

in the House if called up by the Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or its designee; that the concurrent resolution be considered as read; that the previous question be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to adoption without intervening motion, except for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative MAST of Florida and Representative MEEKS of New York, or their respective designees.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1330

DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT, PURSUANT TO SECTION 5(c) OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION, TO REMOVE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES WITH IRAN

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of May 20, 2026, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 86) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities with 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 today, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 86

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)), Congress directs the President to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran, other than those elements of the Armed Forces that may be necessary to defend the United States or an ally or partner of the United States from imminent attack provided that the President complies fully with the requirements of section 5(b) the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(b)) with respect to any such use of the Armed Forces, unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or a specific congressional authorization for use of military force against Iran.

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 now 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 in-

clude any extraneous materials 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, it is not clear to me what exactly my colleagues are trying to do. We were on this merry-go-round last week, and last week my colleagues across the aisle here voted to say let's remove all U.S. forces from any hostilities with Iran, while at the same time they acknowledged the imminent threat that Iran poses against us. They said Iran is the leading state sponsor of terrorism and Iran wants to attack the United States and our allies with ballistic missiles, terrorist proxies, and obtain a nuclear weapon to do so, as well.

They acknowledge all of these things, but then they say let's be a United States of America that does not respond to threats against the United States of America. I don't understand it. I look forward to hearing the explanation from my colleagues, although it will be unexplainable.

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 today in strong support of my War Powers Resolution. Yes, here we go again. Today marks the fourth time this body will vote on a resolution to end President Trump's hostilities against Iran. After months of war, I ask the question: What has changed?

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that certainly nothing has changed for the better. Gas prices are now approaching \$5 a gallon. Airlines are cutting routes and struggling under rising fuel costs. The price of groceries, Mr. Speaker, and everyday goods continue to climb as more families are struggling to make ends meet.

Why? It is all because the Strait of Hormuz, which was open before the war, now sits at the center of escalating disruption and economic uncertainty.

When the President of the United States was asked whether he was thinking about the financial struggles of everyday American people, not the ultrarich like him and his buddies, he doubles down on a failed war. What was his response? "Not even a little bit . . . I don't think about Americans' financial situation. I don't think about anybody."

Here is what else hasn't changed, Mr. Speaker: The same Iranian regime remains in place. Iran retained its coercive capabilities, and Iran's nuclear program remains where it stood after the so-called 12-day war. Iran still possesses its highly enriched uranium and nuclear know-how. Much of its missile and drone capability remains intact, and Tehran retains leverage over the global economy.

Trump started this war, and he started it without congressional authorization and without a credible endgame. He still cannot explain how it ends, and the situation grows worse by worse every day.

Yet, my colleagues across the aisle continue to repeat the same argument. Perhaps for me the most absurd is that Iran posed an imminent threat. We have heard Mr. MAST, the chairman of the committee, say that Iran has posed an imminent threat for 47 years. Mr. Speaker, 47 years is not imminent.

The administration has not even attempted to demonstrate any imminent threat existed, let alone one that would have justified launching this war under the Constitution or the War Powers Resolution.

The law is very clear: If the President wishes to continue hostilities beyond 60 days, Congress must authorize them through an authorization for use of military force. If my Republican colleagues believe this war is justified, they should bring an AUMF to the floor. Yet, they have not. Absent congressional authorization, President Trump, by law, is required to withdraw U.S. forces from hostilities.

It is clear to the entire world that even without a deep-water Navy, Iran is still capable of closing the Strait of Hormuz.

None of this war's shifting objectives have been achieved. If and when Republicans try and claim, as Donald Trump sometimes does, that somehow killing the 86-year-old Khamenei, only to replace him with a much younger Khamenei, is proof of regime change, I would invite them to explain that to their constituents at a townhall meeting and see how seriously it is received by their constituents.

We have heard my Republican colleagues say that we should trust the Commander in Chief. Mr. Speaker, no President, Democrat, or Republican, deserves a blank check, especially one who has said Iran's nuclear program was "obliterated" and then used that same threat to justify this war.

This Commander in Chief has said the war is over, the war is won, that it is not a war, it is a war, that it is a mini war or an excursion. All of these things are what this President has said.

We are trapped in a war that won't end because an incompetent President launched it thinking of only his own ego, while failing to prepare for the consequences.

Diplomacy is the only exit from this, not more bombing, not more bluster, not waiting for the President to stumble into a cease-fire he can brand as a victory. That doesn't work. Yet, my Republican colleagues are just sitting on their hands doing everything they can to cover for this President.

Mr. Chairman, what I would love to do on the Committee on Foreign Affairs is to at least hold a hearing. We have not held one single public hearing, not one witness, not 1 hour of testimony on a war that has cost the

American people tens of billions of dollars.

Congress cannot abandon its constitutional responsibility over matters of war and peace, and we should not be reducing ourselves to be a rubber stamp.

□ 1340

That is why we must vote “yes” today: for our brave men and women in uniform who are in harm’s way; for the family paying almost \$5 a gallon who can’t wait another week; and for the small business owner watching their costs spiral because this President started a war with no plan, with no authorization, and with no end in sight.

All the polls show that Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, the American people, want this over. They are concerned about another forever war.

Mr. Speaker, above all, and most importantly, the Constitution of the United States of America, what we swore an oath to—not to a President, not to anyone, to the Constitution of the United States of America. That Constitution requires us to take action, to have a vote on this floor, and let the American people know where we stand.

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

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, this week, my colleague wants to make the argument about an imminent threat. I am glad he wants to have that debate. Last week, my colleague voted, as I outlined already, to say literally that Iran is the leading state sponsor of terror and Iran wants to attack the United States and our allies with ballistic missiles, terrorist proxies, and, if obtained, a nuclear weapon.

I would ask my colleague across the aisle: You voted to say Iran was an imminent threat. How do you define an imminent threat? You voted for it last week.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), the ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, here we are again, debating something that is not debatable. It is in the Constitution that every single one of us pledges to uphold. You can read it. It says that the Congress authorizes military action.

It doesn’t matter how good or bad or evil or close to a nuclear weapon a foe is. What matters is that the Constitution says we debate and approve military action.

Today, of course, we are well beyond the 60 days of the start of this hostility. Not only is this action unconstitutional, completely unapproved by the Congress, but it is now illegal. The War Powers Act requires that troops be withdrawn, absent the approval of Congress, after 60 days.

The chairman says over and over and over again that the Democrats said that it is an evil regime. Yes, we can all agree that it is an evil regime, but the chairman knows that the world is full of evil regimes. It doesn’t, therefore, follow that you declare war and go to war and raise Americans’ gas prices by \$1.50 a gallon and spit in the face of the Constitution just because we all stipulate that the Iranian regime is evil.

Let’s take a quick tour backward here. We have had no explanation for this war, beyond the fact that we all understand that the regime in Iran is evil. The President himself told us that the nuclear program was obliterated 9 months ago. Iran, as awful and as dangerous as they were—which, again, isn’t a license to go to war—was perhaps in the weakest position it had been in a generation due to the war of 9 months ago, so the notion of imminence is absurd. You are hearing that from the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee.

Where we find ourselves now is that gasoline prices are up \$1.50; food prices are rising; the inflation print of last week was pretty terrifying; and my friends in the majority know how utterly politically toxic this war is. They will not do their constitutional duty because they saw what we all saw, which is that this President decides who amongst Republican Members of the House and the Senate get to survive.

The Senator from Louisiana crosses the President; he is gone. The gentleman from Kentucky crosses the President; he is gone. As a political matter, it is fascinating to me that any President has that kind of choke hold over his party, but that is not a reason to spit in the face of the Constitution.

Lose your job for what you pledge to uphold and defend. No career is worth abnegating a pledge you took to the Constitution of the United States, especially when it is creating massive economic hardship for the people who we represent.

Do you think this is ending quickly? It is not. The Iranians are now in the strategic position to decide when this is over because they know the pain that the closure of the Strait of Hormuz is causing.

The only responsible action, the only legal action, and the only constitutional action is to debate this war and to stop it in the meantime.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I see the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee running off. I don’t think he wants to stay to answer questions.

Good, please stay.

Number one, imminence matters. My colleagues—this being one of them—voted last week to say—let me read it again here: Iran wants to attack the United States, our allies, with ballistic

missiles, terror proxies, and, if obtained, with a nuclear weapon. That, to me, is the definition of “imminence.”

I see him running off. I guess he doesn’t want to explain whether that is a vote to say they are an imminent threat. I am happy to yield him a couple of seconds.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. HIMES. The chairman can say it over and over and over again that we agree that the Iranian regime is evil.

Mr. MAST. I didn’t say “evil.”

Mr. HIMES. It therefore does not follow that we must attack them.

Mr. MAST. I didn’t say “evil.” Did I say “evil”? I agree they are evil, but I didn’t say that. Let’s not twist the words.

Mr. HIMES. Simply because a regime is evil does not authorize a war against it. The chairman knows that.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield more time because I think he is going to run out.

I didn’t say “evil.” You are still saying things I didn’t say. I read what you voted for last week: Iran wants to attack the United States—“wants to attack” means imminent—and our allies with ballistic missiles, terror proxies, and, if obtained, with a nuclear weapon.

Mr. HIMES. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. MAST. I will give you a moment of time in a second.

He voted to say any and all means necessary to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. We could go on and on about these things.

Are they an imminent threat?

Mr. HIMES. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Does the gentleman believe that the Iranian regime is the only regime on the planet that would like to attack the United States of America?

Mr. MAST. They are certainly not.

Mr. HIMES. They are certainly not. Does the gentleman, therefore, believe that we should take military action against all the other regimes that would like to attack America?

Mr. MAST. What I would give you is this, to present, again, imminence of them. I just gave you some examples. We will say just before this began in February, they attacked a U.S.-flagged tanker in the Strait of Hormuz. Just before that, they attacked—IRGC, I am talking about when I say “they.” They attacked another oil tanker in the Strait of Hormuz. Just before that—I am in December now—attacked another one. Just before that, IRGC attacked one in the Marshall Islands. Just before that, IRGC attacked an MSC ship and raided with a helicopter in the Strait of Hormuz. I have pages and pages of these. It is the definition of “imminent.”

As you know, before that, they killed three Americans at Tower 22 in Jordan. It is imminent.

Mr. HIMES. Sir, the definition of “imminent”—and you can look it up—is that they are about to attack us. I can tell you, as the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee who did not leave, that they were not about to attack us. You can make up a different definition for “imminent,” but that does not make it correct.

Mr. MAST. They attacked us literally just before our operations began. I gave you one example. To me, being a servicemember, if I see a foxhole and one or two enemies in that foxhole with the barrel of a .50-cal pointed at me, just because they don’t have two fingers on the trigger playing with that trigger doesn’t mean that it is not an imminent threat. If they are aiming it at me, that is an imminent threat. They are aiming it at us.

Mr. HIMES. If I could point out to the chairman—and I respect his military service—if he were, in fact, in a foxhole facing a .50-caliber machine gun, at least for the last 100 years, he almost certainly would have been in that position pursuant to an Authorization for Use of Military Force by this body.

Mr. MAST. Thankfully, we have had a cease-fire since, I want to say the date was April 7, April 8. We are not in hostilities. We are out there with almost the exact same number of forces that we continually keep in the region.

It brings me to another question I would love to ask you as ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, because the bill literally calls for the removal of U.S. forces from the region, other than those that “may be necessary to defend the United States or an ally or partner of the United States from imminent attack.” That is what the bill says you are voting on today—probably, you will vote for it. I would love to know which military assets you would like to remove.

□ 1350

Mr. HIMES. Well, I think what we should do is pause our military activities while we exercise the constitutional and just the smart act of debating a war which has now affected every single—

Mr. MAST. We are paused. We are in a cease-fire.

Mr. HIMES. Look, if this body chooses to maintain the military action, I will respect the body.

Mr. MAST. That is what a cease-fire is. It is an end to that.

Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time, and I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), an esteemed member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if the majority is so confident in its position, I don’t know

why we wouldn’t be debating this in a regular debate around the authorization of use of military force.

Mr. Speaker, we have been in this illegal, unconstitutional war for 81 days. We have spent at least \$29 billion of taxpayers’ money. While Trump says that we have no money for healthcare or housing, inflation is at a 3-year high. Gas in my home State costs \$6 a gallon. Travel costs are up right now in the summer months when American families are hoping to go on vacation.

Iran now more clearly controls the Strait of Hormuz and the flow of oil than ever before. We are in a worse place than we were during Barack Obama’s Presidency, when we had the Iran nuclear deal in place, until Donald Trump pulled us out of it.

The reality is that, meanwhile, we have lost 13 U.S. troops. Thousands of Iranian and Lebanese civilians have died. Millions more have been displaced, and there is chaos across the region and across the world.

More Republicans need to step up and vote with us to stop this illegal war and force this President to focus on the needs of the American people right here at home, even though he keeps doubling down on his own comments that he doesn’t care about or doesn’t think about the financial situation of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has the sole authority to declare war. I don’t understand why my Republican colleagues across the aisle don’t want to hold the constitutional powers that are granted to this body in Article I. Why not stand up for the things that the Founders put into the Constitution to assure that there would be a debate, that there would be checks and balances, and that there would be authorization from this body to declare war?

Why not stand up for the people at home who are wondering when on Earth we are going to stand up and fight for their price of groceries to go down and the price of gas to go down? The fact that Americans have had healthcare stripped away from them, this is a clear “yes” on this War Powers Resolution.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FINE).

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I find this debate incredibly disappointing because it is an intellectually bankrupt one.

For 4 years under Joe Biden—I looked it up—he engaged in 500 unique airstrikes. He engaged in some level of operation in 78 countries.

If there was a consistent view that Congress ought to weigh in every single time that force is used, then the argument—that I would still disagree with, but it would at least be an intellectually honest one—it is not. In this case, it is even worse because I believe that, in proffering these resolutions, the other side extends the war that they say that they want to end.

Mr. Speaker, we may debate in this Chamber, but folks around the world

watch what we say, and it is my view that the Iranians would have already surrendered and given up what it is that we want—the ability to create a nuclear weapon and fire it at the United States—if what was being done in this room did not give them hope that we would not have the confidence and the fortitude to see it out.

Every one of these debates and every one of these votes gives them hope that maybe America will choose to stand with them—them, who, for 47 years, have killed Americans all over the world. There have been imminent threats constantly for 47 years. From the hostages who were kept in Iran to the American soldiers who were killed in Iraq, to those Americans who lived in Israel who were targeted by their missiles, to the military members who they have attacked repeatedly over 47 years, it has been one constant imminent attack.

We should vote this down today, and we should stop doing this so that we can say to the Iranian people and the Iranian regime, in clear and unambiguous terms: No Member of this body is okay with you having a nuclear weapon and one that you could use to attack the United States, and until the President gets that job done, we are all going to stand with him.

These resolutions extend the conflict. They do not hasten it, and that is why we need to vote this down and stop doing this.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW), a great former member of the United States military.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I am here on behalf of the millions of working-class Americans who have had it and are fed up with an endless cycle of unaccountable conflict in the Middle East.

I started my service to this Nation in uniform, like the chairman. I honor his service, like all of our brothers and sisters. I am proud of that service, as should all of my brothers and sisters who took the oath I took, stood up when our country called, and did our duty honorably.

What is abundantly clear is that our system is broken. Working-class Americans, like the kids who I grew up with, deployed with, fought with, and suffered with, are the ones who have to do the fighting, the dying, and the paying for of these conflicts. They see that the burden of these wars falls on them, while the elites, the rich, and the powerful in this country get richer, more powerful, and more comfortable. The burden is not equal in this Nation. It is because the system is broken.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear that this isn’t about process to me. Yes, there are important constitutional checks and safeguards at play, but this isn’t about inside baseball, notification, and process. The Americans’ eyes glaze over when people talk about that under this dome. What it is about to me is accountability.

When I did my combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, combat mission after

combat mission after combat mission, what I had to know is that important questions were being asked and people were being held to account and asking tough questions, so that I could focus on my mission in bringing my men home.

That has stopped. The debate isn't happening. We are paying for these wars with debt, \$5 trillion to \$8 trillion, 7,000 American lives, and on and on it goes.

It is not just our right. It is our duty. It is our job under this dome to take votes, to appropriate money, to ask tough questions, to hold people to account, and then go home and stand in front of high school gymnasiums, stand in front of our constituents, go to Rotary Clubs, and explain those votes, why we should send our sons and our daughters and our money to the Middle East again and again and again.

That is what our system requires. That is what Americans deserve.

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

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

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, this is not optional. The Framers dedicated this responsibility to us because they knew that the decision to send our sons and daughters into war and to spend taxpayers' money was our most solemn responsibility, and no one person should make that decision.

The system is broken. It is our duty to take it back. That is what this vote is for.

Maybe we should go to war in one instance, but the debate must happen. The vote must happen.

I encourage—I demand that my colleagues step up and take this vote and retake our constitutional duty and to get this done. It is what our servicemen and -women deserve.

□ 1400

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

Mr. Speaker, there is still an argument from my colleagues over there about imminent threat, imminent threat, whether it is an imminent threat. I will just give them one other important piece of information they might want for the debate that was just so passionately spoken about.

Before Epic Fury began, 30 months—the 30 months within, not 30 months just beyond that—30 months within Epic Fury, that time before it, there were 350 attacks against the United States of America. That is not just imminent. That is continuous.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask how my colleagues on the other side to not equate continuous with imminence. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, here is the bottom line: President Trump started a war. Congress never authorized it. I don't think

anybody can dispute that. He started a war. Congress never authorized it. Sixty days have gone by. He still has not come back to Congress. That is the basic responsibilities that we have.

Other than that, we should make a motion, and I would join, love to have a debate on the floor on an AUMF. Again, that is our constitutional authority. Again, the President has to come to us.

Why don't we do our constitutional responsibilities? Why do we want to give it away?

Well, actually, we are not even giving it away. We are not doing what the law says for us to do, what the Constitution says for us to do, what we took and swore an oath of office to do.

The President did this. If he had a clear objective, he didn't bring it to Congress. If he had a credible endgame, he didn't bring it to Congress. However, most importantly, he didn't bring it to the American people, either.

The way our system works, we are supposed to be representatives of the people. If you are going to bring it to the people, you have to bring it through this House or he should be making some public statements of that nature. He has yet to give us a clear objective, he has yet to give us a credible endgame, and he has yet to give us an honest accounting to how much this is costing the American people in dollars and cents.

We can see it with our own eyes. I mean, I know I do. I know that when I go back home and talk to my constituents, they make sure to bring it up. One would show me the gas station, and then he shows me the price of gas. He knows that the price of gas was not that prior to this war of choice.

If you go to a grocery store to buy food, you see the increase in cost. Those who were planning vacations for the summer now can't afford to fly or drive. Why? It is because of the rising costs. The danger is spreading. The President has, in fact, made America less safe, not more.

My colleague keeps talking about imminent.

Here is what the President of the United States said: All three nuclear sites in Iran have been completely destroyed or obliterated. He said it would take years to bring them back into service, and if Iran wanted to, they would be better off starting anew in three different locations prior to those sites being obliterated, should they decide to do so.

Does that sound like the President feels that there is an imminent threat right now from Iran's nuclear facilities?

He says the only thing he is concerned about—I have not heard the President say anything about an imminent threat to the United States. He talked about that he obliterated their nuclear weapons.

Therefore, it just seems to me that the bottom line here is that Congress has a constitutional duty. It has a duty

to act, not to cheerlead, especially not to cheerlead an open-ended war of choice, not to outsource our judgment to one man's ego. We have a responsibility.

In the Constitution, we are a separate but equal branch of government. We are supposed to be a check and balance and oversight of the executive branch of government, not just do whatever the President says, not questioning, not having hearings, not going back and forth. Unfortunately, that is what is happening here.

We had a vote last week, and it was 212–212. We are giving—and I think my Republican colleagues deserve to have—another opportunity to speak to their constituents, to let them know where they stand, whether or not they care about their financial situation, whether or not they care about anybody, about the American people. If we are going to do this, to give them this opportunity to speak to their constituents, we know what we see and hear when we go back home.

We see this conversation is taking place not in blue States only, not only in purple States, but in red States because the truth of the matter and the bottom line, this is an American issue. It is about its institution called the United States House of Representatives and whether or not we are truly that branch of government that will exercise its constitutional responsibility and be a check and a balance on a President. Not whether or not, as the ranking member of the Intel Committee said, not whether we are just afraid of how to vote, as happens in other areas, in other countries. Many people are afraid to vote differently in Russia—so they do whatever Vladimir Putin says—and North Korea and Iran. They are afraid. That should not be us. We should stand for the oath of office that we have taken and make sure that the American people that we represent get to hear from Congress.

Let's vote. Let's go on record. Let's make sure that we are doing our jobs.

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

□ 1410

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

Mr. Speaker, I think we have probably, I don't know, maybe 100 people up in the gallery behind us. I am going to apologize to the people behind us. They came here to the Capitol of the United States of America to hear debate, but they witnessed my colleagues over here don't really want to debate.

I am always willing to give them time if they actually want to have a debate, argue facts, talk about things, but they rarely—as you all witnessed, they don't want to take my time to answer questions.

The ranking member of the Intelligence Committee had a little back and forth with me for a little while. I appreciated it. I asked him very direct questions. Does continuous attacks

against the United States of America equal an imminent threat. They just gloss by that as though they have nothing to do with the national security of the United States of America. They didn't want to talk about it.

You are owed more than that. This is what debate is. I constantly offer them the time. They don't want to answer the questions. It is because this is all political for them. This is political. That is why they don't want to answer why they voted not too long ago to say use any and all means necessary to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. They all over there voted for that.

None of them can explain today why they don't want to use any and all means necessary, but before, that was the case. It is not convenient. It is not politically convenient for them to do that.

My colleagues over here said it is a war of choice. Yes, it is a choice. As Americans, we make a choice. If somebody hits us day after day, week after week, month after month, do we just keep getting hit, or do we hit back? That is a choice.

I can tell you, as an American servicemember, an American fighter, if somebody hits me, kills my people, I am going to hit them back.

Yes, I hate high energy prices, but not as much as I hate people who kill Americans. I hate them, but not as much as I hate those that kill my people.

Iran kills our people consistently, attacks our people consistently, and wants to seek the means to do that with a nuclear weapon. They all agreed on it prior to President Trump doing something about it. They don't want to have a debate about that.

No matter how it comes down in the end, they don't want to actually talk about the real things that are going on. They don't want to talk about the troop levels over there that are basically the same thing that they were before this conflict even began. These are things they don't like to discuss.

Again, you weren't all here in the audience a week ago when we were debating this before, but as I mentioned earlier, they all voted to say the ways that Iran is a nuclear threat: They want to attack the United States of America. They want to attack us with ballistic missiles, with terrorist proxies. They want to obtain a nuclear weapon and use that against us.

They all voted to say that a week ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I will keep that in mind.

They all voted to say that, that this is the way that Iran is a nuclear—that they are an imminent threat. They won't use the words "imminent threat," though, because to use the words "imminent threat" has some

specific legal connotation to it. They know it is bad for them. They don't want to do it. It is political, too political.

It would be like I have a cough, a fever, cold sweats, but I am unwilling to say that I have the flu. They are not willing to say it. They are not willing to acknowledge what is.

People in the audience, people watching, you are owed more than that out of those who are debating national security.

I mentioned already that before Operation Epic Fury began, in the 30 months prior to it beginning: 350 attacks in 30 months. They are not willing to say that that is "imminent."

Examples include U.S.-flagged tankers, and Iranian forces seize Greek-flagged tanker. There was the tanker *Pacific Zircon*, off the coast of Oman. Iranian Navy captures Marshall Islands-flagged tanker, *Advantage Sweet*. Iranian IRGC seizes Panamanian tanker. IRGC seize Marshall Islands-flagged tanker. The list goes on and on, week in and week out. There was an American tanker, a tanker from another country, putting U.S. sailors on their knees on a U.S. vessel, if everybody remembers that.

I am an American. I don't believe in getting hit and walking away and pretending as though it didn't happen. I would like to think that all Americans were the same way, but I know that is not the case. There are very few that serve in the United States military, and probably even less that are capable of it, because not everybody reacts to conflict in the same way or has the same desire to deal with it.

My colleagues over here who are voting for this are the kind of Americans that get hit and pretend as though it never happened.

If you want America to get hit and pretend as though it never happened, then vote with my colleagues over there. If you want us to keep doing something about it, protecting our servicemembers in the region and our assets in the region, then vote "no."

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 today, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution.

The question is on the 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.

PARENTAL RIGHTS OVER THE EDUCATION AND CARE OF THEIR KIDS ACT

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1224, I call up

the bill (H.R. 2616) to require public elementary and middle schools that receive funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to obtain parental consent before changing a minor's gender markers, pronouns, or preferred name on any school form or sex-based accommodations, including locker rooms or bathrooms, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1224, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Workforce, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 119-26 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2616

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

This Act may be cited as the "Stopping Indoctrination and Protecting Kids Act".

SEC. 2. PARENTAL CONSENT REQUIREMENT RELATED TO GENDER MARKERS, PRONOUNS, AND PREFERRED NAMES ON SCHOOL FORMS AND SEX-BASED ACCOMMODATIONS.

(a) *REQUIREMENT.*—As a condition of receiving funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), a public school that receives funds under such Act shall obtain parental consent before changing a covered student's—

- (1) gender markers, pronouns, or preferred name on any school form; or
- (2) sex-based accommodations, including locker rooms or bathrooms.

(b) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section:

(1) *COVERED STUDENT.*—The term "covered student" means a minor who is—

- (A) an elementary school student; or
- (B) a student in any of the middle grades.

(2) *ESEA TERMS.*—The terms "elementary school", "middle grades", and "parent" have the meanings given such terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

SEC. 3. PROHIBITING USE OF ESEA FUNDS TO TEACH GENDER IDEOLOGY.

Section 8526 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7906) is amended—

- (1) in paragraph (6), by striking "or";
- (2) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and
- (3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

"(7) to teach or advance concepts related to gender ideology, as defined in section 2 of Executive Order 14168 (90 Fed. Reg. 8615; relating to defending women from gender ideology extremism and restoring biological truth to the Federal Government); or"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Workforce, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.