

NATO's military campaign to protect the Libyan people, but for a much shorter period of time than provided by H.J. Res. 68.

I believe the President, as Commander-in-Chief, should come directly to Congress to seek a limited authorization of military support for our NATO allies, and Congress should promptly act on it. This would help secure a stronger consensus behind a much more limited and well-defined campaign, and ensure that it is truly conducted in pursuit of our national security and policy interests.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 167, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

YEAS—240

Adams	Flake	Landry
Aderholt	Fleischmann	Lankford
Akin	Fleming	Latham
Alexander	Flores	Latta
Amash	Forbes	Lee (CA)
Austria	Fortenberry	Lewis (CA)
Bachmann	Fox	LoBiondo
Barletta	Franks (AZ)	Long
Bartlett	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Barton (TX)	Gallely	Luetkemeyer
Bass (NH)	Gardner	Lummis
Benish	Garrett	Lungren, Daniel
Biggert	Gerlach	E.
Bilbray	Gibbs	Mack
Bilirakis	Gibson	Manzullo
Black	Gohmert	Marchant
Blackburn	Gonzalez	Marino
Bonner	Goodlatte	Matheson
Bono Mack	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Boren	Gowdy	McCaul
Boustany	Granger	McClintock
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	McCotter
Brooks	Graves (MO)	McHenry
Brown (GA)	Griffin (AR)	McKeon
Buchanan	Griffith (VA)	McKinley
Bucshon	Grimm	McMorris
Buerkle	Guinta	Rodgers
Burgess	Guthrie	Meehan
Burton (IN)	Hall	Mica
Calvert	Hanna	Michaud
Camp	Harper	Miller (FL)
Campbell	Harris	Miller (MI)
Canseco	Hartzler	Miller, Gary
Capito	Hastings (WA)	Mulvaney
Carter	Hayworth	Murphy (PA)
Cassidy	Heck	Myrick
Chabot	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Chaffetz	Herger	Noem
Coble	Herrera Beutler	Nugent
Coffman (CO)	Huelskamp	Nunes
Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee
Conaway	Hultgren	Olson
Cravaack	Hunter	Palazzo
Crawford	Hurt	Paulsen
Crenshaw	Issa	Pearce
Culberson	Jenkins	Pence
Davis (KY)	Johnson (IL)	Petri
Dent	Johnson (OH)	Pitts
DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam	Platts
Diaz-Balart	Jones	Poe (TX)
Dicks	Jordan	Pompeo
Dold	Kelly	Posey
Dreier	King (IA)	Price (GA)
Duffy	King (NY)	Quayle
Duncan (SC)	Kingston	Quigley
Duncan (TN)	Kinzing (IL)	Reed
Ellmers	Kline	Rehberg
Emerson	Kucinich	Reichert
Farenthold	Labrador	Renacci
Fincher	Lamborn	Ribble
Fitzpatrick	Lance	Richardson

Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt

Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi

Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yoder
Young (IN)

NAYS—167

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Filner

NOT VOTING—24

Bachus
Berg
Bishop (UT)
Butterfield
Cantor
Cardoza
Denham
Engel

Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1031

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WU changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 492. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on H. Res. 328, the rule providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 68, Authorizing the limited use of United States Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya; and consideration of H.R. 2278, to limit the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for United States Armed Forces in support of NATO operations in Libya.

AUTHORIZING LIMITED USE OF ARMED FORCES IN LIBYA

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 328, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 68) authorizing the limited use of the United States Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gravity of the legislation before us, but I rise to make a point of order that this bill violates clause 11 of rule XXI. This section of the rule states that it shall not be in order to consider a bill or a joint resolution which has not been reported by a committee until it has been available to Members for 72 hours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 328, all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Can the Chair tell the House when H.R. 2278 and H.J. Res. 68 were made available to Members?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker has said that he will not bring a bill to the floor that has not been available for 72 hours. Have these bills been available for 72 hours?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has once again not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Is the majority waiving the position of the Speaker, waiving the rule as it relates to the legislation before us?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is engaging in debate and not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. The fact of the matter is this bill has not been available for 72 hours, and not even 3 calendar days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate at this point. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Pursuant to House Resolution 328, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 68

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION FOR THE LIMITED USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN LIBYA.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—The President is authorized to continue the limited use of the United States Armed Forces in Libya, in support of United States national security policy interests, as part of the NATO mission to enforce United Nations Security Council Resolution 1973 (2011) as requested by the Transitional National Council, the Gulf Cooperation Council, and the Arab League.

(b) **EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authorization for such limited use of United States Armed Forces in Libya expires one year after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 2. OPPOSITION TO THE USE OF UNITED STATES GROUND TROOPS.

Consistent with the policy and statements of the President, Congress does not support deploying, establishing, or maintaining the presence of units and members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Libya unless the purpose of the presence is limited to the immediate personal defense of United States Government officials (including diplomatic representatives) or to rescuing members of NATO forces from imminent danger.

SEC. 3. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

The President shall consult frequently with Congress regarding United States efforts in Libya, including by providing regular briefings and reports as requested, and responding to inquiries promptly. Such briefings and reports shall include the following elements:

(1) An updated description of United States national security interests in Libya.

(2) An updated statement of United States policy objectives in Libya, both during and after Qaddafi's rule, and a detailed plan to achieve them.

(3) An updated and comprehensive list of the activities of the United States Armed Forces in Libya.

(4) An updated and detailed assessment of the groups in Libya that are opposed to the Qaddafi regime, including potential successor governments.

(5) A full and updated explanation of the President's legal and constitutional rationale for conducting military operations in Libya consistent with the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee

on Foreign Affairs and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes. The gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 68.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support a complete U.S. withdrawal from NATO's Operation Unified Protector. I believe that it is necessary for U.S. Armed Forces to remain engaged in a limited capacity. However, I cannot support an authorization which constitutes our current level of engagement for an entire year. This is what is proposed in H.J. Res. 69, offered by my friend from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), and I therefore must rise in opposition to his resolution.

This resolution not only authorizes U.S. military engagement in Libya far beyond even the 90-day NATO extension, but it justifies U.S. military engagement in Libya as undertaken to enforce a United Nations Security Council resolution and at the request of the Transitional National Council, the Gulf Cooperation Council, and the Arab League. So we must ask: Where is the United States Congress in this equation?

If an authorization resolution had been put forward in February, I might have been able to support it. I understand the mission. But in the intervening period, conditions have changed significantly on the ground in Libya, within NATO, with our NATO partners, and here in the U.S. Decisive action with congressional authorization at the outset might have solved this problem quickly, but now we have drifted into an apparently open-ended commitment with goals that remain only vaguely defined. And that is at the heart of the problem, Mr. Speaker.

The President asserted, "These strikes will be limited in their nature, duration, and scope." Well, it is now day 97—97 of our involvement of U.S. Armed Forces in hostilities regarding Libya; yet Qadhafi still clings to power and the opposition appears to be no closer to a decisive victory. Command for the military operation has been transferred to NATO; yet the constrained role the President has said is

being played by U.S. forces in Libya still includes nearly one-quarter of the total sorties flown in Libya; suppression of the enemy air defense through missile strikes; strikes by unmanned Predators on Qadhafi targets; nearly 70 percent of the mission's intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; and over 75 percent of all aerial refueling. Yet the President has yet to explain just what American interests are at stake and just what outcomes he is hoping to achieve.

The resolution offered by our Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER, and adopted by this Chamber on June 3 posed specific questions that required straight answers. Instead, we received a letter and accompanying documents from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs, which stated that U.S. actions in Libya were "taken in response to direct appeals from the Libyan people and acting with a mandate from the United Nations."

□ 1040

The administration proceeded to justify its current policy by asserting that U.S. military operations in Libya do not constitute hostilities. This argument is so incredulous that even the attorneys in the Office of the Legal Counsel do not agree. Therefore, I am not optimistic that the reporting provisions in the resolution we are considering today, which calls for "a full and updated explanation of the President's legal and constitutional rationale for conducting military operations in Libya," will be fulfilled in a fulsome manner, respectful of congressional prerogatives.

Again, I must underscore that I do not support a complete withdrawal from our commitments concerning Libya. That would be dangerous. That would be ill-advised. A complete withdrawal of all U.S. military assets from the Libya operations would undermine our intelligence efforts and our foreign policy goals, and would all but assure a victory for Qadhafi. It can lead to greater instability, which could affect NATO operations in Iraq and Afghanistan at a critical stage of transition. There are also proliferation concerns at stake, particularly as an increasing number of weapons have moved into the region and reportedly fallen into the hands of extremist organizations, including al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb. The Qadhafi regime is an unpredictable regime that has chemical weapons, including mustard and possibly sarin gas.

While a complete withdrawal is unacceptable, the resolution before us is also unacceptable. The resolution effectively ratifies all that the President has done, and it would grant him the blessings of Congress to continue on his present course. The resolution before us would enable mission creep, rather than setting clear parameters for U.S. engagement. I must therefore oppose this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, and I yield 2 minutes to the sponsor of the resolution, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. It's high time that Congress asserts its authority and engages proactively with the administration on this most serious question of war. I just wonder where my colleagues have been all these years that we have had Presidents and war. It will be interesting to see a matchup of their votes with this one.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation authorizes the limited use of United States forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya. This legislation is a bipartisan effort to prevent the kind of open-ended, indefinite military commitments we have elsewhere in the world. Register that as Afghanistan and Iraq. This resolution is a companion to forward-leaning Senate legislation introduced by Senators JOHN KERRY, JOHN MCCAIN, BENJAMIN CARDIN, and RICHARD DURBIN. Immediately after they introduced the resolution in the Senate, I brought it to the House so that we can make progress on this very important debate before us.

If I had my way, Mr. Speaker—and I don't—we wouldn't be in Libya at all. But I don't have my way, and here we are, and the solution now is not to cut off all funding and suddenly walk out. We have a responsibility to our allies. As long as we are continuing to supply logistics, materiel, and critical intelligence and operational capabilities—and no boots on the ground—we must support our allies who are carrying out the direct combat operations. We must stand with NATO.

Again, Mr. Speaker, if I had my way—and I don't—there are revisions to this resolution that I believe the Congress ought to consider. I maintain that a better date to end the authorization would be the end of September, and certainly no later than December. The 1-year authorization limits the President's ability to engage our Armed Forces indefinitely so that we don't find ourselves neck deep in yet another war.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. This authorization prohibits the use of ground forces and at the same time requires the President to continually report to Congress. I would rather us use some of Libya's frozen assets so that we could have them pay for the mission that they began.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Dr. PAUL, a member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution that endorses the policies that have been going on for 4 months. Not only has the Congress basically been strong in opposition to what has been going on, the American people are even more so. So what this resolution does is endorses exactly what has been going on—another unconstitutional war, involvement and justification under NATO and the United Nations, doing it secretly. There's an attempt to restrain the funding of this effort over in Libya. How can we restrain it, because we've never authorized it. Restrain unauthorized funds? The funds weren't authorized. The President just goes and does it.

What we're talking about here is the challenge for the Congress on looking at the unitary President. The unitary President has been around for quite a few years. That means that Presidents do what they want, and the Congress just acknowledges it. So that is what we're doing. This is what this resolution does. It acknowledges and gives authority to the President to pursue this war, which is actually what he has been doing. Obviously, H.J. Res. 68, for me, is a very, very strong "no" because the last thing we need to do is to be giving explicit support and explicit authorization for the very policies that so many people now think are ill-advised.

This resolution also says you don't send in ground troops. Well, that's fine, no ground troops. But in this day and age, war can go on for a long time without the ground troops. It happened to a degree in Bosnia. But it didn't exempt such things as special forces, the CIA. The CIA has been in Libya, and I'm sure they will be, as they are in many, many other hundreds of countries. Contractors. When we can't send in troops, we send in contractors. We have as many contractors in Afghanistan as we do the military. So a couple thousand troops come out of Afghanistan and nothing changes as we add more contractors. Nothing ever changes.

But this whole idea of this effort to legalize the bombing, at least give the authority to the President to continue this, is foolhardy. How many more wars can we withstand? What number is this? This is I think number five. Today, in the papers, number six is coming. How long before we're in Syria? Go into Syria tomorrow and in 90 days we'll start talking about Syria and proper authority.

Instead, we in Congress have given up our responsibility for war. Because the responsibility of going to war should have been and still remains constitutionally mandated that the Congress makes these decisions. The President is not supposed to get us engaged in war without Congress' authority. Too often we say, Whatever you need, we'll endorse it.

We have another resolution coming up shortly.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. PAUL. Unfortunately, I think the next resolution, H.R. 2278, isn't much different because it has too many exceptions. It says: Deny funding. But there are too many exceptions, and the exceptions are to allow the very things the President is currently doing.

So both resolutions have serious shortcomings. Both resolutions should be defeated if you're opposed to this war in Libya.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT.)

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President's response to Libya.

A week after it started, I received a phone call from a very distinguished professor at the University of Washington, who had left and was back in Libya. He is now the Finance Minister, Dr. Tarhouni. He said to me, Please give us air cover. If you can protect us from the air, we can take care of it ourselves on the ground.

□ 1050

As I listened to him, I thought of an experience I had with President Clinton. I flew to Africa, to Kigali, and met with people who had been part of the massacre—the maimed. Then I saw the President go into the hangar and speak to 500 Rwandans and apologize for not having responded to the Rwandan massacre on the first day. This was a situation where the Libyans were asking for it. It was one where the Arab League was asking for it. This was not something that was cooked up in the White House, created and sent out. This was done in response to people on the ground.

My belief is that these kinds of situations require the President to act decisively. He did and I support him.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE, vice chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. POE of Texas. I appreciate the chairlady for yielding me time on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, going to war is a big deal. That's why our forefathers put within the Constitution that when America is to go to war it is Congress that is to lead that charge, that it is Congress to authorize America's going to war. That has been the law in the Constitution since it was written.

Then came the War Powers resolution, and Congress decided that it would give a little of that constitutional authority to the President for a period of days until he justified his action before Congress. We can argue whether the War Powers resolution is constitutional or not. But in any event, Congress has not led America to war in Libya.

The President has.

The President made that decision.

As James Madison, the author of the Constitution, said in a letter to Thomas Jefferson—and I paraphrase—it has been the history of peoples that it has been the executive branch that has led a country to war, and that's why our Constitution prevented kings and dictators and even Presidents from leading this country to war. It must be authorized by Congress.

But now we find ourselves in America's third war—in Libya. The President took us to war. Now, on this day, we are being asked to support and justify that war in this resolution. I vote “no” on this resolution. We have no business in Libya. Even the administration has said it is not in the national security interest of the United States to be in Libya.

So why are we there? We are there because we don't like Muammar Qadhafi. There are a lot of bad guys in the world, and if we start picking them off one at a time we will be at war with most of the world, because most of the world is led by rogue dictators—or bad guys. We have no business being in Libya. We have no business justifying this war on the House floor.

It is Congress' responsibility to defund any further action in Libya, and that is what we should do. It's unfortunate we don't have that up-or-down vote. I wish we could vote up or down today on that issue and let the House decide if we should be at war in Libya. \$700 million has already been spent on the war in Libya. It's hard to figure out where that money came from. I get different answers from different people about where the President got that money. Maybe we should spend that \$700 million in the United States, building America rather than blowing up Libya. I think that would be a better use of funds.

We need to take care of America. We shouldn't be involved in somebody else's civil war in Libya. Who are the rebels? We're not sure who they are either. They may be extremists. They may be patriots. They may be of democratic philosophy. We have no idea.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. POE of Texas. We don't know who the rebels are. They may be worse than Muammar Qadhafi. Now, isn't that a lovely situation if they take control. We replace an oppressive regime with an extremist radical regime, and that's all because we are in a war that was unauthorized by this Congress.

Cut off all funds. Vote against this resolution.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a gentleman with the opposite view of this issue than I have, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. What? We don't have enough wars going on? A war in Iraq, a

war in Afghanistan? We need one more war? We have to wage war against another nation which did not attack us? We have to wage war against another nation which does not represent an actual or imminent threat to the United States?

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that I have been all over this country, and I haven't had a single person come up to me to tell me, “You know, DENNIS, what America needs is another war.” The last thing we need is to be voting to go to war. There are plenty of reasons to oppose the war in Libya.

It's unconstitutional. Article I, section 8 has given the Congress the power to declare war.

It's illegal. The War Powers resolution was passed over Presidential veto to allow the President latitude to respond when there is an imminent threat to the U.S. while retaining the constitutional duty of Congress. Even the President's top legal advisers at the Pentagon and the Department of Justice determined that the War Powers resolution applies to the war in Libya.

Another reason is that Americans don't want this war. A poll taken at the beginning of the month by CBS found that six in 10 Americans do not think the United States should be involved in a conflict within Libya. Just 30 percent of Americans in that poll thought the United States was doing the right thing by taking part in the current military conflict. A majority of Republicans, Democrats and Independents alike think the U.S. should not be involved in Libya.

Next, this war is a distraction. Our flailing economy demands the full attention of Congress and the President. The American people have little patience, or less, especially for a war of choice.

Then there is the cost of the war, Mr. Speaker. We've spent \$750 million so far. If we keep going on, it will cost billions.

We have to end this war. Vote against this authorization.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I stand today in support of this resolution.

The world is watching our actions today. The world is asking: What are we going to do? We talk all the time about allowing Europe to take the lead in certain areas, about allowing NATO to take the lead in foreign policy, and they have done that. Now will we today pull the rug out from under them simply because we have a dispute between the legislative and the executive branches?

I think the President should have come to this Chamber, too, but he didn't. Yet the wrong thing to do is to pull funding, and the right thing to do

is to give him the authorization to go into Libya. A slaughter almost occurred, and we were able to stop it by our presence there. The vote we take in the House today will have implications far beyond our shores and far into the future. Finally, I am reminded of a quote by George Washington, in which he states, “Liberty, when it begins to take root, is a plant of rapid growth.”

I support this resolution and would urge all my colleagues to do the same. In doing so, we will be supporting the planting of freedom and liberty in the Middle East.

Mr. BERMAN. I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the Hastings amendment.

In my judgment, the President's initial commitment of U.S. airpower and naval forces to support the international effort was appropriate and certainly within his power as Commander in Chief. The United States' effort was undertaken in concert with a broad coalition of nations, and it followed a resolution adopted in the United Nations Security Council, authorizing “all necessary measures” to protect Libyan civilians attempting to overthrow the oppressive regime of Muammar Qadhafi. The Qadhafi government's response to the uprising, inspired by the Arab Spring, was to use force against civilians and opposition forces, and the brutal measures prompted the international outcry and the U.N. action.

In March, the President clearly outlined the rationale for our involvement in this military action. While the direct U.S. leadership of this effort lasted a brief time, U.S. forces remain engaged in the NATO operation. In this Chamber today, we are considering both the resolution authorizing the continued use of limited U.S. involvement in this effort or our immediate withdrawal from it.

While I believe it would have been more appropriate for the President, under the terms of the War Powers Act, to come to Congress earlier, I believe the language offered by HASTINGS of Florida, similar to the language introduced in the other body by Senators MCCAIN and KERRY, is the appropriate course of action at this time.

□ 1100

The language preserves the understanding between the administration and Congress that U.S. ground forces are not appropriate at this time and were not asked for by the rebels.

The strict limitation of funds in the resolution offered by Mr. ROONEY of Florida would end our involvement unilaterally. I believe this action would be unwise and that it would materially harm our relationship with NATO allies.

And when I hear many of my colleagues on the other side of the House

Chamber speaking in favor of abandoning the cause, I'm reminded of Ronald Reagan who attacked Libya with air power and called Qadhafi the "mad dog of the Middle East."

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. We should learn from the past. There are indeed times when American national interests should overtake political or partisan political interests.

I remember the debate on Kosova 12 years ago. Congress refused to authorize American action by a split vote. That was a tragic mistake. House Republican leadership opposed that resolution: 187 noes against 31 yeases. I believe it was clear then that Republicans would not have opposed the Kosova resolution, at least in those numbers, if George Bush had been President.

Today, there are echoes from Kosova on this Libyan resolution. The Republicans should not make the same mistake again. We should join together to support the Hastings' resolution that's consistent with the War Powers Act.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hastings resolution.

I think it's important to remember that U.S. military force is a very awesome thing and should only be employed in very select circumstances. We misused that power when it came to Iraq, and we used that power in an improper way and too long in Afghanistan. But when people are being slaughtered by dictators around the world, where massive loss of lives and innocents are at stake, I think it is appropriate for the United States to step up and protect those people.

Yes, we do have business in Libya. We have business in protecting mass murder from happening and stopping mass murder from happening around the world. We have business in stopping the destabilization of regions like north Africa. We have business in making sure that the peaceful resolutions in Egypt and in Tunisia are not undermined. We have business in making sure that dictators like Ali Saleh in Yemen and Bashar al-Assad in Syria are not emboldened and the signal does not go out to them that they can continue to wipe out their population and nobody cares.

I believe that if I was in this Congress when Rwanda or Srebrenica or Darfur were happening, I pray that I would stand up and say that those people need to have some protection and that the most powerful Nation in the world shouldn't stand by while innocent women and children are being mowed down, and I hope today that my

colleagues will join in that because it's the right thing to do.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The gentleman from California has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Florida has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished Speaker, and to the distinguished Members that are on this floor, what a heck of a position to be in.

Let me make it very clear this is a set of circumstances that frames itself around the Constitution, the War Powers resolution, that indicates that Congress must be consulted. But I am in the middle of my actions that took place months ago or many weeks ago as the crisis and the murderous acts of Colonel Qadhafi began to seize his people. And we went to the Libyan Embassy to ask for Colonel Qadhafi to step down, and we joined with the then-Ambassador in his courageous act. Colonel Qadhafi is known to oppress his people; to deny rights of freedom of press and speech, as well as association; to train dictators in oppression and intelligence; and the murderous acts still go on.

But it is a crisis when we have an administration, unfortunately, that has not seen fit to undertake the consultation that is necessary. Yet I believe that we should finish the task, and it is different from Iraq and it is different from Afghanistan. We have a time certain and, as well, we have the Arab League that has asked us to stand with them against the oppression of one of its members.

This is a door opener to say to the people that we have asked to be with us to go against terrorist acts to stand for democracy. So this is a devastating position to put the Members of Congress in, but we must do our duty today, and I believe that it is good to say that the Hastings amendment is the framework, though I would prefer 6 months, and I hope there is an opportunity to address this for a limited time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker and Members, apparently the House has debated for more than almost 40 years ago the War Powers agreement or War Powers law. What we have before us today is a way in which we can effect that law and put it into place, and there is reason for us to support the Hastings amendment or the Hastings resolution, and there are four reasons.

First of all, there's a humanitarian issue here, and that's why we went into this in the first place, the United Na-

tions resolution on the obligation to protect, and indeed there was a threat.

Secondly, this particular intervention is supported by the United Nations, by NATO, by the Arab League, in a most unusual situation asking for support of the Europeans and the United States in an Arab country.

Finally, we must continue our support of the effort, and we must do it in a very limited way. The resolution does that. It provides for a very limited scope and a limited period of time and, therefore, it is in order; and it appropriately puts the Congress, both Houses if this should pass the Senate, in support of the operation, thereby fulfilling the War Powers Act.

I ask for an "aye" vote on the resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank our distinguished chairwoman for yielding and thank her for her leadership today and every day on human rights issues.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 68.

You know, when U.S. intervention in Libya began last March, I raised—and I was among many—several still unanswered questions about our involvement. They included questions about the identity and the aims of the rebels, the varying Presidential statements that seemed to shift like the wind, the level of U.S. involvement, the possibility of Qadhafi retaliating against American interests outside of Libya, and whether U.S. ground troops might well be requested at some point, although the resolution seems to clearly say that that would not be authorized by Congress.

In the course of the debate over the constitutionality and viability of the War Powers resolution, these questions have remained unanswered. The President has refused to seek congressional approval of his action or even to provide a full explanation of his decisions. As the NATO campaign continues, new questions have arisen about U.S. participation and what is now NATO's involvement in Libya.

□ 1110

Let me just say mention was made a moment ago by Mr. LEVIN about Kosova and that somehow the Republican opposition to military action in Kosova was political. It absolutely was not! I remember because I was very involved in trying to mitigate the Balkan troubles. I visited there many times, visited with Milosevic, the dictator in Belgrade. Actually, I was in Vukovar right before it fell.

So, frankly, the statement that was made earlier I think did a disservice to those of us who were not supportive of the Kosova operation. There was no plan to war protect the Kosovar Albanians. We used air power. Milosevic invaded with ground troops. If Members

will remember, that country's population was literally, literally pushed out into Macedonia and elsewhere—about 1.6 million refugees—because there was no plan when Milosevic sent in the ground troops and killed thousands of people because we had no plan to protect them. An estimated 10,000 people were killed.

So the revisionism that somehow Republican opposition to the war was a political calculation falls very, very far from the truth. And it's a cheap shot. I actually chaired hearings during the war and stated my oppositions based on principle, as did other Members. So I expect—and hope—unfounded revisionism would be avoided and that there would not be that look-back that does a disservice on the issue at hand to principled Republican opposition.

So, who exactly are we backing in Libya? What justification under international law is there for directing both U.S. and foreign government assets to a rebel entity that is not democratically elected and, therefore, not necessarily representative of the people of that country? We don't know.

In addition, a senior NATO official told CNN on June 9 that Qadhafi "was a legitimate target of the bombing campaign." Even though this was expressed as a NATO position, are we now to understand that the Obama administration is sanctioning the killing of foreign leaders? Again, pursuant to what international criteria or legal justification?

Mr. Speaker, again, I call on my colleagues to vote down this resolution that is offered, H.J. Res. 68.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, today I say that we have an opportunity. The camera of history is rolling, is watching what we do today. We can authorize the President to continue the limited use of the United States services, working in conjunction with NATO today so that we can show that we are united with our allies.

Think about what history will say 50 years from now. We have an individual who was going to massacre his individuals. And by us stepping in, working in conjunction with our NATO allies, we are saving thousands of lives. What would have taken place historically if we had allowed the annihilation of the Libyan people? Let's stick together on this.

From its inception, this has been an international initiative to enforce U.N. Resolution 1973 and the response to the request of Libya's Transitional National Council, the Gulf Cooperation Council, and the Arab League. President Obama deployed U.S. assets early, said he will continue just with what we have, our special assets, and then have no troops on the ground. The camera of history is rolling. Let's work together. Let's pass this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, we were asked to come into Libya by Libyans, by the Arab League, by the Gulf Cooperation Council, by the European Union, and by the United Nations Security Council. Today we are standing where we should be standing, with those who believe in freedom, in human rights, and in the rule of law.

But also today, as we debate this issue, Muammar Qadhafi's forces continue their merciless assault against civilians and combatants alike, not just in Misratah but in the western mountains and cities throughout central Libya. The Libyan Transitional National Council, which needs our support, is extraordinarily short of weaponry, money, and training. But they are the boots on the ground, fighting and dying to dislodge Qadhafi, who is a bad guy, who did oversee the killing of 189 innocent passengers on PanAm 103.

We need to be on the other side, not giving comfort to Qadhafi so that he can thank us for the resolution and this vote as he thanked Speaker BOEHNER for his resolution last week. We need to make clear we don't support him. We do support people who are fighting for the same values that define our country; 38 of those people were killed just this week. To cut off operational funding for the NATO operation is to side with Qadhafi against the forces who are fighting for those values which define us.

And, you know, the idea that this hasn't been explained sufficiently by the President is a bogus one. We have minds of our own. We know the facts. We can make a judgment. The right judgment is to side with the President and to continue this support to the Libyans until America shows all the people of the Arab world that it's true to its own values and principles.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, would you inform us as to the amount of time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BERMAN. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

There are two issues before Congress: one is the reassertion of its responsibility under article I and the War Powers Act; number two is the decision on the limited use of force for humanitarian missions in Libya. The Hastings resolution accomplishes both.

It reasserts our authority under article I and the War Powers Act. It says, yes, we do support limited intervention with a role for the U.S. in saving lives in Libya. That mission is necessary to avert a humanitarian disaster. Two, the mission has broad international

support, including from the Arab League. Three, the U.S. role is limited in scope: no boots on the ground. And, finally, we are, by acting, asserting our responsibility under the War Powers Act and our responsibility under article I.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I reserve the right to close, Mr. Speaker; so I will reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are 90 days into this operation, and the majority is bringing up this resolution in order to embarrass the White House. Let's just call it for what it is. They know it will fail. They want to continue to play games with U.S. national security.

Let's be honest about what's happening here. The Republican leadership allowed this resolution to come to the floor for one reason and one reason only: They know it will fail, and they think its defeat will be a political defeat for the White House. If that type of trifling and toying with national security appeals to them, so be it.

□ 1120

Mr. Speaker, I think our commitments to NATO and the humanitarian crisis that created the NATO operation in Libya are too important to be exploited for cynical political purposes. In my view, the perfect authorization would have been a 6-month authorization for a limited purpose with a limitation on that authorization with respect to a position the House has stood for the entire time, as has the President, and that is no boots on the ground.

But the Republicans didn't give this side the choice of the resolution for authorization. They told us what the resolution for authorization would be, and that's a very unfortunate kind of a situation. So we will go through this process. And perhaps, at the end of the day, after this resolution fails, we will get another letter to the House of Representatives sent to the Speaker thanking us from Colonel Qadhafi for once again demonstrating that we want to send a message that he is going to prevail in this conflict.

And when that happens, what do we think the dictator of Syria is going to think? Faced with the choice of change or quitting, he will hear the message: the way to survive, the way to hold onto power is for a despot to continue to kill his own people without the rest of the world doing anything.

There are critical alliances at stake. There are critical interests at stake. The national security question is far beyond simply what is going to happen in Libya, but in its neighbors, Egypt and Tunisia, throughout the Middle East and through the entire world, the message of trying to say that we're going to pull the plug on this particular operation.

And heaven knows, we could spend time talking about the way the administration has handled it; but right now

we have one choice, to pull the plug on this baby, or to let it play out in a limited and responsible fashion, to achieve our goals and send a message that the civilized world is not going to stand for this kind of barbarity and brutality.

I urge an "aye" vote on the joint resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, to wrap up on our side, I am proud and pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN), a member of both the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Joint Resolution 68, which authorizes the President to continue military operations in Libya.

I appreciate all the policy arguments that I've heard here today. But the question for me is, is it illegal or not? If it's a question of law, then all of the arguments about making this group mad or not being a good ally, et cetera, those are very persuasive; but those are not legal arguments. Those don't change whether the actions in Libya are constitutional or legal. Those are policy arguments.

The President continues to be in violation of the War Powers resolution, which requires congressional approval for military action within 60 days of the initial use of our Armed Forces. That deadline expired long ago.

The President continues to involve the U.S. military in this illegal conflict and has continually ignored requests to gain congressional approval.

What's so hard, Mr. President, about coming to the House and consulting with the Congress? What's so hard about that? Other Presidents who may have had their doubts about the constitutionality of the War Powers resolution have still gone through the process to respect the people that are represented by this body.

Reportedly, the President ignored advice from his top lawyers at the Pentagon and the Justice Department who said that he no longer had the legal authority to continue military action without congressional authorization.

Furthermore, this is not a legal argument—but I think it's relevant—we're broke. The price tag of the military action in Libya has already cost the U.S. Government over \$750 million. This resolution would authorize the President to continue military action in Libya for up to a year. That could result in billions of dollars of funding by the American taxpayer that we just can't afford.

We cannot spend precious taxpayer funds to support this military action while the President flouts the law and Constitution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The President's initial justification for our military intervention in Libya was that it was necessary to prevent the massacre of Libyan civilians by government forces in Benghazi, and that this would be strictly a humanitarian mission.

As I noted back in March, deploying American warriors to protect civilians from a brutal dictator is a noble cause. Yet I also expressed my reservations at the time because I feared that the mission could result in a protracted stalemate. Although the President promised the American people that our involvement would be limited, a matter of weeks, not months, we find ourselves past the 3-month mark with no end in sight.

This bill would authorize operations for up to a year. We're currently engaged in a war that is vital to our national security. In Afghanistan we're fighting extremists who sheltered the terrorist organization that killed 3,000 Americans on September 11, and would again provide them with a sanctuary if given the chance. We're in the process of consolidating our victory in Iraq and still have 50,000 troops there in harm's way.

Indeed, a clear strategic vision is required to make any military intervention successful. Since this operation began, the connection between strategic ends and operational means has been lacking. Consequently, unless the NATO mission departs from its original mandate, it appears that our only recourse is to hope that Qadhafi will voluntarily leave his country. I cannot support a long-term commitment of U.S. forces to hostilities when success is based on hope.

Furthermore, the President failed to seek congressional authorization for this operation on the flimsiest of legal rationale. It's not appropriate for this body to cover his lapse with a blanket authorization.

I therefore urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I rise in support of this resolution. This is Congress exercising its authority as appropriate. And I agree with the people who say that Congress should do this, and I just wish we would understand that Congress has a certain responsibility in that regard.

Yes, the President should have asked us, but it's been over 3 months and this House has chosen not to act until now. I think it's appropriate that we are. I think we should authorize this mission in Libya, and I strongly support that mission.

Now, like most Americans, when this issue first came up, when the people in Libya started rising up against their oppressive dictator, I was very reluctant about the idea of U.S. military involvement, as I think we always should

be. I think in the past we have been too over-anxious to use the U.S. military in places where it was not a good fit. We need to think carefully about this. And in every instance we need to strike a balance.

□ 1130

On the one hand, what is the positive impact that our involvement could have and, on the other hand, what are the risks of that involvement? I think there was a unique set of circumstances in Libya that made this make sense.

First of all, our involvement could have a very positive impact. We had international support. The U.N., NATO, the Arab League, everybody in the world wanted Qadhafi to be stopped from slaughtering the civilians who were rightfully standing up and asking for the basic rights that we take for granted in this country. In addition to that, our military budget is roughly equivalent to the entire rest of the world's combined. That gives us a unique set of capabilities. That unique set of capabilities was critical to stopping Qadhafi from crushing again the legitimate democratic aspirations of the Libyan people. If we had not acted, they would be crushed, many more civilians would be dead, and Qadhafi would be back in power. We cannot walk away from that responsibility and say that, well, yes, we don't like Qadhafi, we wish the people there would do well, but we simply don't want to support the action that is necessary to give them that opportunity. So in this case, I think the mission did make sense for that reason. The United States was in the position to make a difference and stand up for people who were asking for legitimate rights.

But then the broader question is, well, what does that have to do with the United States? That may be true, but it's true in a lot of countries. The reason this is so important is because of the broader movement that is going on, the so-called Arab Spring, people in Muslim countries rising up and demanding representative rights. That has an incredible impact on us. The greatest threat that we face as a country right now is from al Qaeda and their ideology. That ideology arose in part because of a whole bunch of repressive governments across the Muslim world that weren't providing for their people, a number of repressive governments, by the way, which the United States has in the past supported. We had an opportunity to do the opposite, to stand up for Muslim people. Let me tell you, in the history of this country, I don't think we've ever gotten as much positive press on the Muslim TV stations and Muslim media as we got for standing up to Qadhafi. This has been enormously helpful to us in that broader ideological effort. We had national security interests here for standing up.

Now as a House, I don't want us to stand up and say that we're going to

back down from that commitment that we made. Make no mistake about it, if we defeat this resolution and pass the Rooney resolution, we will stop the mission in Libya and empower Muammar Qadhafi, something that I know nobody wants to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I've heard a number of people say, well, the Constitution does give the President latitude, but during the Nixon administration Congress passed the War Powers Act, and then when the President vetoed it, Congress overrode his veto, and so the War Powers Act became law. Now whether or not you believe it's constitutional, it has never been tested in the courts, and so it's the law. And the law says, as well as the Constitution, at least this is what most of the people who have looked at the Constitution believe is what it stands for, the Constitution and the War Powers Act say the President cannot do what he did without the support and approval of Congress. Now he's gotten us into the war in Libya and it is, in effect, our war.

People say, well, no, it's NATO. Well, we are providing over 8,000 of the military personnel on the ships and in the air. The majority of the flights that are taking place where they're doing the bombing are done by our airmen and our aircraft. Over 90 percent of the missiles that are being used at over a million dollars per copy are American missiles. This is going to cost billions of dollars. If this were to pass and we were to stay there for over a year, you could count on it costing \$2 billion or \$3 billion.

My colleague from Arkansas just a few minutes ago talked about us being broke. The American people know, if Congress doesn't, that we're \$1.5 trillion short this year, and we're \$14 trillion in debt. We're printing money that our kids are going to have to deal with because they're going to have to pay for the debt down the road. Some of us will pay if we live long enough, but our kids are certainly going to inherit the debt. And so we're adding to the debt by going into a war we shouldn't be in and without the approval of the Congress in accordance with the War Powers Act and the Constitution.

Now my big concern is—and I'm going to talk on the other bill that is coming up later on—not just Libya. My big concern is this President, unless we send a very strong message to him, may take us into Syria. There's humanitarian problems in Syria right now, and the reason they went into Libya, they said, was because of the humanitarian problems. He talked to the French, the English, the NATO, United Nations and the Arab League for about 2 weeks before we went into Libya, but he didn't have time to talk

to the Congress who appropriates the money and authorizes this stuff. He's the Commander in Chief once we go to war, but he needs the authority from Congress to go into it, and he didn't do it.

There are a lot of wars of opportunity. The President could go into Syria. He could go into the Ivory Coast.

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

Mr. McKEON. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. There are a lot of places we could go to war if we choose to do it. There's humanitarian problems around the world. But unless it's a threat to the United States or an attack on the United States, the President does not have the authority to do what he did without the support and approval of Congress.

President Bush came to Congress before he went into Iraq. President Bush came to Congress before he went into Afghanistan, and that's as it should be. This President should not overstep his boundaries. And what I wish we would do, which would exceed the legislation we're going to be talking about today, is to pass legislation to cut off all funds for Libya. I know it would not pass the Senate, but it sure would send a signal to the President and the White House that we're not going to allow him to go into war without the approval of the American people and the approval of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The previous speaker deludes himself, and he is my friend, if he thinks the message we send today goes only to the President. The message will go to all the world, the message will go to Muammar Qadhafi, the message will go to our NATO allies, the message will go to every nation of the world that America does not keep faith with its allies.

"America must lead. We must not equivocate. Such a course would encourage the enemies of peace, the bullies of the world. People around the world look to our country's strength in their struggle for democracy and basic human rights."

As it happens, I said that in 1999 when Clinton sent troops to stop the genocide in Bosnia, and he did so and the authorization lost on this floor, shamefully, 213-213, one of the darkest days I have served in this institution. Let us not repeat that mistake. Let us not repeat that message to our NATO allies, to our European allies, to all the world, that America cannot be counted on. At the same time, Congress was voting to undermine their mission as they flew to Kosovo.

In recent months, people across the Middle East have bravely stood to demand that their government respect

their fundamental rights. I have stood with the gentleman from Indiana on behalf of human rights around the world. The Libyan people, who have been subject to the dictatorship of Muammar Qadhafi, who has more Americans' blood on his hands than any other person other than Osama bin Laden in the last three decades, were among those who insisted that enough was enough. Qadhafi responded by unleashing widespread violence and threatening countless lives, publicly promising to go "door to door" and kill those who stood against him.

In response to this threat of Qadhafi's against those civilian people, the European Union, the Arab League, the United Nations Security Council, and a unanimous NATO called for action to protect Libyan civilians.

□ 1140

The United States is participating in this action both in order to prevent brutal attacks against civilians and in order to stand by our allies.

President Obama has made clear from the beginning that our allies needed to take the leading role in Libya. We can't do it all, but that does not mean we can't support those who choose and take the responsibility of leading. NATO has done that, and to this point the campaign against Qadhafi has proven successful. His exports of oil have ceased, he is running short on funds, cabinet and military officials continue to defect from his regime.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. China has just hosted the Libyan opposition in China, and the opposition controls eastern Libya and is making progress in the west. I believe that the wrong decision today will significantly compromise that progress.

Qadhafi wrote us a letter in the last debate just some weeks ago and thanked the House of Representatives for its debate. Is that the message we want to send to Qadhafi? I think not. It would put civilian lives at risk to withdraw. It would potentially stall the growing movements for democratization, not just in Libya but across the Middle East and, indeed, across the world. And it would severely undermine our NATO alliance, as we all know. If we want our allies to stand by us in our time of need in Afghanistan, we have to stand by them in places like Libya. We are either in an alliance or we're not.

I do believe that President Obama could and should have done a better job of consulting with Congress at the outset of hostilities, and I do believe we are involved in hostilities. But I believe that we must, as a faithful ally and defender of freedom, defeat the Rooney resolution and support the Hastings resolution. America ought to do no less.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my friend and colleague, a member of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST).

Mr. WEST. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Very simply, the War Powers Act of 1973 states: "The President can send U.S. Armed Forces into action abroad only by authorization of Congress, or in case of a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces."

So as we look at the mission—or the perceived mission that we have in Libya—it does not even meet this criteria.

I stand here today as someone who has been sent forth from these shores in the 22 years that I've served in the United States Army. I stand here as the son of a man who left these shores to go defend this great country in World War II. I stand here as the younger brother of a man who left these shores to go defend this country and fight in Vietnam. And I stand here today as the uncle of a young man, a captain, who has already done two tours of duty in Afghanistan.

Many of my friends have called me—some call me colonel, some call me ALLEN—and they say, we need you to do one simple thing: understand that the oath that you take is to support and defend the Constitution, to support and defend the laws of this country. They need us to stand up and be the guardians of the laws of this country.

Just before I came here today, I promoted Jerry Lee Stern to be a major, and I read him that oath of office, that he would greatly take what we must do now as this body, as legislators of this great Nation, uphold the laws and not send our men and women into an undefined and unspecified mission. They want the fight; they want to stand up for us. Let's do the right thing by them.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the Hastings resolution and against the Rooney resolution for one person in particular—three words: Jane Ann Morgan, a high school friend of mine in Pasadena, California, who was on Pan Am Flight 103. She and 177 other Americans lost their lives 23 years ago, and we should not forget them.

Qadhafi was Osama bin Laden before there was Osama bin Laden, and we cannot stop until he is out of power and the 178 Americans who died and the lives of the soldiers who were injured in the Berlin discos are remembered. I will support the resolution and vote thinking of Jane Ann Morgan today.

Mr. McKEON. Just for the record, Mr. Speaker, the original mission was not to get Qadhafi. The original mis-

sion, as explained by the President, was to help, for humanitarian purposes, those civilians that Qadhafi was threatening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank the gentleman and also associate myself with his remarks just now. We were told this is about protecting civilians. It has become a cover for regime change. And just because we can change a regime with military power doesn't mean we should do it. And using military action doesn't mean that you're going to achieve the objectives that maybe you haven't even clearly defined.

Furthermore, if our allies make a mistake, do we follow them? If our allies are going out of the war, why should we go in? Right now, you have China's foreign minister saying we hope the two parties in the conflict can attach importance to the country and the people's interest and earnestly consider the international community's relevant resolution plans, quickly cease hostilities, and resolve the Libyan crisis through political channels.

Amr Moussa, the outgoing head of the Arab League, said this 2 days ago: Now is the time to do whatever you can to reach a political solution that has to start with a genuine cease-fire under international supervision.

The President of South Africa said a few days ago that this is about regime change, political assassination, and foreign military occupation.

Vote against this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. I have said that I would vote for a resolution granting authority to the President if it was appropriately limited and conditioned. I would like to see conditions that require the Benghazi Transitional Government to remove from their midst the al Qaeda fighters and the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group. I would like to see the condition that we use the Qadhafi money that we seized, some \$33 billion, rather than taxpayer money.

But putting those conditions aside, the one thing we almost all agree on is that we would want to limit this to air forces and perhaps a ground rescue mission if necessary. That's not what this resolution does.

Section one grants authority to the President to do whatever he decides to do, including armor divisions on the ground, in support of the NATO mission. Don't be fooled by section 2, which provides the President with non-binding, unsolicited advice that we think that he should limit our ground operations to rescue missions and diplomatic security.

This is a grant of authority to the President to put armor divisions on the ground, if that's what he chooses to do.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, consistent with the policy in here, it says: "Congress does not support deploying, establishing or maintaining the presence of units and members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Libya." The resolution clearly prohibits ground forces.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will start out first by associating myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who I think laid this out clearly. This is a message that goes globally. This is a destiny message.

The Speaker of this House understands his role. He understands that all of America is watching us today. And even if I had a vote, I would have said, no, don't go into Libya. If I had an opportunity to amend this resolution, I would say let's limit the authorization to a shorter period of time so that the President can come do what he should do. But I believe that there are scores of Americans in their graves today because this Congress sent the wrong message in several conflicts that encouraged our enemy.

Clausewitz wrote: "The object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war." And I would shorten that up to say, if you can destroy their will, it doesn't matter what their ability is; you've taken their ability with it.

But this message encourages our enemy. This resolution says that Congress stands with the constitutional authority of the President to be Commander in Chief and to conduct our foreign policy. We should conduct our disagreement with the President domestically, not in our foreign policy and not by limiting an activity that could abrogate our NATO treaty.

□ 1150

Mr. McKEON. May I ask how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining, and the time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 68, regarding continuing operations in Libya. As a member of the House Armed Services and Intelligence Committees, I believe it is vitally important for Congress to exercise strong oversight of the conduct of military operations across the globe. It is for this reason that I have supported measures requiring Congress to authorize the use of limited military force in Libya to protect civilians and support the ongoing NATO mission against Muammar Qaddafi, while prohibiting U.S. ground combat forces.

The President, with the full backing of our allies, the Arab League, and the UN, engaged our military forces in Libya to prevent a humanitarian disaster that raised the specter of tragic episodes like Rwanda and Srebrenica. While I am always reluctant to involve our military in any conflict, I support the President's decision to protect the people of Libya and uphold U.S. principles of political freedom and

basic human rights, when we have the ability to do so. I do not, however, support any effort to involve U.S. ground combat forces in this operation, and this authorization specifically prohibits ground combat forces.

Earlier this month, Congress received a letter from Qaddafi praising its criticism of President Obama over the NATO mission. The world watches America, and what we say has a dramatic effect on not just our own nation, but the safety and security of our allies and peoples around the world. That is why I will also vote today against H.R. 2278, which is a thinly veiled attempt to discredit the President and would only heighten the appearance of divisions between the United States and our allies. Abdicating the mission in Libya in this way emboldens Qaddafi, harms our standing in a dangerous region, and will make it more difficult in the future to rely on and partner with our allies.

I hope my colleagues will reject this measure and send a clear message of support for our allies and for the principles of democracy and human rights that make America great.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, engaging our armed forces is not a vote I take lightly. Like many, I was reluctant to enter our nation into another conflict. But the situation in Libya is different.

This is a nation where the people were giving their lives to fight for a legitimate voice in their government. For these actions, their murderous dictator vowed to hunt them down like “rats and cockroaches.” Chilling words as Muammar el-Qaddafi is no stranger to taking the lives of the innocent. He has more American blood on his hands than any terrorist other than Osama bin Laden.

The international community sought our help in Libya. The Arab League supports the NATO mission and this is historic, as it is the first time the organization has supported an international intervention in an Arab country. The United States’ role can make a difference in Libya. To say otherwise is to question the very values our own nation was founded upon. I believe that our limited mission in Libya is needed and I stand with President Obama.

Let’s remember two things. The movement to overthrow longtime Libyan dictator Colonel Qaddafi began with the Libyan people. The United States should stand with the people of Libya and their fight for freedom and human rights.

We must also remember that under Colonel Qaddafi, Libya was involved in aircraft hijackings, extraterritorial assassinations, bombings at European airports, and the 1986 bombing of a Berlin nightclub popular with American Armed Forces. Libya had a central role in orchestrating and financing the in-air bombing of Pan Am flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland in 1988, which killed 270 people, including 190 Americans. Libya was also central in the bombing of French UTA flight 772 in 1989, which killed 177 people from 18 nations, 7 of whom were American citizens.

The violence of Colonel Qaddafi is known to many nations around the world. In the early 1970s, Libya sent military troops and financed extremist Palestinian activities in Lebanon. Libya gave safe haven to Black September, the Palestinian terrorists that seized Israeli athletes as hostages at the 1972 Olympics in Munich. Later in the decade, Libya sent armed forces into Chad and Uganda. Throughout the 1970s and well into the 1980s, Colonel

Qaddafi either financed or materially supported revolutionary efforts in Chad, Corsica, Eritrea, Germany, Iran, Italy, Nicaragua, Northern Ireland, Japan, Lebanon, Philippines, Sardinia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, and Tunisia. Ending the reign of Colonel Qaddafi and his destabilizing influence is in the interest of the world.

I’ve heard from many of my constituents concerned that our engagement in Libya will become our next Iraq or Afghanistan. I share those concerns and have expressed them to the White House and was assured that our operations in Libya would be limited.

I have voted against the use of ground troops in Libya and my vote today affirms that position. I do not believe that the United States can afford to be involved in further prolonged foreign entanglements and nation building. H.J. Res. 68 authorizes the limited support for the NATO mission to one year. Would I be more comfortable with a shorter timeframe? Yes, but so likely would Colonel Qaddafi. Nothing would give him more comfort than a short deadline for him to cling to so he can continue to slaughter his own people into submission.

The situation in Libya is unlike that in Iraq or Afghanistan. The mission in Libya has broad international support. I’ve mentioned the Arab League and NATO, but also the United Nations, the Gulf Cooperation Council, the Libyan Transitional National Council, and former Libyan Ambassador Ali Aujali support our mission. Traditional Libyan allies, such as China, Russia, and Turkey, have begun talks with the newly formed Libyan Transitional National Council. I strongly support the building of international goodwill and cooperation as integral to our nation’s as well as global security.

My vote today is for the brave and courageous people of Libya. My vote today is for continued rebuilding of our international reputation.

Mahalo nui loa.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 68. This legislation will not end our military involvement in Libya. Both simply maintain the status quo and appease Republican Members who want to score political points against the President.

Under the guise of deficit reduction, Republicans have voted for deep cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and other safety net programs. We could better achieve deficit reduction by swiftly ending the Libyan war and accelerating our withdrawal from Afghanistan.

Congress has the power of the purse. Our nation has been at war in Libya for 97 days and Congress has never authorized the conflict. We need to completely defund operations in Libya and put an end to this conflict. It is time for us to come together, use our constitutional authority, and apply this critical check on the executive branch. At a time when we cannot afford to pursue another military adventure that is not in our national interest. We must get out of this war now.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this toothless bill, and instead defund operations in Libya in the upcoming 2012 Defense Appropriations bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) made a point of order against consideration of the joint resolution for violating clause 11 of rule XXI asserting that the text of the measure had not been available for “72-hours.”

Unfortunately, the gentleman misstated the actual wording of the rule.

Clause 11 states in relevant part that “It shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution which has not been reported by a committee until the third calendar day . . . on which such measure has been available.” The rule clearly counts days, not hours.

I would refer Members to the ruling of Speaker pro tempore POE on March 17, 2011 where he affirmed that under clause 11 of rule 21, an unreported measure may not be considered until the “third working day” on which it has been available to Members.

While the Chair was correct in his response that the rule provides a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution, I also want to point my colleagues to House Report 111–114 which accompanied the rule providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 68 and H.R. 2278.

Under the heading “Explanation of Waivers,” the Committee states that it is not aware of points of order against consideration or the provisions contained in either measure and that the waivers are merely “prophylactic.” This means that no waiver of clause 11 of rule XXI or any other point of order was necessary. That is because H.J. Res. 68 is being considered on the fourth calendar day after it was made available and H.R. 2278 is being considered on the third such day, fully in compliance with the rules of the House.

I hope that in the future my colleagues will pay closer attention to the wording of the rules in making points of order.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired. Pursuant to House Resolution 328, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, yeas 295, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 493]

AYES—123

Ackerman	Carnahan	Davis (CA)
Altmire	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Baca	Chandler	DeLauro
Barrow	Chu	Dent
Bass (CA)	Cleaver	Deutch
Berkley	Clyburn	Dicks
Berman	Cohen	Dingell
Bishop (NY)	Connolly (VA)	Doggett
Blumenauer	Cooper	Donnelly (IN)
Boren	Costa	Doyle
Boswell	Courtney	Dreier
Brady (PA)	Critz	Edwards
Brown (FL)	Crowley	Ellison
Capps	Cuellar	Eshoo
Cardoza	Cummings	Fattah

Filner
Fudge
Garamendi
Green, Al
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Insole
Israel
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Levin
Lowey

Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Moran
Neal
Oliver
Owens
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richmond
Rivera
Rogers (MI)

Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott, David
Sewell
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Van Hollen
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—295

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishke
Biggert
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huiuzenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating

Kelly
Kingston
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri

Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rohalla
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan

Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Waxman
Webster
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Bachus
Berg
Butterfield
Engel
Giffords

Gingrey (GA)
Higgins
Mack
Napolitano
Ryan (OH)

Stivers
Towns
West

□ 1216

Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. LUETKE-MEYER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. CLEAVER and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the joint resolution was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was in a meeting with a constituent and inadvertently missed the vote on H.J. Res. 68, a resolution authorizing for one year the limited use of the United States Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya. Because of the importance of this matter I would like to request that the RECORD reflect that had I been present I would have voted “aye” on rollcall 493 in support of the resolution.

Stated against:

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 493 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 493. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on H.J. Res. 68, authorizing the limited use of United States Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 69

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 69.

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

There was no objection.

LIMITING USE OF FUNDS FOR ARMED FORCES IN LIBYA

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 328, I call up the bill (H.R. 2278) to limit the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for United States Armed Forces in support of North Atlantic Treaty Organization Operation Unified Protector with respect to Libya, unless otherwise specifically authorized by law, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 328, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2278

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

SECTION 1. LIMITATION ON USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FUNDS FOR UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATION UNIFIED PROTECTOR WITH RESPECT TO LIBYA.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for United States Armed Forces in support of North Atlantic Treaty Organization Operation Unified Protector with respect to Libya, unless otherwise specifically authorized by law.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The limitation on funds under subsection (a) does not apply with respect to—

- (1) search and rescue;
- (2) intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance;
- (3) aerial refueling; and
- (4) operational planning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1220

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

Mr. Speaker, on March 19 of this year, the President sent us into military activity, or war, in Libya. Within 48 hours, the President notified the Congress in accordance with the War Powers Act of his decision to do so. For 60 days, the President under the War Powers Act had the opportunity, and chose not to, to come to this body and make the case as to why being in Libya was important. On the 60th day, he wrote a letter to this body saying that he would welcome authorization but he's not asking for it.

Time and time again on the Armed Services Committee, we were presented