

Comey to drop the investigation into Michael Flynn. According to sources close to Comey, this request came just 1 day after Michael Flynn was fired. This is truly a new low. If this is true—and we are trying to get to the bottom of this—it would absolutely constitute an obstruction of justice. The President has put obstacle after obstacle in the way of any real investigation that gives us the information that we need to protect our national security and the American people.

In the 118 days since the Trump Presidency began, it has been scandal after scandal. The latest events have escalated this crisis to an even higher level. As I mentioned, the FBI Director serves a 10-year term specifically in order to be able to carry out these independent investigations free of partisanship or political pressure. The firing of James Comey and the fact that he was asked by the President for loyalty—again, this is apparently in Director Comey's memo, which we hope to be able to see—and to abandon the investigation against Michael Flynn are extremely serious offenses. They hurt our democracy and they hurt our country.

The President has tried to distract us time and time again, but we actually know that the American people deserve better. History smiles kindly on those who stand up and put country over party and on those who ensure that in the darkest of times and the most difficult of times, the times when we face a constitutional crisis, where our Nation wonders what direction we are going in, the times when we know that the need to preserve the institutions of democracy and justice are most necessary, those are the times when we need people to speak out on both sides of the aisle for the facts, for the truth, and for democracy.

This should not be a partisan issue. We are seeing that starting to emerge from our colleagues across the aisle. I commend those Republicans who have begun to ask for information, documents, and hearings; and I hope that more of my colleagues will join us in the pursuit of truth and in the pursuit of justice.

Last night we received news that Robert Mueller, who is the former FBI Director, has been appointed as special counsel for the investigation into the Trump campaign's ties with Russia. This is an extremely distinguished man. He has served the country with tremendous success and loyalty, and we are hopeful that Mr. Mueller will diligently investigate the allegations against Michael Flynn and other members of the Trump campaign with veracity and free from political influence. However, we still maintain that an independent commission is necessary because a special counsel answers to the Attorney General, who can then overrule decisions that they make or even fire them at any time. So the appointment of Robert Mueller is a good first step, but it cannot be the last.

Director Mueller will still be in the chain of command under the Trump-appointed leadership of the Justice Department. He cannot take the place of a truly independent outside commission that is free from Trump's meddling.

I think that is why it is so important that we all join in signing the discharge petition that was introduced yesterday by my colleagues, Representative SWALWELL and Representative CUMMINGS, who is the ranking member on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. This discharge petition would essentially allow for a bill to move forward that would establish an independent commission that we could truly trust to seek justice. The commission would interview witnesses, would obtain documents, would issue subpoenas, and would receive public testimony in order to examine whether or not the Russian Government did, in fact, interfere with U.S. elections and how they carried that out.

This is a really crucial step to take because it is not only about the short term and the immediacy of what is in front of us—extremely important, the commission would deal with that as well—but it is also about how do we ensure that these things don't happen again? What did happen, first of all, and how do we make sure that we continue to protect our democracy in the face of what 17 independent intelligence agencies said, which is that the Russians hacked our election in the United States?

There is a lot we need to understand. We need the special counsel, but we also need this independent citizen commission not made up of Members of Congress, but appointed by the House and the Senate leaders of both parties in equal numbers so that we could actually have people who look at this from the perspective of all of America and not tainted by even the vestiges or the appearance of party.

Apparently when President Trump heard that special counsel had been named, he laughed out loud, saying that this is "the greatest witch hunt of a politician in American history."

No, Mr. President, we are seeking the truth. As the American people have shown us, they are not backing down, and we will continue to fight for this truth.

Now, in that vein, I also wanted to mention that my colleague, Representative RASKIN, and I actually introduced a package of bills that we are calling the Trump transparency package. It is because we really believe that the American people deserve better. We believe that the American people deserve from us transparency. So what this package will do is, first, it will clearly forbid government officials from accepting anything of value from foreign governments in exchange for an official act. It would prohibit government employees from using their positions to further the financial interests of the President. It would ensure that the

President's press pool continues to exist so that the American people receive honest answers, and it would require the President and his family to publicly report any foreign business deals that exceed \$10,000.

These are simple steps. They are not egregious and they are not outrageous. They would apply to anyone. They are not partisan. They are about transparency and accountability so that we know that the President of the United States and that others in government are actually accountable to the American people—not to their financial interests, not to their bank accounts, not to their stock portfolios, not to their hotels and golf courses, but to the American people. We have to hold every administration—and certainly this one—accountable. So now, more than ever, it is our moral duty to defend the Constitution, and this bill package goes a step in the right direction.

So I hope that all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would actually cosponsor the Trump transparency package with us so that we can continue to fight for the American people, for democracy, and for the notion that America is willing to question itself and for the notion that America is willing to always put our hands on that moral arc of the universe to push it more quickly towards justice.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHENEY). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and are further reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 30 minutes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, first, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues, to talk about restoring Congress' constitutional oversight on matters of war and peace. I invite all of my colleagues to join me in demanding that this House immediately repeal the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Nearly 16 years ago, Congress passed an open-ended, blank check for endless war. This authorization gives any President the authority to wage limitless war at any time, anywhere, for any reason in perpetuity. The vote to relinquish our constitutional authority occurred just 3 days after the horrific terrorist attacks on 9/11. The American

people were angry and anxious to take action.

Madam Speaker, I was just as outraged and devastated as every other American, but I voted against this 2001 AUMF because I believed then—as I believe now—that it was a blank check and set the stage for perpetual war.

This House rushed to pass the 60-word authorization with little debate. Sixty words, Madam Speaker, drastically altered history. In the almost 16 years since its passage, the 2001 AUMF—which was designed, mind you, to punish the perpetrators of the brutal and deadly attacks on September 11—has been used now by three Presidents to wage endless war around the globe. A recent report from the Congressional Research Service shows that this authorization has been used more than 37 times in 14 countries to justify military action.

□ 1800

These include operations at Guantanamo Bay, warrantless wiretapping, and recent military actions in Libya, Syria, Somalia, Yemen, and many more. This report only looks at unclassified military actions.

I would like to now yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN), who has been such a leader on so many issues, especially around issues of our constitutional responsibility, issues around war and peace.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Congresswoman for having this Special Order to address this issue and for continuing to be such a leader on behalf of this great democracy that we have.

Although I was not in Congress when this AUMF was established, more than 15 years later, it is clear this authorization is not designed for this endless and perpetual war on terror.

I commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her bravery and her unwavering stance for what is right.

Sadly, what the gentlewoman feared is now our reality. Just today, U.S. forces participated in an airstrike against the Assad regime under the umbrella of the same AUMF. This is just the latest example of this virtual endless war we are able to wage in the Middle East and beyond.

As of January 2013, DOD reported 7,008 U.S. military deaths in the war on terror in addition to the over 50,000 that have been wounded. This does not include the huge numbers of civilians killed and families that have been impacted by the U.S. military machine. This is compounded by the harsh reality that, according to Pentagon statistics, suicide, not combat, is the leading killer of U.S. troops deployed to the Middle East to fight Islamic State militants. Between 2001 and 2010, the rate of suicide in the military has doubled.

When we decide to commit our troops to our mission, it needs to be with

clear goals and the explicit approval of Congress, approval that aligns with the goals of the administration and the Commander in Chief. Anything less puts personnel at risk, draining vital resources, finances, and our military.

We are taking our military away from readiness everywhere. We are making tactical and deliberate actions less feasible by spreading our military capacity thin. We are not doing our job if we allow *carte blanche* to any President to wage a nebulous war.

This is not just a bipartisan issue, this is an American issue.

I have voted against funding bills that maintain operations under the 2001 AUMF under the previous administration and feel no differently today. Quite frankly, based on the actions of this President, I have even less confidence that he has a reasonable and targeted plan to deal with such a complex military issue.

We need a deliberate process. We need a new AUMF that establishes strict parameters, attainable goals, and, most importantly, accountability. There is a real cost here, a human cost here; so whether it is an additional 1 or 1,000, our troops demand more, our allies demand more, and this country of ours deserves more.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for that very powerful statement and also for reminding us that this should not be a partisan issue.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), who has been very diligent in his effort to repeal the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for organizing this very important Special Order. This is something that she has been a champion on. This is my third term, and we have been talking about this for 4 years. Enough is enough. It is time to end this.

I rise today in support of Congress reclaiming its authority under Article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution. The United States must have a clear strategy with well-defined goals to counter nonstate actors like ISIS that threaten the United States. They threaten our national security interests. We must also develop clear legal authority for our military to take action against these groups. Ending the 2001 AUMF is a crucial part of that effort.

According to scholars at Brown University's Watson Institute of International and Public Affairs, our government, our taxpayers, have spent \$4.8 trillion on the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, paid for almost entirely by borrowing.

As of today, 6,925 American soldiers have given their lives serving our country in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Inherent Resolve, and Operation Freedom's Sentinel, ac-

ording to the Department of Defense. But what about the costs to take care of these young men and women for the next 60, 70, and 80 years in our country?

While our brave men and women in uniform continue to fight in the sands of Iraq and Syria and the mountains of Afghanistan, we have gone through three Presidential administrations without a statement articulating what victory is, except that "terrorism must be defeated."

No one disagrees with that goal, but it is an uncertain way to order our Nation's military posture and to commit our young men and women in the military serving this Nation without a clear, defined goal. We have been at war in Afghanistan for 16 years, yet the Taliban controls or contests 40 percent of Afghan districts, according to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction.

The U.S. intelligence community's worldwide threat assessment states that "the overall situation in Afghanistan will very likely continue to deteriorate, even if international support is sustained," and that "endemic state weaknesses, the government's political fragility, deficiencies of the Afghan National Security Forces, Taliban persistence, and regional interference will remain key impediments to improvement."

In addition to Afghanistan, the United States has also been involved in Iraq, on and off, since 2003.

Dr. James Zogby of the Arab American Institute conducted a poll of Iraqi public opinion in 2016, which found that 94 percent of Iraqis had an unfavorable attitude about the United States. Ninety-four percent of Iraqis polled say they do not think the U.S. contributes to peace and stability in the Arab world.

We need a much clearer strategy for our men and women in uniform than to tell them just to keep doing the same thing over and over again. We all know what the definition of insanity is, and we need to do better for them and for our partners around the world.

Our Nation has arrived at a historic and constitutional moment. Prior to President Trump's inauguration, President Obama released a framework outlining his administration's formal legal view on the use of military force against Islamic terror groups around the globe. That report relied heavily on the 2001 AUMF, which has been used to justify numerous American military operations against an ever-expanding number of terror groups, many of which have only slight links to the perpetrators of the September 11, 2001, attacks.

In reality, our loose interpretation of the 2001 AUMF to have a perpetual war against terror might as well be using the authorization that Thomas Jefferson used to go after the Barbary pirates on the shores of Tripoli the way this has been stretched over and over again. It is unconscionable.

I hope that President Trump's administration will not continue to rely

on that same legal framework but, rather, that he will formally ask Congress to pass a new authorization with a clear directive of what success is for the use of force that will not perpetually operate in constitutional gray areas.

Strikes against groups like al-Shabaab in Somalia take place in constitutional twilight zones where the Constitution's distribution of authority to use force is uncertain, as Justice Jackson wrote in *Youngstown v. Sawyer*.

To better preserve our Constitution's separation of powers structure, Congress must make it a priority to develop clear legal authority for American military action against Islamist terror organizations. Further, such authorization should be structured so it will not turn into the expanding grant of power like the 2001 AUMF has done.

If we fail to pass a new AUMF, it would do our servicemen and -women, as well as the American public, a fundamental disservice. It would prolong authorization of an endless war.

It is time to end the Middle East conflict. Let's end the authorization of the 2001 AUMF. Right now, I fear that many of our military operations do not have congressional authorization and do not comply with the clear statement of Article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution that gives Congress the power to declare war.

To show our servicemen and -women we support them, to uphold the Constitution, and for the good of our Nation, I hope we can work on the passage of a new AUMF with deliberate speed.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. Her commitment to this cause is commendable.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman YOHO for his clear and concise statement laying out how explicit the Constitution is as it relates to matters of war and peace and how we must debate both if we are going to continue to use force. We look forward to a bipartisan effort this year to get us where we need to be, and that is to repeal this authorization. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), who is the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and whom I served with on the committee for many years, and who really has a very clear understanding of foreign and military policy and has been such a leader on so many issues and someone on whom we rely on so many fronts.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman LEE. We are all grateful to you for being so clear and so principled.

As I have often said, Congress must fulfill its constitutional obligation to consider an updated AUMF, and as my colleagues said, that stands for the Authorization for the Use of Military Force. Right now, the administration is still using the authorization we

passed after September 11, 2001, in the legal justification to fight ISIS. That is deeply problematic.

The 2001 AUMF has none of the limits many of us are seeking. We are a Congress. We are not a rubber stamp to any President. We have a right to vote on issues such as war and peace.

U.S. leadership to defeat ISIS is critical, but this doesn't require a large-scale deployment of U.S. forces. With American leadership, we were able to prevent the wholesale slaughter of the Yazidi people.

Iraqi partners were able to maintain control of the Mosul Dam, which, if breached by ISIS, could have resulted in death and displacement of up to 2 million people and endangered American personnel in Iraq. With our support, local forces have taken back about 80 percent of the territory from ISIS in Iraq and Syria.

So another large-scale, open-ended commitment of American troops is certainly not the answer. The disastrous intervention in Iraq last decade set the stage for the rise of ISIS in the first place. The 2001 AUMF has no limits at all on U.S. ground troops.

As troop levels continue to rise in the fight against ISIS, we just cannot put our heads in the sand. We need to sit together as a deliberative body and make these important decisions, not give any President or any administration a blank check.

I am working on legislation to limit the authority Congress provided after September 11. We need to tailor this authority to the threat we face today. September 11 happened 16 years ago. We need new parameters to define our mission and our goals. I voted for that AUMF 16 years ago, but I never would have imagined that 16 years later it would still be there and give a blank check to any President who would use it anytime, anyplace, and to do anything. So we must fulfill our constitutional responsibility and consider what an appropriate authorization should include.

Using a 2001 authorization for a 2017 conflict sets a terrible constitutional precedent. Congress has a vital constitutional responsibility over America's war powers. This is one of the most important decisions we are charged with making. When we fail to live up to that responsibility, we weaken the balance of power that is the bedrock of our democracy. Considering an updated AUMF is not easy, but it is our job. We should do our job.

President Obama came to Congress well over a year ago with a proposed AUMF. Not many people cared for it, but it was a proposed AUMF. We could have changed it—it was a starting point—but we didn't do it. We threw it away because it just got too hard. That cannot happen again.

Congress has a responsibility to do its part here, and, unfortunately, we are not meeting that responsibility. We owe it to the American people and we owe it our men and women in uniform

to do our job. Congressional inaction on an AUMF is inexcusable.

□ 1815

I want to say that it a separate issue from the recent strikes against Assad. Congress has made no authorization whatsoever for sustained military action against Assad. The 60-day clock started ticking when the President notified Congress of his missile strike.

The administration must come to Congress on that issue as well. There cannot be long-term military action against Assad without Congressional say-so.

Assad is a bad guy, and I think that he should be deposed, quite frankly. I think that any future for Syria cannot include Assad, who has murdered hundreds of thousands of his own people.

But whether the United States must involve itself in every single war and ground troops using an outdated authorization for the use of force just strikes me as being something that should not happen and will lead us down a path in the future where we can't get out of it.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE). She has always stood up for her beliefs, whether they seem popular or unpopular when it happened. That is just the kind of people we want to serve in Congress: someone who speaks out and has been a consistent fighter.

I am proud to join with her tonight, and I hope that more colleagues on both sides of the aisle will understand that this is an important constitutional principle. It is not a matter of who is in power, who is the President, what party has the majority. As Americans and as legislators, we should all be very concerned about giving any President a blank check to go to war.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for that very powerful statement and for really laying out the fact that Congress is missing in action and that this resolution, this AUMF, must be repealed so that we can move forward and make some determinations as to what Congress' role will be and what we think should happen in terms of our strategy as it relates to going to war.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for being here tonight and I thank him for his leadership and his expertise.

Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), who has been a friend, a supporter, who constantly is talking about why we need to protect our troops, support our troops, keep them out of harm's way, support our veterans. He is a great American, and I have the pleasure of working with him on so many issues.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for the leadership and also this opportunity. I could not agree more with where we are and why we are on the floor tonight.

If you believe in the Constitution, which the majority of us do because we raise our hands when we are sworn in, then we need to do our constitutional responsibility. What has been said tonight by my colleagues and will be ended by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) in just a few minutes is the fact that we do not do our constitutional duty or responsibility.

The 2001 AUMF to talk about going after Osama bin Laden after 9/11, meaning Afghanistan, made sense. The AUMF in 2002 should have never passed this House. I regret that I voted for it because Iraq was an unnecessary war. But that is history now.

What we are talking about is learning from history and dealing with the present and the future. Therefore, there is no reason that the leadership of the House, Mr. RYAN, will not permit the committees of jurisdiction to bring forward a new AUMF. It could be a blanket AUMF or it could mean Syria or maybe Afghanistan.

I have joined with colleagues on the other side, including the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), to put in H.R. 1666 that says, after 16 years, there needs to be a debate on the future involvement of the American people and the military into Afghanistan.

We have 300 Members of Congress sitting on the floor day in and day out who have never been part of a debate or a vote on the future of Afghanistan. After 16 years, \$800 billion spent, 2,000 Americans killed and 20,000 wounded, if we do not have a debate on whether we stay in Afghanistan or we talk about coming home, then our leadership in the House are not doing their constitutional duty either.

Madam Speaker, tonight I wanted to be very supportive, as I will be. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and I have been on each other's bills as it deals with Syria, Afghanistan, or Iraq. It is time for us to demand from our leadership—I do not blame the Presidents, whether it be Trump or Obama, I do not blame them, because it is our responsibility.

James Madison was very clear, and I am going to paraphrase very quickly. It is the legislative branch that will debate and declare war, not the executive branch. What we have done with these AUMFs from 2001 and 2002, we have abdicated our responsibilities.

I know how the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) feels, and all those who spoke tonight and those who are not here tonight to speak, how we all feel. But it is up to us to demand from our leadership. Don't wait for a President to give direction, because Madison was very clear. It is our responsibility.

Madam Speaker, I have written five or six letters to Mr. RYAN, the Speaker of the House. I have written him additional letters with my colleagues on the other side asking him to permit us to meet our constitutional responsibility. At this point we have had no luck, and I am asking Mr. RYAN tonight, the Speaker of the House, to di-

rect the committees of jurisdiction to come forward with one of these bills that have been introduced by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and other Members of the Democratic Party and those of us in the Republican Party to come forward and let's have a refresher course, so to speak, on the constitutional responsibility.

I have Camp Lejeune Marine Base in my district. I talked to marines as recently as 2 weeks ago. One has been five times to Afghanistan. He said it is not worth a dime to be there. We are spending billions and billions of dollars, and kids still getting killed.

I have signed over 10,000 letters to families and extended families who have lost loved ones because I knew I should never have voted to go into Iraq. That is my mistake, and I am living with my mistake. But what I am trying to do now is to join you and others to say we have a constitutional responsibility to debate war. If we are going to send our young men and women to die in war, we need to debate it.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for this opportunity. I look forward to working with her as we go forward. I think we really need to put pressure on the leadership to allow us to meet our responsibilities. I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for giving me this opportunity to be here with my colleagues.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for his statement tonight and for his leadership. I think, listening to him, listening to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), and working with our colleagues in a bipartisan way, you know, we have to keep hope alive on this because our young men and women, our Constitution, our country, deserves it. You have been here from the beginning in terms of trying to help put Congress back into action because we have been missing in action.

Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), my colleague from the Silicon Valley, right next door to my district, who has come to Congress and has hit the ground running. He is a true advocate on so many issues as it relates to peace and justice and security.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her vision in making sure Congress votes on matters of war and peace.

When we were attacked, after 9/11, I, like many Americans, supported strikes on the people who attacked us. But no one in this country would have thought that a resolution would be used for perpetual war.

Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) had the courage back then and the foresight to stand up with courage and stand up against a resolution that has provided

a blank check for the last 16 years. I do believe that that is the type of political courage that one day will be remembered in history, and I applaud the gentlewoman for that.

We have seen that, since 2001, the terrorists, which were contained on the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, have spread. They have spread to the Middle East. They have spread to Africa. And it is about time that we ask: What have all these interventions gotten us?

And this is not a partisan issue, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has mentioned and as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) just articulated. It goes back to our founding principles of John Quincy Adams, an early President who said: "We ought not to go overseas to slay monsters."

And he said the reason we shouldn't do that is we should give people who seek freedom our voice and our prayers; but if we go out to destroy monsters, we actually will be seen not as a liberating force, but as a dictatorial force because we often won't know who the truly freedom-seeking people are.

I wish every Member of Congress, every Senator would read John Quincy Adams' insight so that we had more restraint.

Consider the issue of Afghanistan, where 40 percent of the country is not under our control. And here is the thing: I know this region. I was born here. But being of South Asian origin, on the Pakistan-India border, where there are 3,000 terrorists, there are 150,000 troops to take care of that.

Does anyone think sending 10,000 troops again and again has accomplished anything?

It has not. All it is doing is further antagonizing people and putting our troops at risk.

Then when we called for regime change in 2011 with Syria and Assad, we made Syria a magnet for terrorist groups. Now in Yemen, where we are aiding the Saudi Arabian Government, which is aligned, ironically, with al-Qaida, and al-Qaida, which has claimed responsibility for the shoe bomber and the underwear bomber in this country, we are aiding and intervening in a place where we are actually supporting groups that are harming us.

All the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is saying is we ought to debate these issues, that the American people ought to know what these interventions are getting us; why they are not making us more safe and why we are not having a thoughtful policy.

Madam Speaker, I applaud the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. LEE) vision and I applaud her leadership. I know that history will vindicate her.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) for those kind words, but also for his clarity and his vision and understanding that we must repeal this authorization to use force and put Congress back in the mix where we should have been from day one. I want to

thank him again very much for being here.

Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. LEE. I will close now. Once again, I ask our Speaker a very simple question, and that is why he has not scheduled a debate on this vital issue that affects our national security.

We asked over and over again for a vote to repeal this authorization. We want a debate and we want to have a new vote based on the current realities of what is taking place as it relates to the use of force by our own government.

In February of 2015, Congressman ELIOT ENGEL mentioned that President Obama sent to Congress an ISIS-specific AUMF, and it was never taken up. There were no actions, no hearings, no formal debate. Not one vote.

We have a new President that is continuing to use the outdated 2001 AUMF in expanded ways, including justifying sending more troops to fight ISIS in Syria and spending more taxpayer dollars on war and putting our young men and women in harm's way.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank all of the Members who were here last night. Let's hope that this discussion will help more Members come to the floor and talk about why we need the Speaker to bring up the bill to repeal the authorization to use force.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SWALWELL of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through May 25 on account of birth of child.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 419. An act to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program, and for other purposes.

S. 583. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 19, 2017, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1369. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral James D. Syring, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1370. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2017 Annual Report to Congress on Chemical and Biological Warfare Defense, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1523(a); Public Law 103-160, Sec. 1703; (107 Stat. 1854); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1371. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Advanced Arresting Gear Selected Acquisition Report for the most recently concluded fiscal quarter, pursuant to Sec. 125 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2017, Public Law 114-328, and Secs. 2432 and 2433(g) of title 10 U.S.C.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1372. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the Office's report on discretionary appropriations legislation within seven calendar days of enactment, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 901(a)(7)(B); Public Law 99-177, Sec. 251(a)(7)(B) (as amended by Public Law 114-113, Sec. 1003); (129 Stat. 3035); to the Committee on the Budget.

1373. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria — Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) Program [CFDA Number: 84.371C] [Docket No.: ED-2015-OESE-0129] (RIN: 1810-AB25) received May 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1374. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Promoting Diversification of Ownership in the Broadcasting Services [MB Docket No.: 07-294]; Amendment of Part 1 of the Commission's Rules, Concerning Practice and Procedure, Amendment of CORES Registration System [MD Docket No.: 10-234] received May 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1375. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.3555(e) of the Commission's Rules, National Television Multiple Ownership Rule [MB Docket No.: 13-236] received May 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1376. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-125, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1377. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-136, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1378. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-083, pursuant to Section 36(c) of

the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1379. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-107, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1380. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report containing information about a proposed transaction, pursuant to Sec. 40(g)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1381. A letter from the Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the semiannual report prepared by the Inspector General of the Federal Reserve System for the six-month period ending March 31, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1382. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1383. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major final rule — Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; U.S. Navy Training Activities in the Gulf of Alaska Temporary Maritime Activities Area [Docket No.: 141125997-7365-02] (RIN: 0648-BE67) received May 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 953. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-131 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1726. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to improve the organization of such title and to incorporate certain transfers and modifications into such title, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2510. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.