

was the one who fixed our election system in the State of Florida and became a national model.

But I knew Bill best as a friend. He was a person who always took the time with all of us who wanted to understand the intricacies of how legislation was passed and how to really get things done.

If you had a problem to solve back in the State Legislature, you went to Bill. Here in Congress, he served so ably for 16 years.

Most importantly, as I mentioned before, his heart was always in Brevard County. But his heart was closest with his wife, Katie. As was said so well, and I want to say it again, they were inseparable.

It was such a thrill to always see them because they were on a mission to make sure that the values and principles that founded this Nation were always pushed forward.

Mr. Speaker, I request a moment of silence to remember our good friend and an American patriot, former Congressman Bill Posey.

□ 1850

#### HONORING FORMER SENATOR DON RIEGLE

(Ms. McDONALD RIVET asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. McDONALD RIVET. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues to honor a true champion for the city of Flint and the great State of Michigan: former Congressman and former Senator Don Riegle.

For 28 years, under seven Presidents, Don Riegle stood tall as a principled leader, always fighting to give families a fair shot.

He led efforts to make it easier for working people to buy a home, bring more investments to the communities that needed them the most, stand up for Gulf war veterans exposed to toxic chemicals, and rally against bad trade deals like NAFTA.

He made Washington a better place, and he always put our constituents first.

There are many in this Chamber today who were lucky enough to consider Don not just a colleague but a mentor and a friend. I got to know Don better in recent years, and I will never forget the lessons he shared with me about what it means to be a true servant leader for the communities we both love.

Our hearts go up to Lori, his wife of 48 years; as well as his children; grandchildren; and all his family and friends.

Our country joins them in mourning one of the greatest public servants Michigan has ever known: Don Riegle.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleague to join me in a moment of silence.

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

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of April 27, 2026, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 75) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from hostilities against 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 (Mr. MOORE of Utah). Pursuant to the order of the House of April 27, 2026, the concurrent resolution is considered as read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 75

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

#### SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Islamic Republic of Iran is the leading state sponsor of terrorism and an adversary of the United States.

(2) The Islamic Republic of Iran seeks to pose a threat to the United States, its Armed Forces, and allies through its ballistic missile program, its sponsorship of terrorist proxy forces, and pursuit of a nuclear weapon.

(3) The Islamic Republic of Iran engages in a range of destabilizing activities across the Middle East and the world which have resulted in scores of American deaths since 1979.

(4) Congress has the sole power to declare war under article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

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

(6) United States Armed Forces were introduced into hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran on February 28, 2026.

(7) The President is mandated to brief Congress on the deployment of United States forces, included their estimated scope and duration of their continued use, under the War Powers Resolution.

#### SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF USE OF FORCE.

(a) TERMINATION.—Pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)), Congress hereby directs the President to remove the use of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran or any part of its government or military, including potential ground forces in a combat role or used for occupation, by not later than the date that is 30 days after the date described in section 1(6), 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 may be construed to—

(1) prevent the United States from defending itself, its Armed Forces, its diplomatic facilities, or allied states from imminent attack;

(2) prevent the United States Armed Forces from maintaining a troop presence in the region for defensive purposes; or

(3) force the removal of United States Armed Forces in the region who are not engaged in hostilities against Iran.

#### SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO INTELLIGENCE SHARING.

Nothing in this resolution may be construed to influence or disrupt any intelligence, counterintelligence, or investigative activities relating to threats in or emanating from Iran or surrounding countries 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 RELATING TO NONAUTHORIZATION OF THE 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 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by Representative MAST of Florida and Representative MEEKS of New York, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes 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 reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 75. I thank Mr. GOTTHEIMER for this resolution.

We are here for a third time—a third time—because congressional inaction has cost Americans paying a lot and suffering a lot.

Most Americans oppose this war. Now, this is not my opinion. It is a fact. It is not unpatriotic to say so. It is honest, which is what Americans want and what Americans deserve from their government.

The opposition to this war has just continued to grow. As we stand here today, CBS News found 60 percent of Americans oppose the war. RMG Research, a Republican-leaning firm, has the most recent survey on RealClear Politics. It finds the war is opposed by 59 percent of Americans with only roughly one-third in support.

□ 1900

A recent PBS News poll shows that 81 percent of Americans are feeling the

strain of increased gas prices on their families.

My colleagues across the aisle are defending a war that their own voters really oppose. They can and will, I am sure, deflect, but you cannot escape the facts.

The American people are tired of costly misadventures in the Middle East, and they are right to be tired. They are tired of wars. They thought this President said he would not get them into a war, but, as he wanted to change the Defense Department, he basically said he was going to get into wars because they want to call it the Department of War.

Let's look at the full cost of this war, not cherry-picked facts that some prefer.

The Israelis did strike and kill Supreme Leader Khamenei. We still have a Supreme Leader Khamenei. This new Supreme Leader is 30 years younger and widely considered more extreme, less practical, and more hostile to the United States than his father. We removed a devil we knew and replaced him with one that we don't.

It is a fact that U.S. strikes against Iran have depleted Iran's stock of missiles and drones. The New York Times reported just yesterday that Iran has regained access to most of its missile sites, and there is evidence Iran has restored operational access to 30 of the 33 missile sites it maintains along the Strait of Hormuz.

Iran still has a significant drone capacity. Shahed drone manufacturing is low cost, quick to produce, and easier to conceal than missile production.

Here is what my colleagues do not want to talk about. Per public reporting—this is in the public sphere—we have used 20 percent of our long-range joint air-to-surface missiles and 30 percent of our Tomahawks. We have expended 45 percent of our Precision Strike Missiles, half of our THAAD interceptors, and 50 percent of our Patriot missile interceptors.

These are incredible military capabilities. We are burning through them at an unsustainable rate in a theater that is not our most urgent strategic priority.

Our allies are seeing yearslong delays on the purchases of U.S. arms into the 2030s, undermining their own strategic posture.

My colleagues on the other side who profess to be China hawks should be sounding the alarm right now about the impacts of this war on our Indo-Pacific readiness.

Before the first strike, there was no serious diplomatic off-ramp used. This was and this is a war of choice. It was from the start, and it is now. The American people are paying the price.

This war has also demonstrated to Iran the effectiveness of weaponizing the Strait of Hormuz. Oil prices have skyrocketed. Americans are paying more to take their kids to school and to drive to work. It seems as though, unless you are Secretary Duffy, family

vacations are out of reach because of skyrocketing fuel prices. Rising fertilizer and gasoline costs are making it more difficult to put food on the table.

Just recently, President Trump, when asked by a reporter—I believe it was yesterday—if he is considering America's financial situation when it comes to making a deal to end his war of choice, what was his response? Was he considerate? What did he say? "Not even a little bit." He went on to say: "I don't think about Americans' financial situation." Maybe he is telling the truth, I guess, but the American people need to know that he doesn't think about it. He says: "I don't think about anybody." I think that sentiment couldn't be clearer.

We still don't have the exact figures on the cost of this war. The Trump administration's latest estimate is \$29 billion, which is an enormous figure for an unnecessary and failing war and is far below other reasonable estimates, which suggest the war costs more than a billion dollars a day.

Of course, the highest costs to our country have been to the more than 400 soldiers who have been wounded in the conflict and the 14 who have made the ultimate sacrifice. We honor them. The best way to honor them is to end a war that was never in America's national interests.

The record speaks for itself. Most Americans—yes, most Americans, and that is Democrats, Republicans, liberals, conservatives, and Independents—oppose this war.

Iranian leadership remains a deadly and motivated enemy. They have weaponized the Strait of Hormuz against the world. Our stock of crucial weapon systems has been depleted to shocking levels.

This war is reaching right into the wallets of hardworking Americans every single day, every single hour, and every single minute that it continues.

This debate, for me, isn't about politics. This debate isn't about theatrics. This debate is about reality. The reality is that this war of choice was never in America's national interests.

To my colleagues who believe the administration's claims that Iran posed an imminent threat, a claim that, actually, they have never been able to support with any evidence, the War Powers Act is clear. We are well past 60 days now into this war.

Without congressional approval and without an Authorization for Use of Military Force, the administration must begin to draw down forces to end hostilities. That is not something that I am saying; that is what the law says.

Nothing in the statute says anything about a cease-fire, which is what they are trying to come up with. Even if we were in one, U.S. strikes on Iranian targets continue, as does the U.S. blockade itself, an act of war.

Let's not pretend that renaming the operation weeks later makes this a new conflict. The American people are smarter than that. They can see

through that. It is clear that the administration is concerned about the legality of this war, and it should be. This is a war of choice.

Congress must make clear to the Trump administration that it cannot continue, not without an AUMF passed by this Congress.

□ 1910

We are representatives of the people. We have a responsibility, and the President has a responsibility, and at this moment his responsibility is to come back to Congress, not SCOTUS, not to make up some reason not to come to get an AUMF or this War Powers Act.

I am going to urge the Republican majority not to join Democrats to support the Gottheimer resolution—and I know that is what it is—but really to join the American people.

Join the American people. I gave you the numbers. Join them to send a message that this time of which we are in is the time to end the war and for us to return to a more sane and sustainable path.

Join the American people to secure our interests in the Middle East, yes, and to ensure Americans are safe and prosperous in the process.

Join the American people. They want the executive branch to come to the people. It is clear this is the time. This is the third time that we have been here. We may have to come back, I know, again and again, and there have been all kinds of things to prevent folks from having the vote, but join the American people. It is time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have a smile on my face. I am laughing because in the whole 10 minutes that I just listened to my colleague speak, there was not one mention of what this bill actually does or says. It is probably really convenient to not reference anything that this bill says.

I will tell you why it is really convenient for my colleague across the aisle. He said: We could never show any evidence that Iran posed an imminent threat. He said it numerous times and said it other days that we were going through the same song and dance. So why does he not want to mention the bill? It is because him voting for this bill that he is going to vote for—he is going to vote "yes" on this bill—what does the bill say right in its text? It outlines the imminent threat that Iran is. Thank you to the author of this bill for the bill that you are going to vote for. Let me quote the bill since maybe you didn't read it. "The Islamic Republic of Iran is the leading state sponsor of terrorism and an adversary of the United States." That is one of many.

"The Islamic Republic of Iran seeks to pose a threat to the United States, its Armed Forces, and allies through its ballistic missile program, its sponsorship of terrorist proxy forces, and

pursuit of a nuclear weapon." There are many more whereas clauses in this.

It literally states the imminent threat that they are. So I look forward to you voting "yes" on the imminent threat that Iran is, my colleagues over there, and just proving to yourselves and proving to everybody just how wrong you are, how you probably didn't read this bill, and how you have no interest in actually speaking the truth about what it says.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Utah). Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair.

The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for the time. I appreciate his leadership on highlighting the error of removing the United States Armed Forces from an action that will bring an end to a 47-year conflict.

Mr. Speaker, introducing this provision at this point in time reeks of political gamesmanship when President Trump and his administration are actively engaged in negotiations to bring the tyrannical reign of Iran, the largest state sponsor of terrorism, which the text indicates is the case, to an end.

Placing restrictions on the President both undercuts the ongoing U.S. negotiations and supports the Iranian regime in their 47-year journey to hold the world hostage with a nuclear weapon and approves of the reprehensible slaughter of reportedly more than 30,000 Iranians. To make matters worse, Iran is attempting to use their illegal attempt to close an international strait as leverage in the negotiations.

I am not sure if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle missed the media reporting, but the United States is not engaged in military operations in Iran right now. President Trump's position is consistent with past practices of both Republican and Democratic administrations.

In 1993, a Democrat administration's position was that the War Powers Act clock actually stops when hostilities ceased.

Due to the great success of Operation Epic Fury, the U.S. is currently positioned with the upper hand, and this resolution would completely turn the power over to the tyrannical Iranian regime.

The Iranian regime is the most weakened it has been in the past half-decade. This is a historic opportunity. Their air force has been dismantled. Their navy is currently at the bottom of the ocean. Their command and control structure no longer exists, and their weapons supplies are depleted. They are out of options. They have

come to the end of their rope. This is evident by Iran's continued posturing.

Congress should be on the side of the United States in a conflict with the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism. It baffles me why our Democratic colleagues would be so determined to weaken the United States' negotiating position.

President Trump has been very clear on the goals of this mission: to ensure that Iran cannot obtain a nuclear weapon.

I, for one, am very appreciative of President Trump's courage and willingness to do what numerous leaders before him were unable to accomplish for 47 years.

This resolution will hinder efforts to bring a threat of a possible Iranian nuclear weapon to an end and support the illegal Iranian claim over the Strait of Hormuz.

This politically-charged resolution divides the U.S. in a way that will have Iranian leadership cheering in favor of its passage. Bringing this resolution to the floor undercuts the primary American objective to eliminate the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran and supports Iran's illegal claims on an international strait that is directly affecting Americans' daily lives. Is this what is intended by the sponsors? I hope not.

It seems that our Democrat colleagues only ever come to the table to push a political point versus bringing real solutions that advance American interests.

Diplomacy must be backed by strength, and considering this resolution signals that some congressional Members lack the political resolve to do the right thing. We should support measures that ensure that all tools of national power are available to be used to end the Iranian terror regime. Democrats have overwhelmingly agreed Iran is an existential threat to the United States and its allies. Supporting the President at this point in time will help to achieve America's strategic objectives and ensure the U.S. and our allies are operating with the full support of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MAST for his partnership and his leadership.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I don't know about the gentleman, but I encourage him to read the resolution again because the words "imminent threat" to the United States of America are not in there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), who is also the Democratic whip.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have been at war with Iran for 2½ months. What do we have to show for it? There is no victory. There is no strategy. We still don't have an objective. In fact, the President keeps saying this war is over, but we have 50,000 troops deployed to the region. The strait is still

closed. Shipping is still blockaded, and negotiations that should be about making sure Iran never gets a nuclear weapon are completely stalled out.

Meanwhile, every single day, working Americans are paying the price. Gas prices have spiked. They have skyrocketed through the roof. Utility bills are going up. Because of increased shipping costs, we are seeing further increases in the price of food, clothes, toys, car parts, everything that you can imagine a family needs.

There is still no end in sight, and there won't be an end in sight unless Republicans decide to work for the American people and do their job.

The single fastest way to bring down costs is to end this war. Once again, Republicans are going to have an opportunity to do just that.

Once again, they have a chance to bring our servicemembers home and end this chaos.

Once again, they have a chance to side with working families and our troops.

The American people deserve better than they are getting from the GOP. Vote "yes." Show the American people you are on their side.

□ 1920

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER), my friend and the sponsor of this important resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be standing here today introducing this resolution, but I feel, Mr. President, you have left me no choice. It has been 74 days since the start of the conflict in Iran, and Congress still hasn't been formally briefed on the objectives, our progress, or what success looks like.

Our Nation's Founders were very clear about this. Congress has a constitutional responsibility under Article I to provide oversight. Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution grants Congress exclusive power to declare war, raise and support armies, maintain a navy, and make rules for the military.

We may have one commander in chief at a time, which I agree with, but the United States Congress has a specific constitutional responsibility. The American people sent us to Washington to be their voice, their eyes, and to hold the government accountable. That is not a partisan position. That is our job, our job as Democrats and Republicans.

The War Powers Act of 1973 only affirms that responsibility, clearly laying out, in furtherance of the Constitution, that the President has 60 days after formally informing the Congress to either come to Congress for declaration of war or an Authorization For Use of Military Force. Unfortunately, the President has done neither.

That is what this resolution means to me. It is a call to action to the President of the United States to do what the Constitution requires and to brief the Congress and the country on the state of the conflict, the objectives, the progress we have made, and what lies ahead.

Let me be very clear on what this resolution doesn't mean to me. I believe the Iranian regime must be crushed. They are the world's leading state sponsor of terror, a tyrannical government that chants "The great Satan" and "death to America," bankrolls Hezbollah, Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and the Houthis who have attacked our bases and have killed scores of Americans.

The ayatollah has killed tens of thousands of their own citizens in Iran, brutally so, just for seeking freedom. They are an enemy of the United States of America and work closely with our other adversaries, including Russia, North Korea, and China.

Unlike some of my colleagues who oppose taking on this regime, I believe—no, I actually know, that the world is a safer and more secure place if the Iranian regime were destroyed. They have attacked Americans and done everything to undermine our freedom and our democracy since the 1970s.

I support the administration crushing the Iranian regime. I want to ensure we destroy their nuclear programs, their ballistic missile program, their drone programs, and their terrorist proxy programs. But that said, you cannot leave the United States Congress in the dark any longer. You can't leave the American people in the dark, and that is what this resolution means to me.

Oversight is a key constitutional responsibility of Congress, and moments like this are exactly why the Founders crafted a government with separation of powers. In other words, it wasn't by accident. In *The Federalist Papers*, Hamilton and Madison made the Founders' intentions unmistakable. Papers 23, 41, 69, and 74 deliberately entrust Congress the power to provide for the common defense.

Hamilton said: "The declaring of war would appertain to the legislature," and yet here we are with no formal briefings, no formal hearings, no plans presented on the conflict.

The Founders weren't naive. They anticipated this very moment. That is why we, ultimately, had the War Powers Act of 1973, so the President couldn't go it alone. Article I says he must come here to authorize or declare war. Under the War Powers Act, he is prohibited from keeping armed forces engaged in a conflict for more than 60 days without congressional approval.

But this administration has not given real briefings on the Iran conflict to the Intelligence Committee or the Foreign Affairs Committee or the Armed Services Committee, formal briefings related to this conflict.

Unfortunately, it is often that I have gotten more information, like a lot of

my colleagues have, from papers like *The New York Times*. That is absurd. Yesterday alone, I learned from *The New York Times* that Iran maintained 70 percent of its pre-war missile stockpile despite our military actions. I learned or read, at least, in *The New York Times* that Iran has restored operational access to 30 of 33 missile sites it maintains along the Strait of Hormuz.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if any of that is true or false, but Congress isn't getting briefed, so I wouldn't know if that is true or false. That is not acceptable to me. That is not how this is supposed to work.

It stands in direct contrast to our constitutional obligations and to the precedent for how other administrations have treated Congress during a military campaign of this size and duration. And if some haven't, then, by the way, we shouldn't have accepted that either.

Previous administrations, some, have come to Congress within 60 days to make the case for their actions. After strikes against Iranian-backed militia groups in Iraq and Syria in 2021, the Biden administration notified Congress and sent a formal letter explaining their legal justifications under an existing Congressional authority.

In 2003, the Bush administration conducted extensive briefings to Congress and was granted congressional authorization months before the invasion. After Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, George H.W. Bush's administration regularly briefed Congress. Before U.S. combat began, the administration consulted Congress extensively and sought authorization to use military force.

Again, I didn't want to have to bring this resolution to the floor. I had hoped the administration would have changed their course after I introduced it and properly briefed the Congress and the country.

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

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

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, people have lots of questions about the goals, about the Strait of Hormuz, about \$5 gas, about what a win looks like for America. Make no mistake, my resolution explicitly grants us the ability to maintain a presence in the region, to respond to any Iranian aggression that places Americans or our allies in danger, and to safely remove our troops. If the President comes to seek authorization with a proper briefing, I would do my job and consider it, like we all should.

This vote isn't whether or not we should crush the Iranian regime. It is a

message to the President and his administration to brief the Congress and the country. The people elected us to do this job, Mr. President. Come to us. Make your case. Lay out your plan. Let us do our job as a co-equal branch of government.

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

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

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. My ask, Mr. President, is brief the appropriate committees and do so regularly. Lay out the plan. Let us do our job as a co-equal branch of the government. This is too important not to.

Again, as I said, I believe the Iranian regime should be crushed. It is not a question of that. It is a question about making sure we can do what we must do as elected officials of this branch of government.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) for the purpose of a colloquy to tell us if Iran is an imminent threat.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that if they are able to develop a nuclear program and they continue to have their ballistic missile program and their drone program, then I am deeply concerned about the threat they present to the United States and our allies in the region.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) more time.

Is that an imminent threat?

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. It depends how you define that.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) again for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. I am just saying, Mr. MAST, that if they, right now, are able to—and these are kind of questions I have that I am not getting briefed on. These are the questions I have in terms of where they are in some of their program capabilities to be able to right now threaten our country. That is part of the question that I have. But I think you and I are in agreement, sir, that they are clearly a threat to the United States of America.

Mr. MAST. Absolutely. I am happy to let you continue the dialogue if you want. I am not going to cut you off.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. No, thank you. I thank the gentleman for the colloquy.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentleman say that because Iran is an imminent threat against us.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Representative GOTTHEIMER dialoguing with me for a moment. I will give another quote that he offered. "Iran's sole objective is to wreak havoc, create violence, cause instability, and cowardly murder U.S. servicemen and -women protecting our way of life." That is a quote from my colleague over there. I agree with everything that he said.

That is an outline of an imminent threat, as well as the “whereas” things that were added into this bill. It is an outline, an indictment of an imminent threat. Iran is an imminent threat against us. Iran is an imminent threat.

The imminent threat that has been going on against us, I will outline some more of it. And this relates to the Strait of Hormuz, not because of the combat actions that have taken place, but just because Iran is an imminent threat in what they have been doing. They captured sailors and two boats. Four patrol boats from Iran’s IRGC attacked the USS *Nitze*, and the USNS *Invincible* was forced to change course because IRGC fast-attack crafts tried to run into it.

□ 1930

These are all separate incidents.

IRGC vessel attacks USS *Thunderbolt* in Persian Gulf.

Unarmed Iranian drone flies to USS *Nimitz* as fighter jets landing at night.

IRGC naval personnel place and detonate limpet mines on two Saudi, one UAE, one Norwegian-registered ship, all harbored in UAE. These are going back years.

IRGC naval personnel place and detonate limpet mines on Japanese ship and Norwegian-owned ships transiting the Gulf of Oman. This is, again, just going back in history.

IRGC personnel deploy surface-to-air missiles to shoot down U.S. unmanned aircraft operating over international waters.

IRGC Navy seize British-flagged and Swedish-owned *Stena Impero* tanker while it was transiting the Strait of Hormuz.

Iran attempts to stop British tanker *British Heritage*, and six U.S. Navy ships attacked by Iranian ships.

IRGC Navy forcibly board and detain Hong Kong-flagged *SC Taipei*, an oil tanker, in international waters.

Eleven IRGC Navy small boats attack five U.S. Navy vessels conducting routine exercises.

I have pages of these—I can go on—year after year after year.

I have at least one colleague over here who is willing to acknowledge the imminent threat that they are, what it is that they have been doing, long-standing, with the Strait of Hormuz.

Did the gentleman want to continue the conversation?

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Sure.

Mr. MAST. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. By the way, I completely agree with your outline of the threats that Iran poses, and I want to be very clear about that. I think they present a clear and present danger to our country, their regime there, which is why they need to be crushed.

My broader point and the question, I guess, I would have for you is: Do you believe that we, Congress, are being appropriately briefed and kept up to speed? That is really, fundamentally,

my challenge right now, that I don’t feel like we are getting the information.

I am on the Intelligence Committee. I don’t think we are getting the information that we should be getting as a coequal branch to make sure that we can do our jobs.

Mr. MAST. I am glad you asked.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Thanks.

Mr. MAST. My opinion is that, yes, both by the content of what it is that the administration has told me in whether it is full House classified briefings with the Secretary of War, the Secretary of State, General Caine, and CIA Director John Ratcliffe; whether it is in expanded Gang of Eight meetings that Ranking Member MEEKS and myself have been a part of, numerous of those; or other briefings that we have had.

I don’t know how many briefings it is that you have had as a part of the Intelligence Committee, but I am tracking at least 30 separate briefings, and absolutely, I am satisfied with the content of which I am given.

On any given day, would I love to have more information that they have within a tactical operations center—a TOC, as we call it in the military—of what is going on? I would love to still be an operator inside of a TOC, watching ISR footage of exactly everything that is going on, but that is not the latitude that we have, to sit inside of those TOCs and observe everything that is going on, but I am satisfied.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. No, listen, I am glad that you are briefed, because I think you have—

Mr. MAST. We all are, 30—at least 30 separate briefs.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. If the gentleman will yield, I think you have incredible experience, and I am grateful for your service to our country.

Mr. MAST. Thank you.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. I am glad you are getting those briefings. The challenge is, at least from my colleagues’ perspective and me, who sits on the committee, we have not been getting those sort of briefings that you have been getting. That is part of what we are raising a flag about.

I would ask Chairman MEEKS the same question, but that has been, just so you understand, the real frustration, because I am with you that we should crush Iran.

Mr. MAST. I heard you say it.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. I am with you, and I just want to make sure—I want to understand where we are in that process and actually get appropriate updates on what is going on so that I can do my job. That is really what this is about for me.

Mr. MAST. I appreciate the colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time until the ranking member is ready to close.

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

Mr. MENEFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution to bring an end to the President’s war in Iran.

This administration started a war that the American people never asked for. A majority of Americans oppose it, and every single day, Americans are paying for it.

Before this war started, gas in Houston cost about \$3 a gallon. Today, it costs over \$4 a gallon. That is the largest 2-month gas price spike in the recorded history of Houston, which is the energy capital of the world.

The average Houston family is paying \$100 more every single month just to fill their tanks. This administration told us that they would put America first. Instead, they have put Americans, our servicepersons, and our wallets last.

This administration has blown up the global markets. People are paying more for groceries. Businesses are paying more for supplies. People are struggling to get by that much more because of this President’s actions. The experts say prices will fall slower than they rose, even if this war ends today.

The American people did not ask for this war. It was forced upon them, and Congress must force it to end. I urge my colleagues to support this War Powers Resolution.

We have heard a lot of conversation about imminence here tonight, but that is not the question before us. The question before us is: Who has the power to declare war? That is the United States Congress.

We have seen this President haphazardly bring us into a dispute overseas, resulting in the deaths of 13 U.S. servicepersons, while at the same time conducting foreign policy over Truth Social, saying that he is going to annihilate an entire civilization.

I don’t care what your feelings are about any nation. This country operates by a Constitution, and the President must follow it the same way as anybody else.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this War Powers Resolution.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, first, based upon the argument, I heard the President say just a few months prior that he obliterated all of Iran’s nuclear capabilities. That is what he said, so come back to the United States Congress to tell us that you did not, and here are the reasons why they still have what they have, and it is imminent, from my definition of “imminent,” that they will utilize it against us soon.

From all the evidence that I have seen, they have not done so.

I don’t know what 30 meetings or classified hearings the chairman has had. I have had two—two, one with the full Congress, and one with the gang of 16 or 18, or whatever we are called.

I do know that it is clear by today’s debate that my Republican colleagues

simply cannot defend this costly and massively unpopular war. I have not heard one time anyone talk about how much this war is costing us, how much it is costing the American people.

What I have heard—and we do know what the President thinks because we heard him. The President says that he doesn't care. He doesn't even think a little bit about what it costs Americans. He said that he doesn't think about Americans' financial situation and that he doesn't think about anybody. That is probably including Congress. We are somebody, too. He doesn't think about us.

My colleagues have not been able to make a case that Americans are better off now than we were before this reckless war. We are worse off now. The Strait of Hormuz is closed. We are losing allies.

My colleagues cannot demonstrate that this war has neutralized Iran's most significant threats. Clearly, that is what they are saying. That is what I am hearing. Nor have they put us in a position to guarantee a better nuclear deal than we had before, which Donald J. Trump ripped up.

That is because this is an unauthorized war, and this war has, instead, ushered in a new, younger, and more extreme Ayatollah. That is a fact.

□ 1940

It has weaponized the Strait of Hormuz, severely damaging the global economy as well as everyday American checkbooks. That is a fact. If you deny that, say that to the American people. Ask them when you go home.

As this war grinds on at the cost of \$1 billion a day, the United States must face numerous global challenges with significantly depleted munition stockpiles and setbacks to our military readiness.

The fact is, this war has been a mistake from the start.

The American people ended one forever war in the Middle East. They don't want another. In fact, many of President Trump's MAGA friends, the reason why they voted for him was because he said he would not get into another war. That is why you hear that some of his friends and many Republicans are now angry with him.

What do the American people want? Do you know what they want? They want the affordability crisis addressed. They want good jobs. They want good healthcare. Instead, this administration has started a war that has skyrocketed everything from gasoline to groceries with little to show for it.

So to my colleagues across the aisle, it is past time that we do our job. That is all Mr. GOTTHEIMER was saying: Do our job. We declare war, not the executive branch. It is time for the President to come to us, and it is time for us, I believe, to end this war.

Everyone is asking me: How is it going to end? We are going to have to negotiate our way out of this because clearly we are not going to be able to

bomb our way out of this. It is not going to make us safe as we see what is taking place right now.

It is time for Members of Congress, Republicans, Democrats, and those who are Independent, to say, okay, Mr. President, if you have proof of something, come to us.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Come to us, and we will then decide. That is what the Constitution allows.

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

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

I am going to respond to the trove of ridiculous things that I have heard said on this floor.

Speaking generally about life, I know that there are people out there that when they get hit, they curl up, they cry, and they don't deal with the situation. That is how some people deal with conflict.

I can't personally say that I have known people that get hit, and they deny that it happened at all. That is literally what we have going on here.

As my colleague says over and over, there is no imminent threat that is going on. The author of this bill acknowledged the imminent threat, wrote word after word, paragraph after paragraph in the very thing that my colleagues over there will vote "yes" on to outline specifically the imminent threat that Iran is. He wanted it to be known the imminent threat that Iran is, but my colleagues are denying the imminent threat. They are denying that we have got hit.

They say we started this war. To quote my colleague right now, Ranking Member MEEKS, he said we started this war. That is a denial of every single time the United States of America has been hit. It is a denial of the times that they fired at us at Tower 22 and killed three Americans. It is a denial of the times that they fired at us in Iraq and Syria. It is a denial of the times that they fired at our ships that were passing through the straits and other places causing some of our jets to fall off the decks of our carriers. It is a denial to say we started this war, not all of those things that Iran did started this war.

I literally just read off a laundry list of things that Iran has done to us and to our allies over the years, attack after attack after attack, but according to my colleague, we started this war. Again, it is like getting hit in the face, and it is like no, no, that didn't happen, nobody hit me in the face. Black eye? No black eye. It didn't happen to me. I ran into a wall. That is like what we are living through right now.

I am going to give you some more of the things that they have done, and it is important because my colleague for the first time I have heard him define what "imminent" actually means to him. He said this is what imminent

means to me, that they will utilize against us soon, was what was said—utilize against us soon.

So I just listed off a whole bunch of things, a whole bunch of attacks that were done to us immediately preceding our combat operations in Iran. That to me equals imminent. If they just did it, that means they would continue to do it soon.

But if we go back even further than that, we will list some more. MV *Asphalt Princess*, another ship, a tanker traveling from UAE to Oman, was attacked by Iran. They are our allies. An Iranian-flagged tanker seized two Greek tankers, *Delta Poseidon* and *Prudent Warrior*, in the Persian Gulf. The tanker *Pacific Zircon* was hit by an Iranian drone off the coast. Iran's navy captured a Marshall Islands-flagged tanker, *Advantage Sweet*. Iran's IRGC seized the Panamanian-flagged *Niovi* oil tanker.

The list goes on and on just year after year. I can list off dozens of these imminent what they have been doing in the Strait of Hormuz going on year after year, imminent. But, again my colleagues across the aisle, it is like they are getting hit in the face, and they are saying: No, nobody hit me. They are saying that because they want to talk a big game, but they are too scared to actually deal with somebody hitting them in the face. That is true about life.

Some people don't have the stomach to be soldiers. Some people have the stomach, but they are just not capable of doing it. Not everybody is built to do the same things.

I want to cover some of the other things that were said. My colleague, Ranking Member MEEKS, said numerous times that the new leader of Iran is more extreme. That is certainly an acknowledgment of the extremist nature of the previous leader of Iran. Very extreme.

Having done all of those things that I just listed off to our allies and to the United States of America, that is how extreme the previous leader was, now the new one is more extreme. The previous one was absolutely an imminent threat, absolutely making this a legal military operation, though they continue to say it wasn't some legal operation, that it was a war of choice.

My colleague said it was a war of choice—I counted at least three times—in his remarks. Absolutely, it is a choice. If somebody hits me in the face like my colleagues are denying is happening to America, it is a choice whether we hit them back. My colleagues over there would prefer to choose that, when somebody hits America in the face, we say: No, nothing happened. I walked into a wall. Nothing to see here—and not hit them back.

That is not the United States of America.

It is a choice whether we hit back. Strong people choose to hit back. Strong countries choose to hit back.

Weak people, weak countries, they don't hit back.

Let's go over some of the other things that were said. They regained access to missile sites. It was reported that Iran regained access to missile sites. Absolutely. You know what, they regained access probably 10 minutes after those sites were hit. That doesn't mean that they are operational. That doesn't mean that they can go into a cache where they held weapons and pull the weapons out of that cache and start using them. It doesn't mean that they can take a mobile platform that they could access before we hit it and then go access it again 10 minutes later and utilize it. Sure, they have access to it. That doesn't mean that it is something that can be used.

□ 1950

Our colleagues want you to believe that they had this access and nothing is being done. That is absolutely irresponsible.

I went over how my colleagues talked about how this war caused the closure of the Strait of Hormuz. No, Iran has been closing the Strait of Hormuz year after year, decade after decade, and I have far more pages of what I could go over of all the attacks that they have been conducting through the strait and other places.

It was said numerous times—again, I counted at least three times—“never in America's national interest.” That is the colleague of Ranking Member MEEKS over there, “never in America's national interest.”

If it was never in America's national interest, why did my colleague literally vote to say the United States of America should “use any and all means”—that is a quote, direct quote, from the bill—to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon? That is what President Trump is doing, using any and all means to make sure that that doesn't happen.

In this breath, he says it was never in America's national interest, but before, I guess it was. I am not sure how before it was okay, but now it is never. It doesn't quite add up to me.

He said it is not about theatrics. If you voted previously to say use any and all means necessary against Iran, but now you say it is never in America's national interest, it is 100 percent about theatrics. That is what it is.

That is what this whole show is about for my colleagues over there. It is theatrics because you can't say it was never in America's national interest and just before that say, yes, I voted to say use any and all means necessary. They don't add up. One thing doesn't equal the other. It is all about theatrics.

On the words “imminent threat,” he said the words “imminent threat” are not in there. Yes, the words “imminent threat” are not directly in there. That is correct, but again, my colleague did state the ways that Iran is an imminent threat, my colleague who au-

thored the legislation that they intend to vote “yes” on. They intend to vote “yes” outlining the ways that Iran was an imminent threat, even though they say it is not in our interests and all of these other things.

My colleague over there said that the sole objective of Iran is to wreak havoc—that equals imminent threat; create violence—equals imminent threat to me; cause instability; and cowardly murder U.S. servicemen and -women protecting our way of life. That sounds like a pretty damn big imminent threat to me.

It went on to say in the legislation: “The Islamic Republic of Iran is the leading state sponsor of terrorism and an adversary of the United States.” That sounds like an imminent threat. I know he didn't use the exact words, but sometimes you have to read between the lines, read between those lines.

“The Islamic Republic of Iran seeks to pose a threat to the United States, its Armed Forces, and allies through its ballistic missile program, its sponsorship of terrorist proxy forces, and continued pursuit of a nuclear weapon.” That is an imminent threat.

Again, I would say read between the lines. If you can't read between those lines, you probably don't have business working in the national security sphere.

Let's go over some other quotes that were said here.

They said that we have troops there. We have troops there, so the war is not over. The combat is not over.

Guess what, Ms. CLARK. We have troops in Germany, but I can tell you that World War II—not World War 11, according to Ms. OMAR—World War II is over, but we still have troops in Germany and still have troops in Europe. We had, previous to these operations against Iran, troops throughout the Middle East.

Just because we have troops there doesn't mean that this hasn't ended. It has ended since April 7, and I applaud President Trump for the cease-fire that he has negotiated and the peace that he continues to work toward.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I have more to talk about and go over more quotes here.

Ms. CLARK said there is no strategy. I will tell you, she has been briefed numerous times, probably about 30 times, if she chose to attend all the classified briefings or was invited to all of them. I don't know which ones she was entirely invited to.

To say that there is no strategy is absolutely a direct insult to our United States Armed Forces, all of our generals, all of our colonels, all of our majors, all of our leaders working in tactical operations centers, the Pentagon, crunching data day in and day out, doing everything that they do to plan

every single part of these operations: every time an aircraft takes off of a carrier; the targets that they are looking at; everything that they are looking to hit, when and in what order; what they have to hit before they go hit something further in the interior of Iran.

It is an insult to our military to say that there is no strategy. It takes away from every bit of strategy that is going on.

Let's keep going on.

My colleague Mr. GOTTHEIMER, to quote him, said: I believe that we—that they must be “crushed.” I agree with my colleague that they must be crushed. They have to be crushed. He wrote this legislation because of the imminent threat that Iran is. My colleague agreed with that.

Though my colleague, the ranking member over there, said that nobody could agree that it was an imminent threat, that Republicans couldn't prove it, there is at least one Democrat who agrees and was willing to see that through.

It is theatrics. It is theatrics that hurt our servicemembers.

There is probably only one thank-you that should be given, and that would be a thank-you from the IRGC to my colleagues over there for giving them hope. Without my colleagues over there, the IRGC would have zero hope.

Because they keep bringing forward ridiculous pieces of legislation like this, where they are unwilling to acknowledge the imminent threat that Iran is, all the attacks that have taken place against the United States of America, against our servicemembers, against our tankers, against our Navy vessels, against those of all of our allies, it continues to be theatrics because they won't see this. They are going to get hit in the face and deny that they ever got touched.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield the balance of my time in just one moment and simply say I urge a “no” vote on this because it is ridiculous and dangerous to say, especially in the midst of this cease-fire, of the negotiations for long-term peace, to prevent Iran from seeking a nuclear weapon in the future or seeking to continue their ballistic missile program or their drone program or their terror proxy programs or what they have been doing in the strait, that we even whisper the idea of pulling our servicemembers out of that area. It could not be more irresponsible of my colleagues to suggest that that take place.

They say they want negotiations. Those are taking place, but they want negotiations without the United States military protecting ships, knocking ordnance out of the sky, and being the very credible threat that the United States military is? That makes absolutely no sense.

Again, people that assess that way I do not want in the United States of America's national security decision-making tree.

I will say that I look forward to seeing that my colleagues over there vote “yes,” even though I recommend a “no” vote. Why? Because their “yes” vote literally shows just how much they agree that Iran is an imminent threat, even though they keep saying they are not, which directly leads to the legal justification for every operation that is taking place or has taken place against Iran.

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

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

Pursuant to the order of the House of April 27, 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 will be postponed.

#### RECOGNIZING MARTIN COUNTY WRIGHT FLIGHT FLY DAY

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, dreams are taking flight in Martin County, North Carolina.

The Wright Flight Fly Day rewards sixth graders from across the county for academic success, leadership, and positive choices by giving them an opportunity to see their home community in an airplane from the skies above.

Through a powerful partnership between the local schools, sheriff's office, and airport commission, students are connected to real-world opportunities in aviation, engineering, science, technology, and public service.

We are working to keep the American Dream within reach.

Wright Flight reminds young people across eastern North Carolina that their hopes and dreams are achievable and their future can soar even higher.

□ 2000

#### NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

(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, it is my privilege to be joined by my colleagues for this Police Week Special Order.

Law enforcement across this country is putting their lives on the line every day to protect our communities, and 1 week per year honoring them will never be enough. I want to respect the time of our colleagues so I will turn the time over to them before I give my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Mrs. BIGGS).

Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during National Police Week, we honor the brave men and women in law enforcement who put on the badge each day, knowing the risks that come with serving others.

Today, I rise to remember Greenwood Police Officer Don “DJ” Keller who passed away earlier this week while faithfully serving his community.

Officer Keller was only 31 years old. He was a fellow National Guardsman, a husband, and a father. He represented the very best of law enforcement.

The Greenwood community, the Third District, and the entire State of South Carolina mourn his loss. We also lift up his family, his fellow officers, and all who knew and loved him.

Scripture tells us in Matthew 5:9, “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.”

Officer Keller lived as a peacemaker. His service, sacrifice, and example will not be forgotten. May God bless Officer Keller, his family, and every law enforcement officer serving our communities.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from South Carolina for her great message, and I appreciate her attending this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from the great State of Utah for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this week, during National Police Week, we honor the brave men and women in law enforcement who put on the badge every single day and run toward danger while others are running away.

These officers respond to violent crimes, overdoses, domestic disputes, natural disasters, and unimaginable tragedies. They carry burdens that most Americans will never fully understand. As the wife of a first responder, I have seen firsthand the mental and emotional toll, as well as the physical toll, that this job can take on not just the individual wearing the uniform but all their families, as well. The stress, the trauma, and the weight of responsibility do not disappear when a shift ends.

Too often, when our first responders need help themselves, the system is not prepared to answer their call. That is why I have introduced the Answering

the Call Act of 2026, legislation to strengthen the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline and ensure it effectively serves first responders. That is because I can tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't.

Our law enforcement officers, firefighters, EMTs corrections officers, and public safety telecommunicators face disproportionately high rates of depression, PTSD, substance abuse, and suicide because of the traumatic situations they encounter on the job. Yet many do not seek help because of the stigma or concerns about confidentiality. In fact, over the last 5 years, over 850 law enforcement officers have taken their own lives, and we know that number is underreported.

This bill will take practical steps to address this crisis. It promotes targeted outreach to first responders, improves trauma-informed training for 988 counselors, strengthens accountability and establishes a pilot program to improve support services nationwide for our LEOs.

First responders answer the call at our most critical moments. That is why this legislation will ensure that when they need help, the system is ready to answer theirs.

To every law enforcement officer serving across Florida's Third District, across the Sunshine State, and across this country, I thank them for their courage, their sacrifice, and their service.

May God bless our law enforcement officers and their families who stand beside them every single day.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her inspiring message. It is so personal as well, and I appreciate her willingness to share.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, National Police Week serves as an important reminder of the brave law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line every day to protect our communities.

During this week, we honor the officers who answer the call knowing that they may face dangerous and unpredictable situations in service to our community. Their courage, sacrifice, and dedication deserve not only our gratitude, but our continued support.

This week, two Wisconsin officers are being honored during National Police Week and will have their names added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

The first is Racine County Deputy Joshua LaForge. Deputy LaForge knew from an early age that he wanted to serve others through law enforcement. That commitment guided his life and career.

He served both with the Racine Police Department for 18 years and then joined the Racine County Sheriff's Department. Throughout his career, he took on many responsibilities within