

general, full-time independent investigators there to stop waste, fraud, and abuse, and whistleblowers, ordinary government workers who come forward to tell us what is going on.

This bill strengthens the whistleblower part of that equation, but we have to reflect on the fact that this President has gutted the first part, the inspectors general.

The whistleblower part of oversight only works when people can speak up without fear of retaliation, and that is why whistleblower protections are so important.

At HUD, the administration rolled back fair housing enforcement, stonewalled Congress from receiving critical information, and gutted tenant protections.

Whistleblowers are now the last line of defense against these harmful decisions made behind closed doors, and Congress needs to send a clear message: If you expose wrongdoing, you will be protected. You will not be punished.

Whistleblowers are how we catch waste, fraud, and abuse before they spiral. They are how we make sure that Federal housing programs actually do what Congress intended.

For that reason, I support H.R. 4646. It strengthens whistleblower protections and makes them consistent across HUD contractors without gaps and without guesswork.

Mr. Speaker, we perhaps need this bill more than ever because Republicans in the White House have fired inspectors general across Federal agencies, especially at HUD.

□ 2010

Mr. Trump has fired the HUD inspector general and the FHFA inspector general, including right after they said that they planned to investigate how Trump's administration was engaging in lawlessness. That is not oversight. That is obstruction of justice.

You cannot claim to protect the effort to deal with waste, fraud, and abuse if you support gutting and firing inspectors general. Of course, when you fire inspectors general and either don't have them or install people carefully selected to turn a blind eye, you increase the likelihood of waste, fraud, and abuse.

This bill, at least, deals with that second part of the effort. We need inspectors general. We also need whistleblower protection. This bill will provide additional protection for whistleblowers.

This bill is an important step, perhaps made more necessary by the President's outrageous firing of inspectors general. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4646.

Protecting whistleblowers is not a partisan issue. Doing all we can to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse is not a partisan issue. When employees can safely report waste, fraud, and abuse, government programs work better for everyone. H.R. 4646 strengthens those protections consistently across HUD

and its contractors, and it deserves our support.

We also need to turn our attention to the need for truly independent inspectors general. HUD may not have confirmed leadership in place, but that progress means little while this administration continues to sideline accountability elsewhere, leaving key agencies understaffed and underresourced.

Let us pass this bill today, and let us then focus our efforts on the need for truly independent inspectors general, particularly at HUD and FHFA. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DE LA CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I explained earlier, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. DE LA CRUZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4646, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. DE LA CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 10076

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. GOODLANDER) as a cosponsor of H.R. 10076.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES 93, 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, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider H. Con. Res. 93 in the House if called up by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee, that the concurrent resolution be considered as read, and 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 MOULTON of Massachusetts or their respective designees.

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

There was no objection.

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 September 14, 2026, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 93), 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 of today, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 93

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 MOULTON of Massachusetts or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to discuss the resolution again asking for 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."

I have spoken at length on this floor about Iranian threats, what they have been doing to the United States of America for the last 50 years or the last 50 months, the people that they have killed, the attacks that they have levied against us.

Mr. Speaker, I would love to hear from my colleagues, the authors, and the cosponsors of this legislation what do they think that we are defending the United States of America from? Again, I have spoken at length about it.

I would love to know, do they see a threat? Do they see no threat?

More specifically, about the letter of this law, the letter of this bill, what is it that the sponsors want removed? That is what it says: "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."

What is it that you want removed? Do you want us to remove refueling aircraft so they cannot support Israel or Saudi Arabia?

Do you want us to remove our amphibious ready groups?

Shall we remove our MV-22 Ospreys, our Chinooks, our heavy-lift helicopters, our attack helicopters or our utility helicopters?

What about our Air Force and our naval aviation? What would you like removed there?

We have veterans from the Marine Corps, Army brothers, Army Rangers, others over here that I am guessing are here to speak about what they want removed from this space.

Do you want F-15s removed, F-15 Eagles? Do you want F-16 Falcons removed? Do you want F-35A or B removed or do you want them to remain? How about F-18 Super Hornets?

What is it that you want out of there? That is what you are asking for: "Remove the 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."

What about our KC-135 Stratotankers or our Pegasus? What about our command presence? What is it that you want removed?

This is your resolution.

Do you want signals intelligence, electronic warfare, jamming maritime surveillance, ground surveillance removed? What is it that you want removed?

What about in terms of long-range precision strike capabilities? Would you like our carrier-launched Tomahawk cruise missiles removed from the space?

Do you want our air-launched precision weapons, our ground-launched precision fires, our ship-launched preci-

sion systems removed? What is it that you want removed? Do you want JDAMs removed?

What about in terms of drones? What is it that you want to remain or want removed? How about one-way attack drones, small commercial-style UAVs, larger reconnaissance-strike UAVs?

□ 2020

What personnel do you want removed? Because that is what this is calling for, removing all U.S. Forces.

Do you want logistics personnel removed? Intelligence? Maintenance? Medical? Communications? Headquarters command and control personnel? What do you want removed?

Do you want marines at our embassies removed?

Do you want pararescue jumpers removed?

Do you want us to remove some or all of our Patriot missile batteries from the area?

Can we destroy a missile but not destroy a launcher?

What is it that you want to take place?

Is all of this just because you do not want a naval blockade around Iran? Or is that not it?

I would ask that you be clear because I would love to hear from you exactly what forces you are demanding be removed.

To the sponsor of our bill, I would quote Representative MOULTON: "We have to acknowledge that Iran is a threat to American interests."

To continue that quote—in fact, a brother in arms, and other brothers in arms over there, to continue that quote: "I fought Iranians on the ground in Iraq in 2004. It was bloody. We won. And if necessary, I will fight Iran again."

Iran was attacking us then, as you spoke about, and Iran has been attacking us at all points between that moment and now. I have spoken about it at length on this floor. I have submitted for the RECORD the ships they have attacked and the servicemembers that they killed long before Epic Fury.

They are continuously fighting us. They are a continuous, ongoing threat to the United States and a continuous threat to our allies. That had not stopped until a memorandum of understanding, and then they decided to resume attacks again.

So my question is, again, to the letter of this resolution: What is it that you want removed as you wrote this bill demanding?

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to briefly respond to the remarks from my colleague from Florida.

The gentleman from Florida has asked two basic questions. The first is: Is Iran a threat?

The second is: What troops or materiel should be removed?

There is actually a very simple answer. He answered the first one himself

by quoting me when I have in the past many times said that Iran is a serious threat.

The second question: What should be removed? Also has a very simple answer. We should remove the troops and materiel that are going towards a war that has not only failed but backfired. These are troops and materiel that are depleting resources needed elsewhere in the globe. That is a very simple answer to the gentleman's question, which I will be happy to detail later.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Representative MOULTON's Iran War Powers Resolution.

We are 7 months into a war of choice that President Trump said would only last 4 to 6 weeks. American families have paid over \$100 billion more for gasoline and diesel, roughly \$800 more per household, while gas averages more than \$4 a gallon and diesel is near \$6.

This resolution closely follows my resolution, H. Con. Res. 86, which passed both the House and the Senate. That resolution made clear what the Constitution makes clear: Congress, not the President, has the power to decide when the United States goes to war.

This Congress has not authorized a war with Iran, and yet this administration has kept our troops in harm's way, without a declaration of war, without an authorization from Congress, and without any plan for how to win or end the war.

Congress has already acted. H. Con. Res. 86 passed both Chambers, directing the President to remove U.S. Forces from hostilities with Iran, and in July, the House again passed H. Con. Res. 89 with the same message, a simple message: End this war.

It is important that we do so again.

I have also introduced a binding resolution demanding Speaker JOHNSON take legal action to defend congressional authority. When Congress' constitutional authority is challenged, this institution has an obligation to defend its own prerogatives.

The administration hasn't just continued to wage this illegal war in direct violation of the Constitution, it has done so while Americans bear the costs: 19 fallen servicemembers and more than 750 servicemembers wounded, extended troop deployments, and billions of dollars in additional spending.

The President's mismanagement of this war has hurt America's ability to prepare for future threats.

I ask this body a simple question: Are Americans better off now than before this war started?

Are we safer? Are we more secure?

Has this war produced any of the results the administration promised the American people?

The administration has yet to demonstrate that 7 months of war have produced a lasting strategic resolution to the threats posed by Iran. The Strait of Hormuz remains a source of enormous risk to global energy markets, and Iran's nuclear and missile capabilities, despite what the administration claims, clearly remain.

One only needs to ask our Gulf partners who continue to bear the brunt of Iran's missile and drone attacks.

This war has been a strategic failure. What is left are depleted weapons stockpiles and a tab of more than \$100 billion that taxpayers will have to cover, while families continue to pay more for gas, groceries, and electricity.

Let me be clear: This should not be a partisan question. It is a constitutional one. It is a vote about whether Congress still believes that the power to decide when this Nation goes to war belongs to the Congress, as the Constitution provides.

Our servicemembers deserve clear objectives. Their families deserve accountability, and the American people deserve a Congress willing to exercise its constitutional authority.

Let me remind this body that the House Foreign Affairs Committee has still not held a single public hearing with an administration official on this war, the committee charged with matters of war and peace, zero hearings. Our constituents did not send us here to be a rubber stamp for any administration.

We cannot bomb our way out of this war. We need dialogue and diplomacy with our allies and adversaries alike. We need real diplomats at the table, not real estate developers who are in over their heads.

We, this body, need to hold this administration accountable.

I ask my colleagues to uphold the oath that we all took. Join us and make clear, once again, that this President cannot wage war without our consent.

The American people have made it abundantly clear they do not want and they do not support this war. We should stand with them and not Donald Trump.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would first respond to my colleague, the ranking member, about hearings that we have had. He has heard me say this before. He lived it. We had Secretary Rubio not too long ago. The ranking member left halfway through the hearing never to return. He didn't want to hear from Secretary Rubio. Some of his members took their time to talk about Secretary Rubio's shoes. That was their opportunity to hear from the administration at the highest levels, to talk a little bit about the threat of Iran.

I could use any window of time. I could identify hundreds of attacks in just the 30 months before Epic Fury, or I could identify hundreds more in the last 30 years.

I am going to use the window of time to identify a few, since my colleague, the marine, Representative MOULTON, made the comments that I quoted earlier.

□ 2030

In January 2020, 109 U.S. troops suffered attack and injuries after an Iranian ballistic missile attack on Al Asad Air Base in Iraq. That was just one attack that took place in that ongoing window of time.

In March of '23, an Iranian drone attack killed an American contractor and wounded five U.S. servicemembers and another contractor in a strike on a coalition base in Syria.

In October of '23, Iran-backed terrorists, of course, as everybody is well aware, killed 46 Americans and kidnapped at least 12 Americans in the October 7 genocidal massacre.

In January of '24, Iran-backed Hezbollah terrorists killed 3 U.S. servicemembers and wounded more than 40 other servicemembers in a drone attack at Tower 22: Sergeant Rivers, Sergeant Sanders, and Sergeant Moffett.

In November of '24, an Iranian national and IRGC asset was charged with plotting to assassinate President Trump.

I have more. The list goes on and on. These are just some of the many attacks that I could list since Representative MOULTON made the quote that I spoke about, where he is talking about his service and before Epic Fury began.

This is the continual threat, the imminent threat that Iran is and has been. They attack the United States of America every single chance they get. They attack in the Strait of Hormuz—not just the United States of America but any country going through there—every chance they get. This is just the first time that the United States of America has said enough is enough, that we will not tolerate this any longer.

That same entity that has been attacking us endlessly for all of these years will not be an entity that is allowed to have a nuclear weapon. Why? Because, at best, they now have the capability to hold the entire Gulf hostage because they have a nuclear weapon, and, at worst, they are an entity that does what they have been doing: utilize every asset at their disposal to attack the United States of America and our allies.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken for a few minutes, and Ranking Member MEEKS spoke for a few minutes. I don't know if we have come to that time where my colleague on the other side is happy to detail the pieces of equipment that he wants removed from the battle space, as he mentioned. As is the letter of this resolution, he wants to remove these U.S. forces from hostilities. I am hoping that now is that later time that the Representative will detail what he wants removed.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Florida delivered a comprehensive list of many of the threats that Iran has presented to us in the past. I have not heard any Democrat, myself or otherwise, debate those threats.

The question is: Is Iran a threat today? I think my colleague would agree that they are.

The second question is: Is Iran more of a threat today than they were before this war began? I think anyone with common sense would agree that they are.

Never before has Iran controlled the world economy, brought the world economy to its heels, by closing the Strait of Hormuz as a result of this war not only failing but backfiring.

If we are serious about the threat, then we ought to have a serious strategy to address it. We ought to have a strategy that actually works, whereas this strategy has failed.

I stand here today with my colleagues to do what Congress failed to do for us and our brothers- and sisters-in-arms in Iraq two decades ago: to actually ask tough questions as the Constitution directs us to do—rather than be subservient to another war-mongering administration—and then have the courage to vote to end a war that should never have begun.

I joined over 100,000 other young Americans 23 years ago in invading Iraq in the spring, and we came home to a victory parade in the fall, a victory parade not long after President Bush landed on an aircraft carrier and declared: Mission Accomplished.

We all know it wasn't a victory in 2003, far from it. We were still fighting that Middle Eastern war 20 years later. Mr. Speaker, 4,492 U.S. servicemembers were killed in Iraq, and 32,292 were wounded. Iraq civilian casualties stretched into the hundreds of thousands.

Congress failed to ask the most basic question it owed those families: Was this worth it? It is the same question we are failing to ask today, Mr. Speaker.

That is the price of a war that Congress refused to stop. It is a price that Republicans in Congress are choosing right now to let another generation start paying.

Our President declares victory a couple of times a week—well over 30 times so far—and doesn't dare to try to land a plane on an aircraft carrier to do so. Our carriers can't even land themselves in ports for resupply because our allied ports are now in too much danger of an Iranian attack. We have made our allied ports less safe in the very Gulf where we are fighting this war.

What a remarkably dumb war—dumb. Dumb, you say? Well, let's discuss for a minute what this war has achieved—not using independent metrics, not Democratic metrics, but the very metrics the President has used since day one.

We will start with oil. Well, oil prices are up. We are all paying more at the pump and more in the stores for goods shipped with oil. Good for Iran. Bad for us.

Iran's nuclear program is still intact. In fact, it is more than intact since the President just started talking about yet more strikes against a nuclear program that he and Secretary Hegseth said was obliterated. They were lying, or Iran is rebuilding. Either way: Good for Iran. Bad for us.

Of course, we don't know as much detail on their nuclear program as we once did when we had weapons inspectors and 24/7 electronic monitoring in Iran under President Obama. Trump got rid of those safeguards. Good for Iran. Bad for us.

What about projecting power? We hear a lot about Iran projecting power and what a problem this is in the Middle East and even right here at home, where, as my colleague mentioned, Iran is trying to assassinate officials—officials that the President removed protection from as if to encourage Iran. This measure is truly remarkable because Iran is projecting more power than Iran has ever projected in the history of the world. Never before has the Islamic republic singlehandedly leveraged the entire world economy. Another thing good for Iran; bad for us.

What about ballistic missiles? We were told their ballistic missiles were eliminated. It only took about \$30 billion of our American taxpayer dollars to supposedly do so. Then we learned a matter of weeks later that they still have a lot of missiles and are recovering more. We haven't even begun to talk about the drones that have inflicted more damage than their missiles.

Here is the real kicker. While we were bombing their missiles with only moderate effectiveness, President Trump actually lifted the sanctions on Iran—lifted the sanctions on our adversary that they have admitted is a serious threat to the United States in the middle of a war. They kill a bunch of Americans, and we lift the sanctions? That is quite a strategy.

That alone gave Iran a gift of about \$10 billion. Well, you know what? You can buy a lot of ballistic missiles for \$10 billion. You don't even need to worry about your industrial base. In fact, you can buy Russian or Chinese ballistic missiles that are more sophisticated than what Iran already has. Yet again: Good for Iran. Bad for us.

□ 2040

Of course, the Strait of Hormuz is still closed. A reminder: The strait was open, and has been open in the entire history of the Islamic Republic, before Trump declared victory. It is truly remarkable. Good for Iran; bad for us.

What about their navy? We supposedly obliterated that, too. Yet, we can't open the strait. Any allied tankers require heavy naval escorts, and no art of the deal has gotten Iran to budge.

Any military planner, had the administration asked a single one of them, would have told you Iran could close the strait. It is still effectively closed. Good for Iran; bad for us.

How about their air defenses? We obliterated those, too, shortly before Iran shot down one of our Apache helicopters. Over two decades in Afghanistan, a war my colleague knows well and for which he has seriously sacrificed, and not a single Apache was shot down. Yet, after we supposedly obliterated their air defenses, we lose one to Iran. Good for Iran; bad for us.

What about regime change? That was the stated objective of the President from day one. Now, I want to be a fair arbiter, as we all should in Congress. So on this one count I will give the administration credit. They did achieve regime change. They took out an 86-year-old religious zealot in failing health, who had a fatwa against producing nuclear weapons, and replaced him with someone in his fifties, who is apparently even more committed to their nuclear program, alongside a military government that so far seems more effective than the religious government it replaced. So Trump got regime change. It has just been good for Iran; bad for us.

All of this translates to one sad, embarrassing but unavoidable conclusion: Iran is winning, and America is losing. We didn't get rid of the threat. We empowered it. If that is not dumb, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is.

Remember when Donald Trump said this war would last just a few weeks? Well, it has been over 6 months and counting.

In April, Pete Hegseth stood at a podium and proudly declared a capital V military victory. He said the United States had achieved every single objective. He said that America's objectives were unchanged, on target, and on plan. Yet, as I have just detailed, it seems like we have achieved Iran's objectives quite effectively for them.

Those were Hegseth's terms. He declared victory on them. Really? Well, here's a question for Secretary Hegseth and for every Republican who has taken his word for it since: If we already won, then why is Iran still in control of the Strait of Hormuz? If we already won, why are gas prices still climbing? Why are diesel prices at historic highs, the highest ever? What an achievement.

If we already won, why are our troops still getting hurt 6 months after Hegseth stood up before the American people and declared this victory was won?

If we already won, why does Iran's nuclear program still exist? Compare the state of Iran's nuclear program today to what President Obama achieved with the Iran nuclear deal. Ninety-eight percent of Iran's uranium stockpile was gone. Enrichment was capped at a level so low that it could not be weaponized. The Strait of Hormuz was open, and zero American

troops were killed and zero were wounded. All that, and no war was required.

All of this losing that Trump and Hegseth have been doing comes at a tremendous cost: 18 U.S. servicemembers killed.

At \$100 billion and counting, that translates to an additional \$602 for every American taxpayer on average. How many Americans, how many constituents of mine or the Congressman from Florida, want to be paying \$602 in taxpayer money to lose a war in Iran?

Now, I am saying all this standing here in Congress. Mr. Speaker, how about we stand up for our troops and our citizens for a change rather than perpetuating a war that, by all these measures, on the administration's own terms, is good for Iran and bad for us?

I think it is time to get some common sense, stop taking Trump and Hegseth at their word, find the courage to follow the Constitution and act as our own branch of government, end this war before it gets worse, and stop doing more for Iran than we are doing for us.

Our job is to help America, Mr. Speaker, not help Iran.

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

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

My colleague said: Good for Iran; bad for the U.S. Good for Iran; bad for the U.S. He went back and forth. The best thing for Iran are Representatives that are going to deny that Iran was killing Americans.

To quote my colleague, literally just now, after I just identified to him Sergeant Rivers, Sergeant Sanders, Sergeant Moffett killed at Tower 22 by the hand of Iran, he literally just told us: zero Americans killed. Somebody that is treating our servicemembers, their sacrifice like that, that is the best thing for Iran.

The best thing for Iran are those that have this idea that: Well, you know what? Iran has been attacking us for all these years, but if we bring that to an end, they might fight back. People that are scared of Iran fighting back when we stopped them, that is the best thing for Iran.

My colleague opened up by saying: Nobody on this floor is denying that Iran has been a threat. You don't have to look any further than immediately to your left. In one of the previous debates my colleague was discussing, he has seen no imminent threat from Iran. Ranking Member MEEKS argued on this floor literally numerous times: no imminent threat from Iran.

Even though all of these Members, both Republican and Democrat, came to the floor of the House and literally took a vote to say—Representative MOULTON did not vote in favor of this, but many did—use any and all means necessary to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. Why? Why would that be a vote that overwhelmingly the floor of the House would vote in favor

of? It is because of the extreme, imminent threat that Iran proved themselves to be each and every day.

The dozens of times a month that Iran attacks the United States of America, month in, month out, regardless of the year, that is why everybody overwhelmingly took a vote to say: Use any and all means to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

The best thing for Iran are Representatives that are going to come to this floor, forget that they took a vote to prevent Iran by any means from obtaining a nuclear weapon, because it is politically convenient for them to do so.

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

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

I will respond briefly to my colleague from Florida. My colleague has made a very convincing case, Mr. Speaker, for why we ought to have a strategy or use means necessary to actually defeat the threat from Iran, not a strategy that has backfired and empowered them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW).

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative MOULTON for his leadership on this.

I want to highlight a different component to this. There is a debate around imminent threat. Very clearly, in my opinion and in the opinion of most folks, there is no imminent threat. In fact, the administration itself has stopped even trying to show that, which I think is a clear illustration that there never was one and there isn't one.

Beyond the debate on this floor, one of the things that gets lost, and the important thing that gets lost, is the people who actually get to make this decision are the American people. The genius of our system is that it is Americans who get to decide matters of war and peace, through the Representatives in this body.

For 25 years now, America has been in endless conflict. There have been threats that have come and threats that have gone. The answer can't be that whenever there is a threat, instantly it means we have to go to war. That is the logic on the other side: threat equals war. If a threat pops up, you go to war.

That can't possibly be the logic. If that is the case, then we will be at war forever. We will spend another \$3 trillion in addition to the \$3 trillion we have already spent. Regardless of the nature of the threat posed, the answer always will be to send our military. Americans know that is not tenable, in fact.

□ 2050

What is the accountability mechanism? The accountability mechanism is that Americans are in the driver seat because Americans are the ones that have to do the fighting, do the dying, and pay for this. It is not the elites and

the pedigreed folks in this administration that are fighting and dying. They are banging the war drums and sending working-class kids like us to go do it.

Why are the Republicans so desperate to avoid even voting on this? Why have they literally canceled votes this year to avoid voting on this? Because they know that Americans don't want it. Republicans and Democrats alike don't want it.

President Trump himself used to know that. I don't know what happened, but he campaigned on this. He went around the country and said, let's stop the endless wars. Let's pull out. Let's focus back home. He was right about that. Then he became President and turned his back on the American people and on the very promise he made.

Let's have these votes. Let's let people know where we stand, then go home, stand in front of our constituents, and answer the tough questions. Why send your taxpayer money? Why send your sons and daughters to go do it?

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

Mr. CROW. That is why we are here.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out to the author of the bill that he need only look to his left to see somebody who totally disagreed. There are people that are down here denying that there is any threat posed by Iran. There is not agreement. It is something that, again, the floor of the House voted and said, use any and all means necessary to prevent them from having a nuclear weapon. You have people who can't even acknowledge that they are a threat.

It was said that we can't just go out there and wage war every time a threat just pops up. Iran is not a threat that just popped up. Iran is not some poorly funded militia. It is a country of 92 million people that has been putting every bit of spare currency into creating terrorist groups, funding military, developing nuclear weapons, and continually working to control and threaten the Strait of Hormuz. That is not a new thing.

Let's bring something new into this conversation. You take a company like Lloyds of London or some other big insurance company. They, literally, are out there writing policies for years, not just since Epic Fury, but for years, for every ship going in and out of the Strait of Hormuz, on their way in and on their way out.

Why are they writing these catastrophic risk insurance policies for every ship going in and every ship going out? They do so because of the threat that Iran has been demonstrating day in and day out, week in and week out, month in and month out, every single year.

There is a forever war. President Trump is absolutely against forever

wars. That is what he is ending. Iran has been waging war forever against the United States of America. The forever of this regime, they have been waging war against the United States of America. It comes to an end in only one way: us bringing it to an end. That is what the United States of America is working to do.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I detailed how on so many counts—oil, nuclear weapons, ballistic missiles, and regime change that we are worse off today than we were when this war started, but I thank my colleague from Florida for bringing up another one, which is insurance rates.

I ask my colleague: Are insurance rates higher or lower to go through the Strait of Hormuz today than they were 5, 10, or 50 years ago? Everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, it is worse.

Then my colleague said, well, that is why we need to end this forever war. How is that going? What are we up to, 40 times that President Trump has said the war is ending. I would like to see the day.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, as we have this debate and talk about the lack of strategy of this administration, I am reminded of Sun Tzu in the book, "The Art of War" where he wrote: The one who figures on victory at headquarters before even doing battle is the one who has the most strategic factors on his side. He continued, more than 2,000 years ago, saying: The one with many strategic factors in his favor is the one who wins.

We all agree that Iran, the regime in Iran, is an intolerable threat to the United States, our Gulf allies, Israel, Europe, and much of the rest of the world. We agree that Iran must never ever have a nuclear weapon.

Before President Trump launched the current war with Iran, we had four goals: eliminate Iran's nuclear program; thwart Iran's missiles, rockets, and drone capabilities; dismantle Iran's terror support network; and address the regime's human rights abuses.

Two hundred days later, having lost 19 servicemembers with more than 800 wounded and dangerously depleting our weapons stockpiles, Iran is still pursuing its nuclear program. It still has missiles, rockets, and drones. It is still threatening the Strait of Hormuz, the Gulf States, and Israel. It is still supporting its terrorist proxies, oppressing its citizens, and violently suppressing dissent.

After 200 days of war, none of the four original goals are realized, and we have added a fifth: reopening the Strait of Hormuz to public shipping. After 200 days, we have had no hearings in this body and no substantive debate.

Our Constitution is clear: Our Framers gave only Congress the power to declare war and commit our troops to extended conflict. The President is, indeed, the Commander in Chief, but that authority does not create or erase the role and responsibility of our legislative branch.

Before we ask more American servicemembers to risk their lives and the American people to take on more sacrifice, Congress and the American people deserve to know the administration's military objectives and how we intend to achieve them.

That is why this War Powers Resolution exists. President Trump has a responsibility to come before Congress, and Congress, this Congress, has a responsibility to hold open hearings, public debate, and a vote.

Mr. Speaker, if we allow any President, Republican or Democrat, to take our Nation into an open-ended war without congressional authorization or a basic explanation to the American people, we establish a dangerous precedent that will outlast this conflict and this administration.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague said at the end of his comments that he would like to see the day that this war comes to an end. I don't think my colleague wants to see that day because, again, my colleague brought forward a resolution today saying remove any of these forces that are engaged with Iran from the area. Those are not the exact words, but that is basically what it says.

I have yet to see the identification of which forces my colleague wants out of there. It was promised. I haven't heard it, but I don't think that they want to see that day.

The strategy, one of many that is taking place, as you probably heard Secretary Rubio state: They fire at one of our ships, we destroy one of theirs. That is a change from what has taken place. They attack the United States of America or our interests or our allies, we respond.

That is the change. Not everybody has the stomach to respond to threats. That is just the world we live in. Few are capable, and few are willing.

This administration has the stones to say that Iran has been attacking us endlessly, this comes to an end. They attack us. We destroy them. They attack us. We destroy them. My colleague would capture that as good for Iran, but the truth is it is anything but good for Iran.

□ 2100

What took place against Iran? Natanz, Isfahan, and Fordo destroyed. There were 13,000 targets struck, 2,000 command-and-control targets defeated, 1,450 defense- and industrial-based targets destroyed, 1,500 air defense targets destroyed, 700 mine systems destroyed,

800 attack drones destroyed, 600 naval targets destroyed, 450 ballistic missile targets destroyed, 1,000 incoming attack drones intercepted, 700 ballistic missile threats intercepted. The list goes on and on. None of that is good for Iran.

Every single one of those that Iran has done, whether since Epic Fury or before, was intended to indiscriminately kill any civilian that they can, not just military targets but anybody that they can hit. Just like October 7 was to indiscriminately kill anybody that they can, not just military targets but anybody, civilian or otherwise.

That is what Iran's aim has been dozens of times a month, and that is what the United States of America is bringing to an end, whether by their willingness to leave their ways or when they are no longer capable to do so. That is the way that this ends for Iran.

It does take a strong stomach to do that. It does take individuals that are willing to acknowledge there were U.S. servicemembers that were killed before Epic Fury. If you are not recognizing that very serious and simple fact, then you are not understanding the threat of Iran and have no business dealing with it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, before my colleague launched into a Westmoreland-like list of targets, which has nothing to do with whether or not we are actually winning this war, he talked about the President having the stomach to go to war, maybe the stomach to end it.

I would ask my colleague, who is the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, when we are going to find the stomach in Congress to just hold a hearing on this war? That shouldn't be a very high bar. Yet, the chairman hasn't reached it.

Why is it that the Republicans in Congress will literally cancel votes before they have a vote on the most important responsibility that we have?

If the end is truly in sight for this war, then why, as I have detailed on every single measure, is it getting worse and the threat is increasing?

Yes, Iran has been a threat for a really long time, and that is why we should have a strategy that ends the threat, not further empowers Iran.

Yes, Americans have been killed in the past by Iran. The question is will more Americans be killed in the future? I think we all know, sadly, what that answer is today.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution delegates to Congress no more important responsibility than deciding when to send the best of America, our young Americans, to war—decisions that make our families more or less safe here at home.

The unmistakable conclusion of this debate is that Iran is sadly better off today, more empowered today than

they were before this began, this unconstitutional, illegal, dumb war that has truly not just failed but backfired. Doubling down with wars escalating follows the precedent set by other forever wars in the Middle East.

We haven't even talked about the greatest threat in the world today, which is not Iran, but Xi Jinping in China. As we take more and more assets away from deterring China, away from deterring Russia, which is inching closer and closer to starting a war with NATO in Europe, it is a gift to Putin and Xi Jinping, a gift.

This war has been a tactical failure and a strategic disaster. We are not better off than we were before, and that is why we need to bring it to an end.

But, most fundamentally, we ought to have the courage or, as my colleague says, the stomach to debate it, to talk about it, to not continually try to put off these votes, but to have the courage to vote on these resolutions for the American people, the constituents that we represent, and then go home and ask them—constituents in Florida, constituents in Massachusetts, and military families all across the world—whether this is worth it, whether a war that we are losing is worth their sacrifice, worth their taxpayer dollars.

Let's have the courage to take that vote and then answer to our constituents, because our troops, our families, and the American citizens deserve nothing less.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MAST. I don't think I am going to need 11½ minutes, but I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to begin by answering some of my colleague's questions. When will we find the stomach in Congress to hold hearings on this war? I mentioned it already. The Committee on Foreign Affairs not too long ago held a hearing with Secretary of State Marco Rubio. The ranking member, as I pointed out, was walking out of the room, not wanting to stay and respond. He left midway through the hearing and didn't even want to stay to hear Secretary of State Rubio.

We have held hearings. Democrats, unfortunately, wasted a lot of their time trying to make quips about Secretary Rubio's shoes and other silly things really unbecoming members of that committee.

This resolution, in my opinion, is designed for two things. I don't believe it to be serious. I have seen the same language numerous times now. It is designed for political points. This is a resolution stating remove all of these forces from hostilities. I gave you a comprehensive list of forces, but you can't tell me one that you want removed. That is just political theater.

You are just saying you want something done, and either you haven't thought through what you actually want done or there is really nothing you want done. You just want to pretend and say it. That is political.

I think the second point of this resolution is to destroy our ability to pressure the Iranian regime by removing any offensive capabilities that we have in the region. I don't think they want an ability for us to go out there and say: We are going to hold this blockade over Iran because Iran has been attacking our ships, not just in the year 2026, but in the years 2025, 2024, and 2023, and well beyond. I have given the list on this floor numerous times of hundreds of attacks just in the 30 months before Epic Fury even took place.

Sometimes the only choice you have is you are going to hit back.

There have been a lot of questions asked on this floor. What I would like to know is: When are my Democrat colleagues going to have the stomach to hit back against an enemy that has been hitting us? Because, apparently, you don't have it.

□ 2110

You are unwilling to do so, and you are willing to come to the floor of the House and say things so untruthful, such as that there weren't any Americans killed prior to Epic Fury, to quote my colleague on the other side of the aisle, when just before that, I identified to my colleague three U.S. servicemembers who were killed, Sergeant Rivers, Sergeant Sanders, and Sergeant Moffett, and a list of hundreds who were injured by Iranian attacks.

All of those things were ignored so that they could say that there was nobody killed. Why ignore those things? Why ignore something so serious as servicemembers, our brothers and sisters, our brothers-and sisters-in-arms, being killed? Why ignore that? It is because it doesn't fit the political narrative. That is a sad thing.

I have the stomach to hit back our enemies. Some of my colleagues don't. That is the question on the floor here: Do you have the stomach to hit back our enemies, or are you going to throw up the flag of surrender and say: Remove these forces.

We don't know what they are. We don't know what they are doing. We don't know the capabilities that they bring. We don't know the increased danger that it puts other forces in to remove them. We don't know anything about it, but remove them because it is politically expeditious, instead of having the stomach to go out there and seek and destroy the enemies of the United States of America, as we trained to do.

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 adoption of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. MOULTON. 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 RICKY PARKS

(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, Ricky Parks of Rocky Mount is a true servant whose life has been defined by duty, courage, and selfless service.

Ricky was honored with a special quilt, "A Thin Blue Line," from the Tar River Peacemakers Quilting Guild, honoring his service to the community, eastern North Carolina, and our State.

He was also instrumental in helping to start the Ride of Honor in Nash County, which honors our veterans.

For more than 37 years, Ricky has served in law enforcement, mostly on patrol. His commitment to public service continued when he was appointed marshal of the North Carolina Supreme Court.

Through every chapter of his life, Ricky has answered the call to serve.

I thank Ricky and his wife, Rebecca, for a lifetime of service, and I congratulate them on being great Americans.

RECOGNIZING TRUCKER APPRECIATION WEEK

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Ms. HAGEMAN of Wyoming was recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.)

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here and we have gathered this evening to talk about Trucker Appreciation Week.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the unsung heroes who spend their days hauling the American Dream across our Nation's highways.

America's truckers are the men and women who keep America moving. They drive for hours on end to make sure that our shelves are stocked. They rush in to deliver lifesaving supplies when disaster strikes. They keep our industries running by delivering the raw materials needed to build our country. Simply put, truckers are the reason Americans have and continue to live in an era of unprecedented prosperity.

Unfortunately, our truckers face challenges from the lingering consequences of years of open borders and political leaders who flooded the Nation's highways with unqualified, foreign drivers who undercut our home-

grown American labor. These new foreign drivers not only undermine wages and opportunities for American truckers but exacerbate the shortage of infrastructure to keep our goods moving.

Worst of all, however, are the deadly crashes caused by these unqualified drivers who have been killing Americans, all of which have been made possible by the intentional decision of some to disregard commonsense Federal safety standards.

The highway tragedies that have become so ubiquitous in the last couple of years have shone a spotlight on those collisions that could have been prevented but for the decisions by States like California, New York, and Illinois to unleash tens of thousands of unqualified drivers on our American freeways.

These high-speed, 80,000-pound guided missiles have been barreling down our highways at 80 miles an hour, leaving way too many victims in their wake, and these illegally licensed drivers who have killed our fellow American residents simply have no business being on our roads.

My home State of Wyoming, home to snow-covered and windswept highways built at elevations higher than the Sierra Nevada, suffers the highest rate of fatal truck crashes of any State. Threats to drivers anywhere are threats to families everywhere.

The status quo is unacceptable, and it is time to prioritize our hardworking American truckers while keeping every motorist safe.

I have introduced a series of bills to clean up our roads and crack down on bad actors who are exploiting loopholes in the system. I introduced the Commercial Motor Vehicle English Proficiency Act to require that all testing for commercial driver's licenses be administered in English.

I also introduced Connor's Law with Representative DAVE TAYLOR to codify the Trump administration's reinstatement of longstanding English proficiency requirements for anyone getting behind the wheel of a big rig. Understanding our national language to read our signs, adhere to warnings about hazardous conditions, and communicate with law enforcement should be the bare minimum to operate a commercial vehicle.

I introduced the SAFE Act, included in this year's surface transportation reauthorization package, to enhance the ability of Federal regulators to effectively detect and crack down on chameleon carriers.

Chameleon carriers are those that rack up safety violations yet continue to operate by adopting new identities to drive under the radar.

The SAFE Act has been endorsed by nearly a dozen major industry advocates, including the American Trucking Association, Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association, Teamsters, Truckload Carriers Association, Truck Safety Coalition, American Truckers United, National Tank Truck