must take action. He said: I have lost 20 of my friends to the Iranians, to their terror throughout the years. He had served 24 years in the United States Army.

In years prior, we have had Presidents use strikes against our enemies and have done it without congressional approval because the Constitution does a couple of things. In Article I, it gives Congress the power to declare war, but in Article II, it gives the President the power to be the Commander in Chief. Our Founders intentionally made it inherently contradict in that way.

They wanted to diffuse power. They didn't want to give all the power to Congress, and they didn't want to give all the power to the President of the United States, so they intentionally did that. Presidents throughout time have used that.

Thomas Jefferson in the First Barbary War did not come to Congress. He deployed troops in the Barbary War. The War of 1812, the same thing was done, although Congress did come back and authorize and declare war. It wasn't done at first.

We have had Presidents use these strikes against our enemies without