United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 24, 2011 No. 92

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, June 27, 2011, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JUNE 24, 2011

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. We pause in Your presence and ask guidance for the men and women of the people's House. Enable them, O God, to act on what they believe to be right and true and just, and to do so in ways that show respect for those with whom they disagree. In this, may they grow to be models and good examples in a time when so many in our world are unable to engage gracefully with those they are at odds with.

May the Members realize that Your congregation is wider and broader than ever we could measure or determine. Help them, and help us, O Lord, to put away any judgments that belong to You and do what we can to live together in peace.

As we approach this next recess, bless our great Nation and keep it faithful to its ideals, its hopes, and its promise of freedom in our world.

Bless us this day and every day. And may all that is done within the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. NUNNELEE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side.

VOTE ''NO'' ON LIBYA RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, later this morning we will be debating and voting on two resolutions dealing with Libya. The first one, H.J. Res. 68, has been said to be one that literally endorses exactly what the President has been doing, and I agree with that: Even though it excludes ground troops, it doesn't talk about Special Forces, CIA, contractors, and unlimited bombing, which is really what we have to restrict.

But the second one, H.R. 2278, has been said to be more strongly worded in restraint on the President, and this is where I disagree. I believe the wording is different. It says no funds for ground troops. But then it has exceptions, and the exceptions are for all the things that we're already doing. So I believe if we vote and pass the second one, it will be the first time this Congress has given authority to the President for what he is doing right now.

So I urge my colleagues to look at both of these carefully. I have concluded that not only should the first one be voted down, but it's very important that the second one be voted down as well.

DEFEAT AUTHORIZATION FOR WAR IN LIBYA

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

Mr. KUCINICH. We've been in Afghanistan for 10 years at a cost of over a half trillion dollars and in Iraq for 8 years at a long-term cost of at least $3 trillion. Those who told us the war in Libya would last days now want to extend it for another year at a total cost of billions.

It is surreal that we could even be considering authorizing this war at a time when the government is collapsing in debt. Those who told us the war in Libya was to save civilian lives quickly switched to regime change, with innocent civilians dying from NATO's bombs.

Prior to NATO's assuming responsibility, we launched hundreds of cruise

Printed on recycled paper.

missiles and dropped tons of bombs on Libya. Since NATO took over, the U.S. has struck from the air at least 90 times, including drone attacks. But these are not ''hostilities,'' claims the White House; so what business is it of Congress?

We must put an end not only to the war in Libya, but we must put an end to the thinking that the Constitution is a doormat and that our constituents must simply bear the consequences of the misguided policies of this administration without this Congress having any say whatsoever.

Defeat the authorization for the war. Vote for the Rooney bill, which limits the war. And when we return, let's vote for a total cutoff of funds for this wrongheaded adventure.

MR. PRESIDENT, UNLEASH THE POWER OF AMERICAN ENERGY EXPLORATION

(Mr. NUNNELEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NUNNELEE. Yesterday, President Obama executed a shortsighted energy plan and released 30 million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, all while the United States' combined recoverable oil, natural gas, and coal resources are 1.3 trillion barrels of oil equivalent, the largest in the world.

We have 40,000 times more American natural resources under our ground than the amount President Obama took out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Drawing down reserves intended for national emergencies is far from the energy plan we need, especially when we're sitting on abundant resources. President Obama must quit blocking American energy production.

Mr. President, if you want to make us energy secure, if you want to see a thriving economy creating jobs, if you want to free Americans from the burden of high gas prices, unleash the power and ingenuity of American energy exploration, and do it now.

RELEASE STAFF SERGEANT GILAD SHALIT

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the fifth anniversary of the abduction of Israeli soldier Staff Sergeant Gilad Shalit from inside Israel's borders by the terrorist organization Hamas. For 5 years, Hamas has violated international human rights conventions by denying Shalit contact with his family and visits by the International Red Cross.

Now Hamas wants to be partners with the Palestinian Authority. If the Palestinian Authority is determined to pursue unity with Hamas, then President Abbas must demand that his new partner free Sergeant Shalit.

Israel can never be expected to negotiate with an organization that remains bent on its destruction. But if Hamas ever expects to have a seat at the table, it must show good faith now and immediately release Gilad Shalit.

We stand here today with our great ally, Israel. We stand here with allies from Europe and throughout the world. We stand with all who believe in and fight for basic human rights. Anyone who can hear my voice knows that Gilad Shalit must be released.

CUT OFF FUNDS TO PRESIDENT'S WAR IN LIBYA

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, America's third war continues. The President's little war in Libya is unconstitutional and it also violates the War Powers Resolution. Even the administration says Libya is not a national security risk to America.

So why are we at war in Libya? Because the French want us there? Mr. Speaker, don't you think we've done enough for the French in World War I, World War II, and even in Indochina, what we now call Vietnam?

The United States should not be involved in Libya's civil war. The cost has been over $700 million to the American taxpayer. Mr. Speaker, don't you think that money, that millions of dollars could be better spent building America instead of blowing up Libya?

And who are these rebels in Libya that we are supporting? Of course Omar Qadhafi is a tyrant, but we may end up replacing an oppressive regime with an extremist radical regime. Now, isn't that lovely?

Congress should cut off all American funds to the President's little war in Libya.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 0910

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF THE LIBYAN OPERATION

(Mr. GARAMENDI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARAMENDI. It appears this morning and today the House of Representatives and Congress will be carrying out its constitutional responsibilities dealing with the war in Libya. Resolutions will be on the floor. Appropriately, we will be voting today on whether we want to end, limit, or extend.

For me, I think we have to carry out the U.N. resolution that calls for the right to protect or the obligation and duty to protect. That is why the Libyan situation started. That needs to be completed.

I would suggest that the Hastings resolution that gives a year is good in that it provides the necessary restrictions on the White House and on the military in the Libya operation and basically puts the United States in a support position. I would prefer that there be an amendment to that—perhaps it will be in a motion to recommit—that it be limited to 6 months.

OVERSIGHT OVER CORPORATE MERGERS NEEDED

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there are many issues that we must address in this august body, but it is tragic to note that we have been here for 24 weeks since the GOP took responsibility and control of this House and we have done nothing to create jobs. In fact, the majority leader has indicated the Republicans have no plans to do anything on jobs through this summer.

Why does this pose a crisis? Because in the midst of all of this, a number of mergers are coming into fruition, in particular the United-Continental merger. We have already had an announcement that Houston will lose 1,500 jobs, and no response from United or Continental. In addition, United had a recent collapse of its database, or its system, which caused massive shutdowns and clogging of the system, where passengers were stuck in airports because they couldn't get their planes off the ground.

When we have mergers with no restraint and no oversight, we have a problem. So jobs are necessary to be created, and there needs to be oversight over mergers like Continental and United so that communities like Houston and elsewhere won't be losing jobs with no response.

MARKING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER SCOUT

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a piece of American history and to pay tribute to the Americans that created it: 2011 marks the 50th anniversary of the International Harvester Scout; the first Scout, built out of American ingenuity and steel, rolled off the assembly line 50 years ago in Fort Wayne, Indiana, the creation of Ted Ornas, literally drawn on a napkin at his kitchen table.

In the near future, my good friend from Indiana, JOE DONNELLY, and I will come to this floor at the end of the day to tell the history of this great company and the iconic IH Scout. We will also tell the stories of those who restore, drive, and keep the legacy alive. These are the stories of America, stories of hardworking people who respect our history and believe it is worth preserving.

The Scout reflects the exceptional American personality, ingenuity,

thriftiness, self-reliance, and a can-do spirit. The Scout was built in the heartland of Indiana on these principles.

I want to thank Jeff Bade and John Glancy for helping put this effort together. Honoring our history reminds us of what we were capable of together in this great Nation.

AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2011, PART III

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2279) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend the airport improvement program, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2279

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part III''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TAXES FUNDING AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) FUEL TAXES.—Subparagraph (B) of section 4081(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''June 30, 2011'' and inserting ''July 22, 2011''.

(b) TICKET TAXES.—

(1) PERSONS.—Clause (ii) of section 4261(j)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''June 30, 2011'' and inserting ''July 22, 2011''.

(2) PROPERTY.—Clause (ii) of section 4271(d)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''June 30, 2011'' and inserting ''July 22, 2011''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 2011.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 9502(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''July 1, 2011'' and inserting ''July 23, 2011''; and

(2) by inserting ''or the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part III'' before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 9502(e) of such Code is amended by striking ''July 1, 2011'' and inserting ''July 23, 2011''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 2011.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 48103 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following:

''(8) $2,840,890,411 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on July 22, 2011.''.

(2) OBLIGATION OF AMOUNTS.—Subject to limitations specified in advance in appropriation Acts, sums made available pursuant to the amendment made by paragraph (1) may be obligated at any time through September 30, 2011, and shall remain available until expended.

(3) PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION.—For purposes of calculating funding apportionments and meeting other requirements under sections 47114, 47115, 47116, and 47117 of title 49, United States Code, for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on July 22, 2011, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall—

(A) first calculate funding apportionments on an annualized basis as if the total amount available under section 48103 of such title for fiscal year 2011 were $3,515,000,000; and

(B) then reduce by 7 percent—

(i) all funding apportionments calculated under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) amounts available pursuant to sections 47117(b) and 47117(f)(2) of such title.

(b) PROJECT GRANT AUTHORITY.—Section 47104(c) of such title is amended by striking ''June 30, 2011,'' and inserting ''July 22, 2011,''.

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES.

(a) Section 40117(l)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''July 1, 2011.'' and inserting ''July 23, 2011.''.

(b) Section 44302(f)(1) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking ''June 30, 2011,'' and inserting ''July 22, 2011,''; and

(2) by striking ''September 30, 2011,'' and inserting ''October 31, 2011,''.

(c) Section 44303(b) of such title is amended by striking ''September 30, 2011,'' and inserting ''October 31, 2011,''.

(d) Section 47107(s)(3) of such title is amended by striking ''July 1, 2011.'' and inserting ''July 23, 2011.''.

(e) Section 47115(j) of such title is amended by striking ''July 1, 2011,'' and inserting ''July 23, 2011,''.

(f) Section 47141(f) of such title is amended by striking ''June 30, 2011.'' and inserting ''July 22, 2011.''.

(g) Section 49108 of such title is amended by striking ''June 30, 2011,'' and inserting ''July 22, 2011,''.

(h) Section 161 of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (49 U.S.C. 47109 note) is amended by striking ''July 1, 2011,'' and inserting ''July 23, 2011,''.

(i) Section 186(d) of such Act (117 Stat. 2518) is amended by striking ''July 1, 2011,'' and inserting ''July 23, 2011,''.

(j) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 2011.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following exchange of letters.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, June 24, 2011.

Hon. JOHN MICA,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MICA, I am writing concerning H.R. 2279, the ''Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part III'' which is expected to be scheduled for floor consideration today.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Code. Sections 2 and 3 of this bill amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by extending the current Airport and Airway Trust Fund (AATF) expenditure authority and the associated Federal excise taxes to July 22, 2011. In order to expedite H.R. 2279 for Floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on the bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 2279, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, June 24, 2011.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2279, the ''Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part III.'' The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure recognizes the Committee on Ways and Means has a jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2279, and I appreciate your effort to facilitate consideration of this bill.

I concur with you that forgoing action on H.R. 2279 does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include our letters on H.R. 2279 in the Congressional Record during House Floor consideration of the bill. Again, I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I look forward to working with the Committee on Ways and Means as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
Chairman.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2279, the ''Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part III.'' This bill is a ''clean'' extension of the authority of the Federal Aviation Administration, FAA, to spend from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to carry out airport improvement projects at current levels through July 22, 2011.

In February, the Senate approved a bipartisan, comprehensive FAA reauthorization bill by a wide 87-to-8-vote margin. Passage of the Senate bill was applauded by both labor and industry stakeholders, and it was estimated that the bill would create at least 150,000 jobs.

The House followed on April 1 with a bill containing some controversial provisions that the Senate has indicated it will not accept. These provisions include the repeal of a National Mediation Board rule on fair union representation elections and cuts to funding for FAA programs, airport construction and improvement, and air traffic control modernization.

For the last 2 months, we have worked with the Senate to resolve a number of differences between the two bills. The negotiations have made good progress, and, with just a handful of major differences remaining, we may be on the cusp of enacting a long-term reauthorization—a reauthorization that provides the FAA with the stability and funding necessary to safeguard safety, modernize the system, and create jobs.

Like my Republican colleagues, I had hoped that each of the previous two short-term extensions would be the last. I was reassured by

their expressions of a commitment to deliver a forward-looking bill that could pass both chambers and be signed by the President. But now we find ourselves with the need for a twentieth short-term extension. This extension is necessary, but I again say to my Republican colleagues: Let this extension be the last. Get a long-term bill done.

I will work with my colleagues across the aisle to produce a bipartisan FAA bill that will create jobs and keep our economy moving throughout the 21st century and make this our last extension. For the present time, however, this extension is necessary, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill just passed, H.R. 2279.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, JUNE 28, 2011

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, June 28, 2011; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Friday, July 1, 2011.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 68, AUTHORIZING LIMITED USE OF ARMED FORCES IN LIBYA; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2278, LIMITING USE OF FUNDS FOR ARMED FORCES IN LIBYA

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 328 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 328

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House 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, if called up by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or her designee. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, 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; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House 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, if called up by the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, 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 gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 328 provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2278 and H.J. Res. 68. The rule provides a total of 3 hours of debate in this Chamber on this vitally important issue of U.S. military operations in Libya. The rule also provides the minority with two separate motions to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, it was in this week in 1788, June 21, 1788, that the United States ratified its Constitution, that Constitution that still serves us so well today. In that Constitution, our Framers made clear that the power of the purse belongs here and here alone, here in the people's House, here on Capitol Hill; and that Constitution made clear that the power to declare war lies here and here alone.

On June 3 of this year by a vote of 268–145 the House of Representatives passed a resolution asking the President to make clear what his intentions are in Libya, asking the President to come and consult with Congress, to get Congress' permission, to seek our authority to prosecute those hostilities in Libya.

We have received some information from the White House since then. We have gotten a letter from the White House since then. We even have classified documents since then. But what we have not had since then, Mr. Speaker, is an opportunity for the American people to make their voice heard on this important issue, because, after all, this isn't an issue for Congress, because as a Congressman, it is not about my voice. It is about the voice of the 911,000 people back home that I represent that I bring here to Congress, and those people's voices have yet to be heard on this Libya issue.

□ 0920

Operation Odyssey Dawn is in full operation now, since the month of March, and the people's voice has still not been heard. But today, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee, as one of the longest-standing committees in this U.S. House of Representatives, first constituted in 1789, the Rules Committee is making that opportunity available with these two resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, my hope is that the people's voice will be heard today; that in this hour upon hour of debate that we have today, these two very different choices for where this country goes, that the American people will for the first time have their voice heard on the question of Libya.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, when we come back in July, we're going to take up the FY 2012 defense bill. In fact, we'll take it up tonight and start considering amendments when we return. We'll again have an opportunity to have our voice heard. Because, Mr. Speaker, there is an entire gradation of options that we have here. Are we going to declare war on Libya? Are we going to allow the President to continue doing what he's doing in Libya? Are we going to shut down the funding for troops on the ground on Libya? Are we going to shut down funding for Libya altogether? These are the questions that the Rules Committee has made available today and 2 weeks from now so that this House will be able to have its voice heard.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to thank my colleague very much for yielding the time, Mr. Speaker.

We're considering matters of war and peace today. On Sunday, our Nation will have been engaged in military action in Libya for 100 days. The actions taken by the President have a grave impact on the constitutional role of Congress and the role of the United States abroad. Taken together, these are among the most important issues that we as Members of Congress will ever consider. These are the very debates that scholars and historians will study and analyze for decades to come.

Given these fundamental issues, the American people deserve the full and thorough consideration that should be afforded to all legislation introduced in this body—with committee hearings

and debate, followed by an open and regular process, and a thoughtful debate by the whole House.

In 1990, when I was first here, the body considered a resolution regarding matters of war and peace. At the request of President George H.W. Bush, both Chambers of the United States Congress engaged in a fierce debate about whether to authorize the use of military force in the Persian Gulf. I have vivid memories of those debates long into the night, with issues being debated in committees, marked up by both parties, brought to the House floor for a final debate before the American public. On that particular measure concerning the Persian Gulf, we had 25 hours of debate and 263 Members spoke. It was one of the most thorough airings of our constitutional obligations that I have witnessed.

In exchanges that can be publicly accessed today, Members of the House and our colleagues in the Senate engaged in an intelligent and enlightening exchange of ideas about the merits, the dangers, and necessities of passing a resolution authorizing American troops to engage in military force overseas. There were strong views on both sides of the aisle, but these views were accompanied by an overriding sense of duty to our country—a belief that Congress would reach a decision based upon the thoughtful and prudent vote of its Members and a reflection of a common interest of all its citizens.

As historians look back on the debate over the Persian Gulf War, they can clearly see a vibrant democracy—a democracy that is engaged in robust debate and a democracy earnestly working together for the best interest of its people. Two decades later, we stand in a room imbued with this history—that debate took place right here—but we avoid the robust debates that preceded us here today. Indeed, the way in which today's measures are being debated shame the dignity, history, and tradition of this body.

Today's resolutions about our actions in Libya have been rushed through the House of Representatives. They were written behind closed doors and received neither committee hearings nor committee markups. The two resolutions are being considered under a single closed rule following an emergency meeting of the Rules Committee yesterday afternoon. The process by which these measures proceeded through the Rules Committee is indicative of the chaotic and rushed process that we're being asked to vote for here today.

Late Tuesday night—10 o'clock, I believe—we were given two resolutions for an emergency meeting on Wednesday. They were added as emergency items to our afternoon meeting. When we got to the Rules Committee, they had been pulled from the agenda. It wasn't until 9 p.m. Wednesday that we received the text of H.R. 2278. Yesterday, we were notified that the Rules Committee would meet on this new and unvetted bill, along with one of the original two resolutions, less than 3 hours before the meeting began. We now stand on the House floor being asked to vote for a closed rule. We will then be asked to consider two resolutions of historic proportions with no ability to shape and adjust the measures to reflect the true will of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I regret the shameful way this important debate has been rushed through Congress, and I apologize to future generations who will look back on the work that we're doing today. Quite simply, the legislative process matters. Historians, scholars, and yes, future Members of Congress will look back on our actions today to see how their forebearers shaped the fate of this country.

In the case of the resolution of the Persian Gulf, they'll say how our democratic process thrived, whether one agreed with the resolution or not. Shamefully, in the case of today's resolutions, they will see a dysfunctional democratic process, one that has committed a disservice to the American people, to the dignity of the House of Representatives, and the future of the United States, by avoiding a true debate on one of the most important issues of our time.

For these very reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on today's rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to a gentleman who has great reverence for the United States Constitution, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this rule, although I have a lot of complaints about how we deal with the issue of war. This is a debate that should have gone on 4 months ago, before the war was started. And if we had done this properly, we wouldn't be bringing this up quickly today. No committee work, no discussion, no chance for amendment. But, nevertheless, I will support the rule because at least we get a chance to talk a little bit about what's going on in Libya.

We have two resolutions that will come up under this rule. The first resolution, generally, I understand most individuals aren't too keen on this, because it's a literal endorsement—a rather explicit endorsement—of the war, so obviously I oppose H.J. Res. 68. But my greatest concern is about H.R. 2278. The way I read this resolution is that it essentially grants the same authority that we grant in the first Resolution because we say that no funds can be used—it denies the use of funds. But how can you deny the use of appropriated funds when they're using funds that weren't appropriated? It's so redundant. The funds were never appropriated. So, yes, it's a good statement. You don't continue to be illegal, is what we're saying.

What I'm concerned about are the exceptions. All the exceptions are for the things that they're already doing, like search and rescue, intelligence gathering, reconnaissance, surveillance, refueling, operations planning, and doing everything except pulling the trigger. So we're legalizing the current war.

I believe that H.R. 2278 is the first time that we in the Congress are making a statement of granting authority to the President to pursue this particular war. I am in strong opposition to that resolution as well, although I understand the other side of the argument because it says ''denial of funds.'' The author of the resolution said the reason why we have the exception is to protect the integrity of our contract or agreement with NATO. Well, in the resolution it says we have to stop the funding because we don't want to support NATO's war.

So it's totally inconsistent. Makes no sense whatsoever. But it reminds me of the War Powers resolution. After the Vietnam War, we didn't want to get into that kind of war any more, so Congress, in its infinite wisdom, with good intentions, it designs the War Powers resolution, which legalized war for 90 days. That's part of the reason why we're here. We're worried about 90 days. But here we're going into the fourth month dealing with the War Powers resolution.

□ 0930

There is a simple solution to all of this, and that is to obey the Constitution. Don't allow our Presidents to go to war without a declaration of war, and we wouldn't be facing this problem of this debate that actually gets a little bit silly on restraining the President. Yes, we should. We should exert ourselves. We have the prerogatives, and we have the obligations. We have avoided it. It's time to stand up for the rule of law.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Hastings resolution and in support of the Rooney resolution.

This morning's paper, The New York Times, says that this is a dangerous resolution because it would allow the financing only for American surveillance, search and rescue missions, planning and aerial refueling. It would halt drone strikes and attacks on Libyan air defenses, and it would damage the Nation's credibility in its leadership of NATO.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Nation's credibility—that is to say its promise to go to war if backed by the President and not by Congress—ought to be damaged. We have been sliding for 70 years into a situation where Congress has nothing to do with the decision about whether to go to war or not, and the President is becoming an absolute monarch. We must put a stop to

that right now if we don't want to become an empire instead of a Republic. This country was set up to be a Republic where the basic questions of war and peace are supposed to be answered by this Congress. Because of the exigencies of the Cold War, if the bombers are coming over the Pole, you don't have time to call Congress. We lost a lot of that power. We ceded it to the President.

But in a situation such as Libya, whether the reasons for going there are good or ill, the fact is there was no imminent threat to the United States, and the Secretary of Defense said that. There was plenty of time to negotiate with the Arab League, and there was plenty of time to go to the U.N. There should have been time to have, not consultations with Congress, but the authorization from Congress. In the absence of that authorization, we have to put our foot down now and say ''no.'' If foreign countries learn that they cannot depend on American military intervention unless Congress is aboard for the ride, good. That's a good thing.

The power of the Presidency—and I'm not talking about this President—as was said by Charles James Fox in 1780, the power of the Crown, in this case the power of the President, has increased, is increasing and ought to be diminished. This country's power to go to war or not must reside here except in extreme and urgent emergencies. It is time to put our foot down now by passing that resolution.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding time.

I rise today in support of this rule and of H.R. 2278, a bill to prohibit funds for continued U.S. military involvement in Libya except for operations involving search and rescue, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, aerial refueling, and operational planning.

In 2007, then the junior Senator from Illinois, Barack Obama, confidently proclaimed to the Boston Globe this comment: ''The President does not have power under the Constitution to unilaterally authorize a military attack in a situation that does not involve stopping an actual or imminent threat to the Nation.'' However, now that he is not attacking political opponents, that stance has proven inconvenient, prompting one of his many, many flip-flops, such as his vote opposing to raise the debt limit.

Regardless of one's position on the constitutional powers of the President as Commander in Chief or Congress' authority to declare war, the legislative branch unquestionably yields the power of the purse. This bill represents a proper exercise of that power, pure and simple. The bill does not leave our military personnel in dangerous circumstances without the funds or supplies they need. It does not require a precipitous withdrawal since, without a ground presence, there is nowhere from which to withdraw. The bill simply denies U.S. taxpayer funding for what the President calls a ''kinetic activity,'' but what the world recognizes as an ongoing bombing campaign in Libya.

It is for these reasons and many more that I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support H.R. 2278.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentlelady from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are later this morning going to be engaged in one of the most important tasks of Congress, and that is what to do about war. Unfortunately, the administration—and I think they would agree to this—didn't adequately engage Congress in the process running up to the beginning of the Libya conflict and didn't sufficiently engage during the course of it. We are now in a position where we will be making some decisions today about how we want this Nation to proceed, whether we want to proceed with a full-on war or with limited or much more limited activity with regard to the support of NATO in the Libya fight.

Unfortunately, all of this is now being rushed upon us here on the last day just before the break for the 4th of July. The amount of time to debate this on the floor is far too limited. It would have been our preference on the Democratic side to have had a more full discussion along the lines that the gentlelady from New York discussed in her opening comments—a full-on discussion about how we are to proceed. We are basically going to have two options, both of them with inadequate discussion. I guess we're down to that point now where we have no more alternative but to use the 1 hour, so here we are debating this issue at this moment.

For me, there is a very important principle that was enunciated by the United Nations, which is the obligation to defend and protect. That was the basic rationale for this country moving forward with the Libya operation. Yes, the President should have come to us early. He should have come to us at the very beginning and allowed Congress to carry out its constitutional obligations, ''yes'' or ''no.'' But here we are. The obligation or the right or the necessity to defend is very important. That's why we're there. We need to provide the President with the necessary powers to carry out that obligation in a very limited period of time. We'll see that this afternoon or later this morning with the Hastings amendment.

Mr. WOODALL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House has the opportunity today to actually have a serious debate on the war with Libya.

Like most Americans, I am disappointed in any argument that says we are not at war. I believe that argument shows contempt for the Constitution and for the executive's coequal branch of government—the United States Congress.

How can this not be war? If another country launched aggressive air strikes against the United States, you'd better believe we'd consider it an act of war. Does anyone remember Pearl Harbor or 9/11? We certainly considered those acts of war against our country. To say that our bombing of Libya does not rise to the level of ''hostilities'' flies in the face of common sense.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation can't afford a third war. The ones we are already fighting are bankrupting us morally and fiscally. This Congress must reassert our power of the purse and not fund an unauthorized war. Today, we must send a clear message that the American people and this Congress will not support perpetual war.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend from Lawrenceville for his typical stellar management of this very important rule; but I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that it saddens me greatly that we are here on the House floor, dealing with this. We have been in the midst of what has been a celebration, a celebration as described as the Arab Spring.

We saw a few months ago a young merchant in a small town in Tunisia very, very distraught over the fact that a government official came and took his scale away from him and took it to the government office.

□ 0940

He went back and asked for it, and when he made that request, he was denied it. He basically said he'd had enough, and so this young man chose to set himself afire in the middle of the town square in this tiny town in Tunisia.

Now, as we all know, that launched what has become known as the Arab Spring. The Economist magazine very appropriately said that one of the great developments that the Arab Spring has wrought is that we have now seen those so-called ''barbarians'' in the Arab world, in the Muslim world, move towards self-determination. Many people in the West and in other parts of the world very arrogantly said there's no way in the world that those people could possibly make great strides towards political pluralism and development of the rule of law, self-determination, but, in fact, we saw—beginning with this one very sad act—people throughout the Arab world in not only Tunisia, but Egypt, Bahrain and, yes,

in Libya, demonstrate their frustration over authoritarian dictatorships that were actually undermining the potential of the people of each of these countries.

So that's why, Mr. Speaker, it saddens me greatly that we are here today doing what it is that we're doing. Why? Because we should be in the midst of a celebration, a celebration of these very bold and dynamic steps that are being taken throughout the Arab world. And why is it that we're here? We're here because of what has been described by Members on both sides of the aisle—and I just heard my friend from New York describe the actions of this Presidency—as being the act of a monarch.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's very important for us to look at recent history. If we go back to the 2006 election, the Republicans lost the majority in large part because of the war in Iraq. Democrats and Republicans alike acknowledge that.

There's an important distinction that needs to be made. If one goes back and looks at the action that was taken by President Bush, he chose to come to this Congress. He wanted the support of the American people through their elected Representatives and Senators to be behind his effort. We all know that he reached out to the United Nations, built a coalition, and there was lots of controversy. There, to this day, continues to be controversy. But the Congress was involved in that process, as has been the case in many instances in the past, not every instance, but many instances in the past.

We know, as my friend from Grandfather Community, North Carolina, just said, that President Obama when he was a candidate, United States Senator, was very critical of President Bush. We know that his campaign for the Presidency in large part centered around this notion of bringing home the troops, and we had his speech the before night last on dealing with Afghanistan and his notion that we were going to bring these efforts to an end.

I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that as we, I said, should be in the midst of celebrating the Arab Spring, we probably would have had, when one thinks about the actions that took place in Libya, we probably would have had, Mr. Speaker, pretty broad support here in the Congress for the action that was taken by the President if there had been an early authorization of this.

Now, it is, as I said, very sad that we are here now because I think Democrats and Republicans alike acknowledge that this has been very, very poorly handled. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if there's any more time.

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

Mr. WOODALL. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me just say that as we look at this, Mr. Speaker, I think we need to recognize that there are other very troubled spots in the world. We just, today, have gotten word of thousands of Syrians who are fleeing to Turkey because of the barbaric acts that have taken place there.

So I think that as we look at the great positive steps that have been taken in the Arab world, we need to make sure that the United States Congress and the President of the United States are in this together. There should be consultation and authorization to deal with this.

Mr. Speaker, I've got to say that as we look at this rule itself, I really am absolutely stunned, absolutely stunned at the kinds of things that I've heard from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as my good friend from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), knows, as we began debate on this, we had complete compliance with the 3-day layover requirement, and we had these measures before us. I would say to my friend from Rochester, Mr. Speaker, there was not a single amendment offered in the Committee on Rules to deal with this, not a single amendment offered, and, in fact, one of these measures is offered by a Republican, gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY); the other is offered by a Democrat, the other gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

And so when I think about 3 o'clock in the morning on June 25 of 2009, we began the debate on this horrible idea of cap-and-trade, and it was 3 o'clock in the morning and I was sitting upstairs with my Rules Committee colleagues, Mr. Speaker, and dropped in my lap, still hot because it had just come off of the copying machine, was 300 pages of an amendment that we reported out.

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

Mr. WOODALL. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, at 3 o'clock in the morning we were handed this measure.

Now, what we have before us has, again, complied with the 3-day layover requirement, not a single amendment was offered, and there's a proposal offered by a Democrat and a proposal offered by a Republican. So, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I believe that this rule is one that does allow for a free-flowing debate. It allows for an opportunity to consider this, and it's not as if we haven't been engaged in this discussion for a long period of time.

My friend from Cleveland is here and he has played a very, very constructive role in leading the charge on this over the past several weeks, as he often does, and I believe that our ability to continue this debate is an important one.

But again, Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by saying it saddens me that at a time when we should be celebrating the fact there are people in the Arab world who are seeking the opportunity to enjoy the kinds of freedoms that we have here in the United States of America, that the President of the United States has chosen to go it alone without recognizing the very, very important responsibility of the first branch of the United States Government.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. The right to protect civilians has morphed into the so-called right to change a regime and the right to destroy civilians. The situation is positively Orwellian, and it is all going wrong. Even early supporters of the war are changing their minds. I would quote from al Jazeera just a couple of days ago:

''Italy's foreign minister and the outgoing head of the Arab League have each called for a halt to hostilities in the war-torn north African country.

''Franco Frattini told members of Parliament on Wednesday that the suspension of military operations in Libya was 'essential' for immediate humanitarian aid, while Amr Moussa, the Arab League chief, called for a political solution to the crisis.

''Moussa's sentiment was shared by the Italian foreign minister, who called for urgent humanitarian aid to trapped residents in cities like Tripoli and Misurata.

''He said the people in those areas face a 'dramatic' humanitarian situation and added that a suspension of hostilities would also avoid 'consolidating a division of Libya' between east and west.

''He said he hoped the European Council in Brussels on Thursday would highlight an end to the fighting in Libya as 'a practical solution.' ''

The question is, Mr. Speaker, will Congress rush into the breach here while our allies are headed to the exit?

H.R. 2278 by Mr. ROONEY would immediately prevent the administration from engaging in direct offensive hostilities in Libya, and it ought to be supported.

Now, the resolution isn't perfect. It doesn't end the war in its entirety immediately, but it does make clear that the United States will not take over the war as European support continues to diminish.

□ 0950

I proposed an amendment with Representative AMASH of Michigan and 11 others to the Defense authorization bill that would eliminate all funds for military operations in Libya. I urge a vote for this bipartisan amendment when we come back after the recess.

H.R. 2278 and the Kucinich-Amash amendment are complementary. If we want to end U.S. involvement, we can do it in two steps: First step, vote for H.R. 2278; second step, vote for Kucinich-Amash when we come back.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here this morning as someone who has opposed the Iraq war and consistently opposed the Afghanistan war under both Republican and Democratic Presidents. I think it is important to stop the politics this morning and recognize that mistakes were made by Presidents of all political parties.

The War Powers Resolution that is now being debated as being unconstitutional by my Republican friends has a very strong purpose. It is the purpose of this joint resolution to fulfill the intent of the Framers of the Constitution of the United States and ensure that the collective judgment of both the Congress and the President will apply to the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly going to occur. Now we have Republicans suggesting that the War Powers Resolution is unconstitutional. What do they want? This is a political game.

I voted for Mr. KUCINICH's resolution, and the Republicans had the opportunity to also vote for Mr. KUCINICH's resolution. This is to embarrass the President.

I agree with the underlying sentiment that this was handled badly and that there should have been consultation. Now there is an opportunity for authorization. We need to debate this not whether it is President Obama but whether or not there is a collaborative effort between NATO and the Arab League to address this hostile situation in Libya. And, frankly, I don't like the politics of this. The politics says, it's okay if it's a Republican President but not okay if it's Mr. Obama.

I am interested in preserving the integrity of this Constitution and have consistently voted that Congress has a right to declare war. But we are now engaged in a consultation process, and I hope Members will engage in the debate on the basis of the right decision to make. I am against war. Bring the troops home from Afghanistan. End the war in Iraq. But right now, this should not be Republicans against Democrats on the question of whether or not we are in a collaborative effort with NATO on this issue of Libya. We are attempting to save lives; take the politics out of it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I would be happy to yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentlelady.

I went to the Libyan Embassy at the very start of this horrific crisis and stood with the Libyan ambassador that resigned and called for the resignation of General Qadhafi. Today I continue to call for the cessation of the violence and abuse against the Libyan people. But we have to address this question away from the cloud, as I indicated, of politics.

We must adhere to the Constitution, Congress' right to declare war, but I can't understand this now backside debate about the War Powers Resolution being constitutional. For some of us, we believe that the contents of it insist that it is.

So my point to my colleagues is, the Kucinich resolution was on the floor, and every Republican had the opportunity to vote for it. Why we are here again with a resolution that imitates the debate that we had, I believe the underlying principle and premise is to embarrass this administration and President Obama.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say I absolutely agree with the gentlelady. This is no place for politics. And that's why, as Mr. KUCINICH has led this effort time after time after time, he's had tremendous support from the Republican side of the aisle.

This is not about Republicans and Democrats. This is about the Constitution of the United States. This is about the 911,000 people I represent back home. This is about the people's voice being behind the President. As the chairman of the Rules Committee said, this should not be a time for division. This should be a time for unification.

I absolutely agree with my colleagues who are concerned about the debate happening today, on June 24. The time for the debate was March 18. The time for the debate was before this got started to begin with. But we have been put in this box, Mr. Speaker, and we have a constitutional responsibility to find our way out of it. We have on the floor today under this rule two opportunities, two opportunities to make our constituents' voices heard, and I encourage a strong ''yes'' vote for this rule so that we can bring those opportunities to the floor.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I want to thank our ranking member for yielding and for her leadership and for this very important debate this morning.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, this debate, I believe, should have taken place at least 2 weeks prior to the war in Libya. The War Powers Act specifically forbids Armed Forces from engaging militarily in foreign lands for more than 60 days without congressional authorization of the use of military force or a declaration of war. And we should really make no mistake about it: We are at war in Libya today. We have been actively fighting the Qadhafi regime in Libya since March 19, which is 97 days ago.

No one in this House now would defend the deplorable actions of Colonel Qadhafi and the decades he has spent repressing the Libyan people. But no one should fail to recognize that the actions we have taken in Libya since March 19 amount to a war. Missile strikes, naval attacks, bombings of strategic military targets, all of these actions would be a declaration of war if a foreign country launched such attacks on any country, including our own.

We have committed $1 billion and thousands of servicemen and -women to a new front. And regardless of one's position on our involvement in Libya, one point is crystal clear: This debate should have happened before we launched a war in Libya.

On March 30 of this year, I joined with Representatives WOOLSEY, HONDA, GRIJALVA, and WATERS, and we sent a letter to Speaker BOEHNER urging him to bring forth an authorization of the use of military force in Libya, stressing the need for a robust debate and vote in line with our congressional prerogative and, indeed, obligations.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I would be pleased to yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentlelady.

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentlewoman.

Unfortunately, the Speaker did not grant our request, and we find ourselves here today debating this important constitutional issue well over 60 and even 90 days after hostilities began. So you will have to forgive me if I am somewhat skeptical about the political motives behind the floor actions that are scheduled today. Because we really need to understand that this is serious business, and it should not be politicized.

This is not about this President or any President. This is not about politics or isolationism. This is about the War Powers Act and the Constitution. It's about standing up for this body and our important role in one of the most solemn and one of the most important decisions that we make as lawmakers, and that's the decision to declare war.

Unfortunately, this resolution offered by my colleague from Florida (Mr. ROONEY) that is before us today has many exemptions that are very broad and, of course, fall short of ending this war. I have some concerns in terms of some of the limitations and exemptions, in terms of making sure that this does not broaden the war with these exemptions.

And I would hope the author, Mr. ROONEY, would be able to clarify these items and reassure us that: (1) reconnaissance would be limited to intelligence gathering and not tactical operations and (2) refueling would be limited to intelligence and reconnaissance, not operations.

Again, I hope we can clarify these points because we must stand up for the Constitution and this body.

I hope that today we stand up for our Constitution. We must oppose, I believe, the resolution that gives carte blanche authorization to continue the war in Libya after the fact.

□ 1000

And I want to thank again our ranking member for allowing for this debate, and the chairman of the Rules Committee and Mr. KUCINICH and everyone for at least encouraging this debate to move forward. I guess we could say today better late than never, but I certainly wish we had adhered to our constitutional responsibility before the military engagement began.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge a ''no'' vote on the rule and remind us the last time we had such a weighty debate, we devoted 26 hours to it, and 263 Members, more than half the House of Representatives, spoke.

I agree with what has just been said by Ms. LEE: this is much too late. It comes at a very strange time, and it really says today that this is pretty much a political move, which I regret, because this is probably, as she pointed out, and those of us who've been here before having to vote for it, voting to go to war is the most solemn experience that we face here.

So let me urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with my colleagues who say it's much too late. It is much too late. I wish we'd had that opportunity to have this conversation before hostilities began.

I am new to this body, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps my colleagues knew hostilities were getting ready to begin. I did not. I heard about it on CNN. There was no consultation with Congress before those hostilities began. That was the right time to have this debate. That time has passed.

And for those who say delay, delay, delay, I'll tell you, it's already too late. We cannot delay any further.

And I'm very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the Rules Committee has made these two resolutions available because you have two very clear choices today, Mr. Speaker.

As you know, on the Senate side there's the Kerry-McCain resolution. And this resolution that we have from Mr. HASTINGS today largely mirrors that resolution. If you believe that what's going on in Libya is in the best interest of the United States, if you believe we have a national security interest in Libya, if you believe that the Congress should make clear that we are behind the President and what's going on in Libya, you have that choice today in the resolution offered by Mr. HASTINGS.

If you believe that this is just another example of a war that's going to escalate, and you're concerned about that escalation, and you want to put yourself on the record as saying no, no more, no more, you have your chance to do that today with the Rooney resolution. No more.

I hold here in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a copy of Constitution of the United States of America, again, ratified this week in 1788. Article I, section 8: the Congress shall have the power to declare war. Article I, section 9: no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

Mr. Speaker, it's easy to say that foreign policy is the dominion of the President of the United States, and it is. But the purse is the dominion of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I want to hearken back again to what the chairman of the Rules Committee said on the floor earlier: this should be a time of celebration. And, Mr. Speaker, when we have troops in harm's way, it should be something that we are unified behind and believe in as a Nation, that we are ready to prosecute a war effort to the fullest extent and bring our men and women home victorious.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is not a topic of unanimity. This is not a topic that we have found any sort of agreement on whatsoever in this body. In fact, this is a topic that we have been focused on and focused on and focused on, trying to bring to conclusion in this House. And this rule today, Mr. Speaker, gives us that opportunity.

Now, I want to make clear there's a further step that we could go. We could go one step further that says no funds shall be used, period. And when we return to this body, Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues, Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. AMASH, are going to make that amendment available to us, and I will be voting ''yes'' when that amendment comes down the pike.

But for today, we have an opportunity to take a step in that direction. We have an opportunity to make our voices heard. Are you with it, or are you against it? Do you support what's going on in Libya, or do you believe we're headed in the wrong direction as a Nation?

You have that opportunity today; but only, Mr. Speaker, if you vote ''yes'' for this rule to make these two measures in order. I urge a strong ''yes'' vote.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe we do need proper congressional authorization for the military operations we are conducting in Libya, and we need a clear definition of the mission and our objectives.

I would very much like to vote for such a measure, but that is not the legislation before us today. Neither bill meets this test.

Instead, we have been presented with two unsatisfactory options: an unfortunate choice between a cut-off of all funds for the Libya operation, or support for a broad authorization for the use of force—except for the deployment of ground forces—that lasts for one year.

Moreover, under the rules established by the Republican leadership, no amendments are permitted to either measure.

So these are up-and-down votes on a very critical issue involving the ongoing engagement of our military forces against Libya—on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

Neither of these measures has my support today.

I have never viewed Libya as being in the vital national security interests of the United States. That in itself is a flashing warning sign and a presumption against military involvement in Libya. This is true notwithstanding the enormous hopes that rose with the democratic uprising that erupted this spring—and the anger and outrage we feel as those expressions for freedom and an end to Qaddafi's tyranny and corruption have been met with the most brutal repression.

In March, Qaddafi blatantly threatened to exterminate tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of his people. Key NATO allies, particularly Britain and France, viewed this crisis as vital to their national security interests, and urged us to join a military campaign that would prevent a humanitarian catastrophe.

In pursuit of this goal, President Obama commenced U.S. participation in NATO military activities in March.

At the outset of the Libya operation in March, I was afraid that we would in fact end up where we are today: a conflict that has lasted for months, not weeks, as the President indicated would be the case, and with a highly inconclusive situation on the ground.

This operation has carried significant internal tensions from the very beginning. The purpose of the military campaign was to protect the Libyan people from Qaddafi, but not explicitly to oust him. Nevertheless, the scope and scale of military activities, in the face of the stalemate between Qaddafi and the opposition forces, suggests that the conflict cannot be resolved until Qaddafi is removed.

Second, while President Obama has consulted extensively with Congress, he has not sought authorization for U.S. military involvement pursuant to the War Powers Act. I disagree strongly with his determination that the military campaign we are supporting and prosecuting does not constitute ''hostilities'' within the meaning of the War Powers Resolution. Active support for military operations that involve extensive bombing of Libya plainly constitutes ''hostilities.''

It is therefore regrettable that, in addressing this complex and difficult situation, we are presented with two unsatisfactory choices. As I previously stated earlier this month when we took votes on Libya, a sharp cut-off of funds, as provided today in H.R. 2778, is the wrong thing to do. If this became law, we would run out on our NATO allies. Qaddafi would be freer to resume murdering his own people with impunity. And other tyrants in the region, such as Assad in Syria, would be emboldened in their determination to crush democratic movements in their countries.

But providing continued support for up to one year of the current military campaign is also unacceptable to me, even though it includes the very important limitation on the deployment of U.S. ground forces—a limitation I strongly support. Should the current stalemate in Libya continue indefinitely, such a commitment invites more and more aggressive use of force in order to resolve it. This carries the significant risk that we will find ourselves, months from now, more deeply embedded in Libya and not any closer to a successful outcome and conclusion.

While Libya is not in our vital national security interests, standing with our NATO allies very much is. Accordingly, I would support a limited authorization for continuing support for

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
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
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
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, 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

NOT VOTING—24

Bachus
Berg
Bishop (UT)
Butterfield
Cantor
Cardoza
Denham
Engel
Fattah
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
LaTourette
Napolitano
Paul
Pelosi
Rangel
Ryan (OH)
Simpson
Stivers
Towns
Watt
Whitfield
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 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 yeses. 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 Nations 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 trops. 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 gentlewoman 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 Kosova.

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 mission, 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 nonbinding, 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 continue the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, 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 noes 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, noes 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
Inslee
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
Olver
Owens
Pascrell
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
Benishek
Biggert
Bilbray
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
Foxx
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
Huizenga (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
Loebsack
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
Rokita
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)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
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. LUETKEMEYER 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

with speakers from the administration who would give certain updates on various matters to which I would ask: Are you here to ask authorization for ongoing activity in Libya? And the speakers, the witnesses, would say, ''No.''

After 90 days and the President has not ceased activity or hostilities in Libya, the time has come and gone and we've sent our indication over to the administration time and time again that we disapprove. But because the War Powers resolution, by some either Republican or Democrat or in the House or the Senate, is questionable whether or not they consider it constitutional or not, the President has operated in what we now know is called the zone of twilight as to whether or not he even needs our approval.

So what are we left with? Mr. Speaker, we're left with, today, our ability under the power of the purse to restrict funds from ongoing operations in Libya. Without it and without the Supreme Court weighing in on whether or not the War Powers is unconstitutional, in my opinion, the President is breaking the law, but he is being restricted by nobody and being able to continue unfettered.

Some have said that the War Powers resolution isn't worth the paper that it is written on. To that I say: Based on what Supreme Court decision? Based on what precedent? There is none, because the courts haven't weighed in on it. I know some of our colleagues here have a pending case before the Court, and I wish them well, but what if they don't accept the case? What if they say these Members, as they have said before, don't have standing? Then we're right back to square one.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to send a message to the executive branch, and this transcends party but it exerts our power under the separation of powers, to say we, the House of Representatives, are relevant; we, the House of Representatives, are exercising our ability that the Founding Fathers gave us in the ability to declare war because they wanted us to have this deliberation, this debate that we're having here today, arguments that have been made on both sides that have been very good, because the last thing that we want as Americans is for some President, whether it's this President or some future President, to be able to pick fights around the world without any debate from another branch of government.

It's the most difficult thing we have to do as government officials, and that's send our kids into harm's way. So it has to be a sober, deliberative, long debate, and the President has 60 days and chose not to engage in that debate. So here we are today saying, if you choose not to come here and get authorization, we are going to stop it until you do. The President always has the ability in the future to come and try to get authorization for what he's doing in Libya or anywhere else.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill to withdraw funding from future engagement in Libya.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The bottom line with this resolution—and I think the gentleman made a lot of very fair points. I certainly think that the White House could have handled it better in terms of communicating with Congress. But what this resolution would do that he has presented would be to end our mission in Libya. So all of the debates and arguments that you heard from the previous discussion apply to this just as well.

It has some limited options in terms of what the President could continue to do in support of NATO, but it very specifically disallows any effort at air support, any effort at suppressing opposition fire. It does allow for aerial refueling. It allows for rescue missions, but what the military has made clear is they will not do that without all of the other assets that are necessary to suppress enemy fire. We are not going to send up our aerial refueling apparatus or aerial refueling planes if we know we can't protect them from being shot down.

So the effect of this resolution is to, again, end the mission in Libya, and people have different opinions about where they should come down on that. I don't believe that we should end the mission in Libya. I do believe that Congress' voice should be heard on this issue, and that is why I supported the resolution that would have authorized that. So I don't think that we should stop what we're doing in Libya, and getting back to the previous debate, there have been some comments that have been made that I want to be sure and correct.

I think we have a much better idea of who the forces in Libya fighting against Muammar Qadhafi are than has been said, and we know this because they control roughly half the country right now. What our mission was able to do, it stopped Muammar Qadhafi from being able to crush the folks who are rising up against him and retake the territory that they have. So in Benghazi and in most of I think it's eastern Libya, it is controlled by these opposition forces, and by all accounts, they are running a very sensible government. It is not an Islamic state. It does not have al Qaeda influence. It has a bunch of people who are simply trying to exercise free expression that they have been denied for nearly 40 years by Muammar Qadhafi. We have a very good idea who these people are. They are precisely the type of people that the United States of America should be supporting.

And as I mentioned before, in our great struggle against al Qaeda, one of the centerpieces of it is ideological. The ideology that bin Laden and many others advance is very anti-Western, and their biggest argument is that the West has consistently supported governments that have repressed the Muslim people, that we have not been good for them, and there are at least one or two instances when that argument actually has some facts to back it up. And now we are presented with the chance to support a legitimate group of people who want basically what we have—democracy. They want the ability to vote for their representatives. They want a voice in their government, and we are going to pull the rug out from under them.

And keep in mind, this is a very limited mission. It is NATO-led, but we are offering critical support to make it possible, and if we vote for the Rooney resolution, we will pull all of that away and right at the moment—in fact, there was a newspaper story this morning about how Qadhafi is talking about leaving Tripoli because the pressure is getting too great on him. We have had continual members of the Libyan Government abandoning Qadhafi. He is ready to fall, and those voices of Libyan people who want the very freedoms that we all say we want for them are ready to rise, and we are going to reverse that by pulling out this minimal level of support that we are offering.

That is the effect of the Rooney resolution, and therefore I oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time and I commend him for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill and in defense of the Constitution. The Founding Fathers clearly intended for Congress to have the power to commit this Nation into armed conflict.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have the power to declare war. Our first Commander in Chief, George Washington, knew that when he said, ''The Constitution vests the power of declaring war in Congress; therefore, no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have deliberated upon the subject and authorized such a measure.''

That is exactly what this bill is about, and President Obama, when he was a Senator, knew this when he said that, ''The President does not have power under the Constitution to authorize a military attack in a situation that does not involve stopping an actual or imminent threat to the Nation.''

He went on further to say that, ''No law can give Congress a backbone if it refuses to stand up as the co-equal branch the Constitution made it.''

I couldn't agree more with him, but, unfortunately, as President, Mr. Obama appears to no longer agree with his prior interpretation of the Constitution, and in reviewing the War Powers Act, we can argue that it is unconstitutional, but that is for the Supreme Court to decide.

In applying the War Powers Act to the facts here in this case, it is clear that the President failed to comply with the requirements to get congressional approval; and when we examine the merits of the case for involvement in Libya, this administration has wholly failed to define a clear national interest, mission, or goal.

□ 1230

Why are we there? Are we there to kill Qadhafi or to provide humanitarian aid? And since when does humanitarian aid come from a missile launched from a Predator drone? And who are these rebels that we are supporting? The administration has failed to provide Congress with a clear answer to this question, but we do know that some of them are tied to terrorist organizations.

The bill introduced by my good friend from Florida (Mr. ROONEY) reasserts Congress' role as a coequal branch of government, and it sends a clear message to the President that he must get congressional approval before he commits this Nation to war, as he stated when he was in the United States Senate.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) for his leadership and for characterizing where we are today as a conflicted and, if you will, highly uncertain posture.

I'm looking at the vote count, and it looks as if 225 Republicans voted against a time certain to get out of Libya. If you read the bill H.R. 2278—and I am looking at it over and over again—there really is no print as to a time certain. There is a nebulous statement about limiting funds for such things as search and rescue, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, aerial funding, and operational planning. That can go on ad infinitum. We can take the American people's money forever and ever and continue in this effort.

I don't like where we are today. Constitutionally, it is true, it is Congress' right to declare war. And the War Powers resolution—which my good friends on the other side of the aisle are now debating on its constitutionality, and of course they've used it in the past—does indicate that it was done in order to track the Constitution and allow congressional consultation. There was a letter sent by the President. There has been a report sent. But there's no doubt that this was not handled right.

But in the Iraq war, an unnecessary war, no Arab League States asked us to join with them. There was no defined threat to the United States in the Iraq war, as we've said. We left the Afghanistan war to dillydally in Iraq and lose 4,000 soldiers. So where is the hypocrisy here?

Right now, the Arab League has asked us to join them. Right now, our NATO allies are engaged in trying to get rid of an oppressive abuser and a person who has killed his own people. Where is the dignity on this place? It's nothing but politics. And I respect my colleagues who want to make choices about which direction they want to go. But I will tell you, I would much rather vote for something that is time certain, ending in 1 year or before. And if there is not a definitive end, then I will offer a privileged resolution to get out of Libya.

But I don't want to abandon my friends in the Arab States who are now struggling for democracy. Why is Syria different? Why is Yemen different? Why is Bahrain different? You are absolutely right. Because other forces are engaged in Syria, Yemen, and Bahrain. And the Arab States are attempting to negotiate.

So I am not interested in willy-nilly going into all kinds of wars. I'm not interested in going to Syria or Yemen or Bahrain. But I am interested in being consistent.

We now have an operation, and we can tell that there is movement by those who are rebels. And I would like my friends to document for me, if they have got a documented presence of al Qaeda, then they can tell us that. But right now, we have an obligation, and we can't play politics. And this bill is nothing but politics because it does not end when we're supposed to get out. It does it ad infinitum.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. It is a continuous, unending obligation to be in Libya. I would much rather have a definitive act which is to say that we have no more than a year. And I would offer to the White House that we would like reports sooner than that, and some of us may wish to go forward with another resolution to move us out.

But I will not be supporting politics today. I have to support those who are fighting for justice in Libya.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to today to express my disappointment with the Administration's decision not to consult with the Congress over the important and critical actions taken in Libya. Our government operates based upon a constitutionally protected system of checks and balances. It does not matter whether or not the Administration is Democrat or Republican. What is important is ensuring the role of Congress when determinations are made to engage in military actions in foreign countries. The War Powers Resolution was intended to ensure that any action taken by an Administration which utilizes military forces would require the involvement of this body.

As the Ranking Member of the House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Senior Member of the House Judiciary Committee, I believe in supporting the Constitution of the United States. The issue before us raises the debate on how to apply the War Powers Resolution. As this resolution has not been declared unconstitutional it is important to follow our laws as written. This is a reminder to the American people that we must firmly hold true to our constitutional duties. We have the power to ensure the Executive does not overstep its bounds. As Members of Congress, we can exercise our power through appropriation, the appointment process, exercising oversight over the Executive, enactment legislation, or even establishing a select Committee to probe any abuse of power by the Administration.

The War Power resolution is an integral part of our process. The actions that have taken place in Libya raise the debate on how the War Power Resolution should be applied.

Presidents, Members of Congress, scholars and lawyers have long argued about which branch of government has the power to decide whether the nation goes to war, and meaningful discussions between the branches has not always taken place. In 1973, The War Powers resolution was passed over the veto of President Nixon, in order to provide procedures for Congress and the President to participate in decisions to send U.S. Armed Forces into hostilities.

Such force is constitutional under the Necessary and Proper Clause which specifically provided that ''Congress shall have the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution, not only its own powers but also all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States. . . .'' The policy behind this power, entrusted to the President as Commander in Chief, to deploy U.S. armed forces to defend itself is ''exercised only pursuant to: (1) a declaration of war; (2) specific statutory authorization; or (3) a national emergency created by attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces.'' Pursuant to this authority, the President ''in every possible instance'' shall consult with Congress before deploying U.S. Armed Forces, and to continue consultations as long as the armed forces remain in hostile situations.

As we consider this Joint Resolution, we must also consider facts surrounding the state of violence and unrest in Libya, and the consequences of both action and inaction on behalf of the Libyan people. I value the importance of a fair, just, and balanced approach. We must always act in compliance with our nation's constitution.

Prior to this conflict, since assuming power, Colonel Qaddafi has ignored the needs of the Libyan people; choosing instead to train other oppressive leaders in intelligence and weaponry. Qaddafi had given money to dictators such as Robert Mugabe and Charles Taylor, and intervened in foreign wars instead of investing in education and infrastructure for the betterment of his own people.

Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International have consistently reported the lack of free press and free speech in Libya. The State controls the media and speaking out against Qaddafi or his government is not only illegal, it is also deadly. Qaddafi and his army executed activists who opposed the government and broadcasted their deaths on television.

Qaddafi was particularly intolerant of women and other minorities. He established ''social rehabilitation'' centers, where women who were designated financially or morally vulnerable were detained indefinitely. Homosexuality

was deemed criminal, and punished with up to five years in jail.

Now, the people of Libya have given their lives in their fight for democracy. This current conflict in Libya began four months ago, when Colonel Qadahfi failed to do what was right for his country and its people. Violence erupted as many Libyan citizens felt the painful consequences of a government resistant to change. Civil liberties were infringed upon, human rights were violated, and worst of all, many Libyan lives were lost. These atrocities were not committed under the command of some far away leader or as a consequence of a conflict with a foreign nation. No, these unforgivable acts were authorized by the hand of the Libyan leader himself.

I applaud efforts to come to the aid of the Libyan people. I condemn Colonel Qadahfi's despicable and inhuman actions, and support the President in our national policy—and the World's policy—of removing this tyrant from power. The widespread suffering in Libya was initiated and continues to be encouraged by the very man charged with protecting the Libyan people. The Libyan people are in desperate need of outside assistance; the question is no longer whether or not Libya is in a critical condition. I call on my fellow Members of Congress to continue to condemn the violence taking place in Libya.

We should not forget that the people of Libya are continuing to fight for democracy and there has been a significant loss of life. Colonel Muammar Qadahfi has continued to refuse to acknowledge the will of the Libyan people and the reality of the dilemmas that Libya faced. When faced with the shadow of oppression, the suppression of liberties, and the constant threat of brutality, history has shown that humanity will always rise up in protest, and if necessary, in armed resistance.

Rather than act as a true leader and acknowledge the interests of Libyan citizens, Qadahfi chose to remain steadfast to the status quo—to disregard the context of an intolerable situation in favor of blindly following what has always been done just for tradition's sake and lust for power. The reality of the situation is this: it was Qadahfi's refusal to contemplate the circumstances in Libya that has led to the unnecessary loss of innocent lives. Let us not make the same error as we continue to deliberate the role of the U.S. and the decision of our President to act on behalf of innocent people. Colonel Qadahfi has proved himself to be, by the standards of any free nation, an illegitimate leader of the Libyan people. He has utilized snipers, helicopters gunships, mercenaries and gangs of hired thugs to harm his own people throughout the course of the protests. Rebels taking to the streets demanding free elections were injured and killed.

No leader should remain in power after committing the indiscriminate slaughter of thousands of their own citizens; no leader should remain in power after ordering soldiers to fire upon crowds of defenseless, peaceful protesters; no leader should remain in power after executing hundreds of soldiers who bravely refused to carry out orders to shoot their fellow citizens in cold blood.

My message to Qadahfi is clear: stop the slaughter, stop the killing, and stop murdering your own people. I demand you step down from power! I implore you to consider and value the lives of your people. Stop the violence. I call for a unified voice from NATO, the United Nations, the African Union, and other world groups to stop the slaughter and violence against the people of Libya.

As a Member of this body, I am calling on my colleagues to join me in calling attention to the plight of the people of Libya and their fight for freedom, justice, and deliverance from Colonel Qaddafi.

For over four months, NATO-led air strikes in Libya have inflicted serious damage upon the Qaddafi regime's war machine, yet loyalist forces continue to demonstrate cohesiveness and operational superiority over besieged rebel forces. Still, some analysts suggest the stalemate is now yielding to a war of attrition favoring the rebels. Rebel combat skills have improved, as has their arsenal, which now reportedly includes vehicle-mounted antiaircraft guns, recoilless rifles, and mortars.

As rebels consolidate recent gains, NATO has proven to be the equalizing force. The African Union continues to press for a peace deal that was accepted by Qaddafi but rejected by the opposition because it would leave Qaddafi in power. With the support of the United States, United Nations, and NATO we must continue to push for the support of the African Union resolution. Turkey also has proposed a roadmap to establish an immediate and verifiable ceasefire, secure humanitarian aid corridors, and advance a political process for a transition. However, Turkey has not yet provided an implementation strategy other than making it clear that Qaddafi must go.

After the President of South Africa, Jacob Zuma, engaged in peace talks with Qadahfi most of the world believed the bloodshed would end. Today, it is clear that Qadahfi is going to continue to fight to stay in power.

We cannot stand by and watch as the people of Libya suffer. We need and must provide humanitarian aid. Americans have always come to aid of their neighbors in times of crisis.

We must continue to remember the context upon which we are currently operating in the world today. The Middle East is finally awaking to democracy and freedom. Advancing these objectives also advances our nation's security. The evidence is clear of an Arab Spring. The evidence is compelling all we need to do is look at Egypt, Byrahn, Yemen, Syria, and Libya to watch the effects of voices that are calling for democracy.

The Founders distributed the decision to go to war between the two political branches to assure that the decision would be made carefully. The founding generation experienced the hardship of several wars and they knew war's human and financial costs. They understood that a strong executive who is already given the title ''Commander in Chief,'' might flex the country's military strength injudiciously. Giving Congress the essential power to declare war allows heads to cool, alternatives to be considered, and makes certain there is consensus if the country is called to fight.

I continue to support the premise that Congress has the right to declare war, and our current debate must reflect this imperative. Congress has a right to assert its authority; however, the situation in Libya gives me great pause.

H.J. RES 68, ''Authorizing the limited use of the United States Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya,''

Authorizes the President to continue the limited use of U.S. Armed Forces in Libya in support of U.S. security policy interests as part of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) mission to enforce U.N. Security Council Resolution 1973, as requested by the Transitional National Council, the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), and the Arab League.

This bill will terminate such authorization one year after the date of enactment of this joint resolution. Further, H.J. Res. 68 states that consistent with the policy and statements of the President, Congress does not support deploying, establishing, or maintaining the presence of units and members of U.S. Armed Forces on the ground in Libya unless the purpose of the presence is limited to the immediate personal defense of U.S. government officials (including diplomatic representatives) or to rescuing members of NATO forces from imminent danger. It requires the President to consult frequently with Congress regarding U.S. efforts in Libya, including by providing regular briefings and reports. Includes as elements in such briefings and reports:

(1) an updated description of U.S. national security interests and policy objectives in Libya;

(2) an updated list of U.S. Armed Forces activities in Libya;

(3) an updated assessment of the opposition groups in Libya, including potential successor governments; and

(4) an updated explanation of the President's legal and constitutional rationale for conducting military operations in Libya consistent with the War Powers Resolution.

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,'' this bill prevents the use of funds to pay for United States participation in any aspect of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) effort except intelligence, surveillance, search-and-rescue and other ''non-hostile'' support activities. I am for peace and not war, however I am not for politics of the Republicans that vote against Democratic Presidents but for Republican Presidents. This war is an effort for humanitarian assistance in Libya. The Libyan people were being attacked and were dying by their own leader.

Although, I am again disappointed by the continuing actions of the Administration that are taking place without the consultation of Congress. This should not cause us to ignore the plight of the Libyan people. We must continue to insist on providing the technical assistance and weapons necessary to defeat this regime. I will vote against H.R. 2278 because it is a political game and does not have a time certain to leave Libya.

The resolution cuts off funds just to embarrass President Obama. I want peace to come to Libya in the right way. Efforts to support action by the African Union, European Union, NATO and other U.S. allies only advance our call for democracy that is now being heard and is spreading throughout the Middle East. This can be done while complying with the War Powers Resolution, that is why I will support H.J. Res. 68 for now which sets a time of before one (1) year this war should end. I want the conflict to end sooner, I therefore reserve the right to offer a resolution on the floor to end this war.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I would beg to depart from the remarks of the distinguished gentlelady from Texas because there are those of us who oppose this bill in principle, and we believe we are fighting for justice as well.

I want to state that if you believe the war should end, then at least believe we should limit it today. That's what Mr. ROONEY does. I oppose this war. It's unconstitutional. It's in violation of statute. And there's a two-step way to end the war: Vote for Rooney, step one, and then the Kucinich-Amash amendment, which defunds the DOD bill. You can do that when we come back.

But to claim that the Arab League is somehow asking for us to continue this attack on Libya is plain false. The fact of the matter is we have al Jazeera reporting that Italy's foreign minister and the outgoing head of the Arab League have each called for a halt to hostilities in Libya. It was reported that 2 days ago, Amr Moussa, the outgoing head of the Arab League, said now is the time to do whatever we can to reach a political solution, and that has to start with a genuine cease-fire under international supervision. So you don't have the Arab League's head here saying, Oh, America, come on. Go for it. Prosecute the war. Bomb Libya. No, they're not saying that at all. We have to be very clear about that.

Even China, who's eating our lunch financially, they're not involved in this war. They're saying there ought to be a political solution, that from the Chinese minister 2 days ago. We've got to be careful about our intentions here. And our intention should be to end this war, and we can do it with Mr. ROONEY's bill.

The bill isn't perfect. It doesn't end the war in its entirety immediately, but it does make clear that the United States will not take over the war as European support continues to diminish.

The Kucinich-Amash amendment is complementary to the bill. We want to end U.S. involvement in the war in Libya. We can do it in two steps. Vote ''yes'' for Mr. ROONEY's bill, which ends direct hostilities immediately, and support Kucinich-Amash when it comes up in 2 weeks.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member SMITH for yielding me the time.

I rise in support of this bill as well as the prior resolution, as it's better late than never. Here again, with Libya, Congress follows in the wake of a major executive branch military action absent congressional authorization.

I sent a letter to President Obama on March 22 regarding what was then called Operation Odyssey Dawn and have never gotten an answer. When one looks at the duration of U.S. military engagements in the Middle East, north Africa, and central Asia and what the future might bring, these are the longest wars and military actions in U.S. history.

Our Nation has fallen into deep debt directly connected to our expenditures of over $1 trillion in the past decade on wars that have not been paid for. Moreover, creeping defense commitments in that region and globally now consume over half of the U.S. discretionary budget annually. It is an astounding predicament 20 years after the end of the Cold War, as jobless Americans question whether our Federal Government even sees their plight.

We all know freedom is not free, but it is largely the American people that are bearing this military burden more and more each year. What is most striking is that other nations in the region in which we are fighting are simply not carrying anywhere near their fair share of the load of boots on the ground, nor have they measured up either in terms of putting their treasuries at risk. Unless an alliance of nations in that region fight for freedom themselves, they won't own it, and we can't transfuse it.

Sadly, compared to the moral justification for World War II, which historians termed ''America's most just foreign war,'' our Nation in the current period has drawn into resource wars in farflung places that history is likely to judge as morally indefensible.

The world is full of bad dictators, but it always seems the dictators America is most interested in are those that sit atop huge oil reserves. Libya has the world's ninth largest oil reserves and exports 1.5 million barrels a day.

I will be placing several articles in the RECORD that document Western Europe's dependence, as well as Canada's reliance, on Libya's oil investments and the Libyan President's threats to nationalize those investments, which even has affected China.

The West's utter and growing reliance on imported petroleum has twisted our foreign policy and crippled our domestic economy time and again.

□ 1240

As we import half of what we consume, until Americans clearly see our predicament, our Nation will keep repeating these same mistakes.

Let us be clear on the nature of the Libyan economy: 95 percent of its exports are oil; 80 percent of its government revenue derives from oil sales. Oil represents 25 percent of Libya's GDP and its most important industry. And Libya is Africa's third largest oil producer.

The major powers involved in this military operation have vast pecuniary interests at stake through the multinational oil corporations that operate in Libya, whether it is Italy, from which operations are being staged, and which gets 22 percent of its oil from Libyan operations through firms like Eni and Repsol, or Canada, whose NATO General is leading operations, while Canada's second largest corporation, Suncor Energy, has major oil operations in Libya.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentlelady an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. An article I am submitting for the RECORD reports that ''Seif al-Island Qadhafi, the son of Colonel Qadhafi, warned that in the event of a civil war, Libya's oil wealth would be burned.''

One can see why the global powers took note. In fact, China lifted 55,000 of its oil workers out of Libya.

History will judge whether these resource wars and selective dictator deposals are justifiable. But the answer for America is to invest here at home and to restore America's energy independence and to extricate ourselves from all these foreign oil involvements.

MARCH 22, 2011.

President BARACK OBAMA,
The White House, Pennsylvania Ave, NW, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT OBAMA: According to information available from public sources, the United States participated, and perhaps has led, military operations against the government of Libya. Press reports indicate U.S. military engagement began at 16:53 GMT March 19, 2011 bombing commenced on targets including surface to air systems and other air defense infrastructure.

It appears four days of U.S. air and naval strikes inside Libya have destroyed strategic communications facilities, the military intelligence headquarters, and air defense systems. It is unclear how many lives, civilian and military, have been lost, or saved, in these Libyan operations.

Please provide a detailed description of the coalition of forces involved in these operations in which the U. S. has participated, its command and decision-making structure, and from the planning stage to execution.

Further, under which accounts of the U.S. Departments of Defense and State are these operations being funded? What level of funding does the United States expect to use in the operations in Libya?

Thank you for your reply.

Sincerely,

MARCY KAPTUR,
Member of Congress.

CIA WORLD FACT BOOK—LIBYA

WWW.CIA.GOV (ACCESSED JUNE 24, 2011)

Economy—overview:

The Libyan economy depends primarily upon revenues from the oil sector, which contribute about 95% of export earnings, 25% of GDP, and 80% of government revenue. The weakness in world hydrocarbon prices in 2009 reduced Libyan government tax income and constrained economic growth. Substantial revenues from the energy sector coupled with a small population give Libya one of the highest per capita GDPs in Africa, but little of this income flows down to the lower orders of society. Libyan officials in the past five years have made progress on economic reforms as part of a broader campaign to reintegrate the country into the international fold. This effort picked up steam after UN sanctions were lifted in September 2003 and as Libya announced in December 2003 that it would abandon programs to build weapons of

mass destruction. The process of lifting US unilateral sanctions began in the spring of 2004; all sanctions were removed by June 2006, helping Libya attract greater foreign direct investment, especially in the energy sector. Libyan oil and gas licensing rounds continue to draw high international interest; the National Oil Corporation (NOC) set a goal of nearly doubling oil production to 3 million bbl/day by 2012. In November 2009, the NOC announced that that target may slip to as late as 2017. Libya faces a long road ahead in liberalizing the socialist-oriented economy, but initial steps—including applying for WTO membership, reducing some subsidies, and announcing plans for privatization—are laying the groundwork for a transition to a more market-based economy. The non-oil manufacturing and construction sectors, which account for more than 20% of GDP, have expanded from processing mostly agricultural products to include the production of petrochemicals, iron, steel, and aluminum. Climatic conditions and poor soils severely limit agricultural output, and Libya imports about 75% of its food. Libya's primary agricultural water source remains the Great Manmade River Project, but significant resources are being invested in desalinization research to meet growing water demands.

PROVEN RESERVES OF THE MAJOR OIL-PRODUCING COUNTRIES, AS OF END 2002

Major producer (in rank order)	Proven reserves (billion barrels)	Percentage of world total
1. Saudi Arabia	261.8	25.0
2. Iraq	112.5	10.7
3. United Arab Emirates	97.8	9.3
4. Kuwait	96.5	9.1
5. Iran	89.7	8.6
6. Venezuela	77.8	7.4
7. Russian Federation and Caspian Sea states	77.1	7.4
8. United States	30.4	2.9
9. Libya	29.5	2.8
10. Nigeria	24.0	2.3
11. China	18.3	1.7
12. North Sea (Norway, U.K. Denmark)	16.3	1.6
13. Qatar	15.2	1.5
14. Mexico	12.6	1.2
All others	90.2	8.6
World total	1047.7	100.0

Source: BP, BP Statistical Review of World Energy (London: BP, June 2003), p. 4.

SUNCOR RESPONSE, MARCH 3, 2011

SUNCOR'S OPERATIONS IN LIBYA—BRIEF BACKGROUNDER

Update: French translation added at 3:08 p.m. EST on March 3, 2011

Suncor's Libyan assets were acquired in the company's 2009 merger with Petro-Canada which, in turn, assumed interests in Libya through the acquisition of the German energy company, Veba Oil, in 2002. In 2007 and 2008, these interests were converted to ''Exploration and Production Sharing Agreements'' (or EPSAs).

Operations under the EPSAs include exploration in the Sirte basin operated by Suncor and the redevelopment of other existing Libyan oilfields, operated by a joint venture company in which Suncor is a partner. To date, Suncor has invested approximately $1.4 billion in its Libyan operations, including an initial US$500 million, representing 50% of the agreed price to buy into assets and development plans under the EPSAs.

Suncor's working interest share of production from Libyan operations was 34,700 barrels per day in 2010, representing less than 6% of Suncor's total production and approximately 2% of Libya's national oil production.

BRÈVE DESCRIPTION DES ACTIVITES DE SUNCOR EN LIBYE

Suncor a acquis ses actifs en Libye lors de la fusion avec Petro-Canada en 2009, qui à son tour, avait obtenu des participations en Libye en faisant l'acquisition de la société énergétique allemande Veba Oil en 2002. En 2007 et 2008, ces participations ont été converties en <<contrats d'exploration et de partage de la production>> (ou CEPP).

Les activités convenues en vertu des CEPP comprennent l'exploration du bassin Syrte exploité par Suncor et la remise en valeur d'autres champs pétrolifères existants en Libye, exploités par une coentreprise dans laquelle Suncor est partenaire. À ce jour, Suncor a investi environ 1,4 milliard $ dans ses activités en Libye, incluant une somme initiale de 500 millions $ US qui représente 50% du prix convenu d'investissement dans les actifs et les plans de développement en vertu des CEPP.

La quote-part de la participation directe de Suncor dans les activités en Libye était de 34 700 barils par jour en 2010, ce qui représente moins de 6% de la production totale de Suncor et environ 2% de la production pétrolière nationale en Libye.

[From IBNLive, Mar. 21, 2011]

LIBYA SAYS MAY GIVE OIL DEALS TO CHINA, INDIA

TRIPOLI.—Libya is considering offering oil block contracts directly to China, India and other nations it sees as friends in its month-long conflict with rebels, Libya's top oil official said on Saturday.

Oil companies have pulled out staff and shut operations in the country, formerly Africa's third-largest producer, due to the uprising against Muammar Gaddafi's rule, leading to a sharp reduction in output.

National Oil Corporation Chairman Shukri Ghanem, speaking about future projects, said Libya was considering awarding contracts directly to new partners instead of using its more traditional open bidding process.

''We will be looking at giving direct block contracts to countries ready to come and work in the country, because we want to increase production,'' he said.

He said Libya would look into the possibility of working closer with partners such as India, China, Brazil and others in the future but gave no details.

Ghanem said, however, that the government would honour all existing contracts with Western firms and called on foreign workers to return to help restore output.

''It's not our intention to violate any of these agreements,'' he told reporters in Tripoli.

''Of course, as you know, production has declined drastically because of the dramatic events,'' he added.

He said crude production had fallen to less than 400,000 barrels per day from 1.6 million before the crisis. He warned that oil exports might halt altogether if output is not restored.

''We will be able to restore most fields but we need the foreign workforce to come back . . . We call on them to send back their workers,'' he said.

Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi has taken a tougher stance on Western oil companies. He said earlier this month that Germany was the only Western power that had a chance of doing business with Libyan oil in the future.

[Feb. 24, 2011]

CHINA'S OIL PROJECTS, WORKERS, UNDER ATTACK IN LIBYA

China rushed to evacuate thousands of workers from Libya on Thursday, after CNPC and other Chinese firms were attacked in the wave of unrest sweeping the country.

Officials say 30,000 Chinese are in the country and the scramble to evacuate them—in what may be the country's largest overseas evacuation ever—is posing a new foreign policy dilemma for China, which has for decades supported the Gaddafi regime.

CNPC, China's largest oil and gas producer, said on Thursday that its facilities had been attacked and that CNPC employees were being evacuated back to Beijing. The statement is the first confirmation of attacks on oil companies, after oil majors such as Eni of Italy and Repsol YPF shut down their Libyan operations earlier this week.

The violence in Libya poses a new test for China's foreign policy in the region, which has centred around the concept of non-interference. That policy has become increasingly difficult to maintain as China's commercial engagement with Africa deepens and Chinese workers decamp by the thousands to build infrastructure projects on the continent.

Ma Zhaoxu, Foreign Ministry spokesman, acknowledged that some Chinese companies in Libya ''had their local camp sites raided by gangsters and some people got hurt.''

One Chinese railway worker painted a vivid picture of those attacks in his microblog posts on Chinese website Sina. Raiders set fire to equipment and cars and injured Chinese workers in an attack on his work camp on Monday, said the blogger known as ''Happy Xufeng,'' posting pictures of the inferno as well as desperate calls for help.

''We are in great danger,'' he wrote on Monday night, describing a group of more than 500 Chinese workers who lacked basic supplies. ''Chinese companies in Libya are in a state of emergency, our projects are being raided and communications are down.'' By Wednesday the blogger, whose internet records indicated he was an employee of China Railway 11th Bureau, reported that he and his colleagues were being evacuated to safety.

In an unusual statement on Tuesday, China's President Hu Jintao ordered government workers to ''spare no efforts to ensure the safety of life and properties of Chinese citizens in Libya.'' China has dispatched charter flights, COSCO transport ships and Chinese fishing boats to travel toward Libya. Hired buses will also stand ready to enter Libya to help with the evacuation if necessary, the foreign ministry said.

There have already been signs of resentment in Libya at China's growing economic clout in the region. At the end of 2009, Libyan Foreign Minister Musa Kusa said in an interview: ''When we look at the reality on the ground we find that there is something akin to a Chinese invasion of the African continent. This is something that brings to mind the effects that colonialism had on the African continent.''

The forced evacuation of such a large group of overseas Chinese has exposed one of the new vulnerabilities of China's foreign policy as its interests expand rapidly around the globe.

There are now tens of thousands of Chinese migrants working in potentially volatile places such as Sudan, Congo, Burma and Pakistan. Chinese diplomats worry that high-profile cases of kidnapping or violence towards Chinese workers overseas could provoke nationalist reactions at home and push the government, which prides itself on a policy of non-intervention, to become much more involved in the domestic political affairs of crisis-ridden countries.

To the intense discomfort of Beijing, a defiant Colonel Muammer Gadaffi has used the example of China's violent crackdown on protesters in Tiananmen Square in 1989 to

justify his own use of military force against domestic opponents. ''The unity of China was more important than those people on Tiananmen Square,'' he said earlier this week.

The evacuations of oil companies have caused Libya's oil output to fall by half, sending oil prices higher amid global fears that unrest in the Middle East will lead to shortages.

News of the attack on CNPC will heighten concerns among oil industry executives that the turmoil in Libya may lead to widespread sabotage of oil facilities and that it would take many months or even years to return the country to full production capacity, even if a semblance of peace returns.

In a speech earlier this week, Seif al-Islam Gaddafi, the son of Col Gaddafi, warned that in the event of a civil war, Libya's oil wealth would be ''burned''.

Oil experts in Beijing have said that unrest across the Middle East is likely to prompt Chinese authorities to accelerate oil purchases in an effort to fill reserves, a move that would put further pressure on global supplies of crude.

''Recent events made them very nervous and they believe the oil price may be on an upward trend, so better to buy sooner rather than later,'' said K F Yan, director of IHS Cera in Bejing. ''With or without events in the Middle East, China needs to refill the tanks after depleting supplies at the end of 2010.''

China's trade with Libya centres mainly on oil, but the $6.6bn in bilateral trade also includes companies in a wide range of other businesses, thanks in part to China never having imposed sanctions on the Gaddafi regime. Chinese rail companies have signed lucrative railway contracts with Libya, agreeing in 2008 to build a rail line between Tripoli and Sirte for $1.7bn, according to reports.

CHINA'S OTHER PROBLEM WITH PROTESTS ABROAD

Talk of a ''Jasmine Revolution'' online and a subsequent stepping up of censorship by Beijing authorities this week has helped thrust the Internet—microblogging in particular—to the center of the conversation around how China's government manages problems at home. But as the upheaval in Libya grows increasingly violent, microblogs are also serving to highlight a challenge China faces abroad: The presence of tens of thousands of Chinese nationals, many of them workers for state-owned enterprises, living in potential conflict zones in Africa and elsewhere.

On Tuesday morning Beijing time, a person claiming to be one of those expatriates, an employee of a Chinese company in Libya, took to Sina Weibo, China's most active microblogging service, to send out a plea for help.

''Urgent situation Libya has lost control, the army has moved suppress demonstrators, countless numbers of dead and wounded,'' read the hastily punctuated Chinese-language message, posted on an account with the name Happy Xu Feng. ''Communication is completely cut off. Right now it's middle of the night I used a satellite to leave a message, calling on the government to send a plane to rescue us. Urgent''

It's not clear how the user was posting to Sina Weibo despite communications being down, but several hours later, the user posted another message saying a number of the company's compounds had been trashed. That was followed by photos of a construction vehicle and a building in flames along with another urgent call for help:

''The UK, France and South Korea are preparing to send over planes. How come there's still no movement from our government? A lot of Chinese brothers are embroiled in fights with gangsters.''

It's not clear which company Happy Xu Feng is working for and is almost impossible to confirm details of the attack described in the posts. State media reported that ''armed gangsters'' looted a Chinese-operated construction site in the eastern city of Agedabia, forcing nearly a thousand Chinese workers to abandon their living quarters. However, that attack reportedly took place on Sunday, a day before the attacks described by Happy Xu Feng.

The messages were forwarded thousands of times and attracted hundreds of comments urging the government to move quickly.

Xinhua reported Tuesday night that China's State Council had set up a ''special headquarters'' to coordinate efforts to evacuate Chinese nationals from Libya. The headquarters had decided to dispatch chartered airplanes, as well as fishing boats and cargo ships, the report said, adding that Chinese president Hu Jintao and premier Wen Jiabao had jointly ordered ''all-out efforts to ensure life and property safety of Chinese nationals in Libya.'' News of Messrs. Hu and Wen's orders, including the ''all-out'' modifier, was repeated multiple times on CCTV's main news broadcast Tuesday night, a sign of the sensitivity surrounding the effort.

Indeed, for Chinese leaders confronting the protests in Libya, Egypt and elsewhere, public criticism over their ability to protect Chinese citizens abroad is arguably as big a concern as the possibility the unrest will somehow spread to China. While regular Chinese people seem to have little interest in emulating protestors in North Africa (whether because censorship has kept them in the dark or because they're just not that keen on revolution), they are interested in having a government strong and competent enough to look after them when they're overseas.

Beijing came under considerable public pressure over its handling of the killing of Hong Kong tourists who had been taken hostage in Manila last August. More recently, leaders faced criticism for sending too few planes to evacuate Chinese citizens from Cairo after protests erupted there in late January. With Libya, too, the pressure is on.

''I just called the number 86–10–6596114 listed on the website of Ministry of Foreign affairs and a woman answered, sounding as if she's just woken up,'' one user wrote in a comment on Happy Xu Feng's Sina Weibo feed. ''As soon as the word 'Libya' left my mouth, she said 'the leaders have all gone home, we'll deal with it tomorrow.'"

Wrote another: ''Government, the time has come to test whether you rule for the people.''

That test is not likely to be easy. According to state media, there are more than 30,000 Chinese living in Libya.

CHINA IN AFRICA: THE REAL STORY

[Feb. 22, 2011]

(By The Associated Press)

NEW YORK.—Europe gets over 85 percent of Libya's crude exports. The rest goes to Asia, Australia and the U.S. Here's a breakdown of how much oil various countries import from Libya (in barrels per day) and the percentage of a country's total crude imports supplied by Libya.

—Italy: 376,000 (22 percent)
—France: 205,000 (16 percent)
—China: 150,000 (3 percent)
—Germany: 144,000 (8 percent)
—Spain: 136,000 (12 percent)
—United Kingdom: 95,000 (9 percent)
—Greece: 63,000 (15 percent)
—United States: 51,000 (0.5 percent)
—Austria: 31,000 (21 percent)
—Netherlands: 31,000 (2 percent)
—Portugal: 27,000 (11 percent)
—Switzerland: 17,000 (19 percent)
—Ireland: 14,000 (23 percent)
—Australia: 11,000 (2 percent)

(Source: International Energy Agency 2010 statistics)

[From YvesEngler.com, Mar. 29, 2011]

WHY CANADA ATTACKED LIBYA

(By Yves Engler)

Would Stephen Harper attack Libya simply to justify spending tens of billions of dollars on F–35 fighter jets? Perhaps. But, add on doing it for major Canadian investors, reinforcing his ''principled'' foreign policy rhetoric and reasserting western control over a region in flux, and you pretty much have the range of reasons why a half dozen CF–18s, four other military aircraft and naval frigate are currently engaged in combat 10,000 km away from Canadian soil.

Over the past few months the Conservative's plan to buy 65 F–35 Joint Strike Fighter jets has become a serious political headache. A recent poll showed 68 per cent of Canadians—including a majority of Conservative supporters—agreed that ''now is not a good time'' to spend between $16 and $29 billion on these controversial single-engine jets. So, sending Canadian military aircraft to enforce a UN ''no-fly zone'' in Libya provides an opportunity to soften opposition to the F–35 purchase, an issue bound to be a hot topic in the election campaign that formally began Saturday. Most critics of the F–35 purchase—from the NDP's Michael Byers to Project Ploughshares Ernie Regehr to Liberal foreign affairs critic Bob Rae—support the ''humanitarian'' mission in Libya. With these and other liberal interventionists supporting a bombing campaign in North Africa, Harper can more easily justify spending nearly $1,000 per Canadian on the best fighter jets money can buy. (Québec housing group, FRAPRU, claims the cost of a single F–35 equals 6,400 social housing units.)

Conveniently, the right-wing press has already begun to connect the dots in support of the Harper government. An Ottawa Citizen headline read, ''Libya shows why Canada needs jets,'' while a Sun Media chain commentary explained, ''enforcing a 'no-fly' zone to shut down a dictator is an expeditionary air operation. Is that something Canadians want to be able to do in the future? If yes, you need an F–35, expensive or not.''

Over the past five years, the Conservatives have further militarized Canadian foreign policy. Military spending is at its highest level since World War II—the Harper government expanded Canada's role in the occupation of Afghanistan, claimed that Russia is planning to attack and sent 2,000 troops to police Haitians after a devastating earthquake.

The Conservatives draw significant support from the military as well as its associated companies and culture. To get us in the fighting spirit, for instance, the Canadian Forces released onboard video footage of a CF–18 destroying a ground target in Libya.

But there is more to it than pleasing the Great White North's version of the military-industrial complex. On March 21, The Financial Times reported that western oil companies were worried that if Gaddafi defeated the rebels in the east of Libya he would nationalize their operations out of anger at the west's duplicity. Presumably, this includes Suncor, Canada's second largest corporation, which signed a multi-billion dollar 30-year oil concession with Libya in 2008.

Home to the second largest amount of Canadian investment in Africa, instability in Libya has put a couple billion dollars worth of this country's corporate investment in

jeopardy. Dru Oja Jay, editor of the Dominion and a candidate for the Mountain Equipment Co-op Board of Directors, notes ''Canadian investors are legitimately worried about what's going to happen to the $1 billion signing bonus Suncor paid out to the Libyan government, or whether SNC-Lavalin is going to recoup its investments in the country, which is home to 10 per cent of its workforce.'' And these are some of this country's most powerful corporations. Embassymagazine includes both Suncor and SNC-Lavalin's CEOs among the nine most influential business executives in determining Canadian foreign policy.

Would a victorious Gaddafi have moved against Canadian companies? Even if he didn't, with all the bad press SNC and Suncor have received could they continue in Libya without regime change? Finally, will the rebels dependence on the west lead to better contract terms?

Unlike Egypt or Tunisia, the Conservatives denounced Gaddafi's repression at the beginning of the Libyan uprising. This is partly because Gaddafi has never been on great terms with much of the West, even if there have been warmer relations in recent years. Also, the Conservatives were widely derided for supporting Egypt's Hosni Mubarak and (to a lesser extent) Ben-Ali in Tunisia to the bitter end. So Libya gave Harper an opportunity to re-affirm his ''principled'' foreign policy rhetoric.

Beyond wanting to appear on the side of human rights and democracy, another element motivating the military intervention in Libya is the desire to influence the revolutions in bordering states Tunisia and Egypt, which are still in flux. Controlling Libya gives the West another point of leverage over developments in those countries. Bombing Libya tells democratic forces in the region that the west is prepared to use force to assert itself (as does tacit support for the Saudi military intervention in Bahrain).

Recent developments in Libya are a reminder that if you give the western decision-makers an interventionist inch they take an imperial mile. In principle trying to stop Gaddafi from massacring people in eastern Libya is a good thing. But, the ''no-fly zone'' immediately became a license to bomb Libyan tanks, Gaddafi's compound and other targets in coordination with rebel attacks. On March 22, Foreign Affairs Minister Lawrence Cannon claimed the UN resolution allowed for ''boots on the ground.''

Beyond the inevitable death and destruction in Libya, the security council resolution further undermines state sovereignty, which provides the weakest states with some protection from the most powerful. This is the main reason why many Latin American and African countries have opposed the intervention.

Finally, let's put the current moral outrage in perspective. A little over two years ago Israel launched a 22-day onslaught against Gaza that left some 1,400 people, mostly civilians, dead. There, the power imbalance between the two sides was much greater and the aggrieved population had been under the boot of the attacking force for as long as Gaddafi has ruled. Yet there was no talk of imposing a no-fly zone over Gaza. In fact, the Harper government cheered Israel on.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mr. ROONEY. I appreciate the time, and also your advancing this resolution.

The President has not made the case for committing our military to the conflict in Libya. The President claims that these military actions do not constitute hostilities. However, the American people know otherwise.

The President is engaged in military action against Libya and the Qadhafi regime without congressional approval. In addition to ignoring Congress, many believe that the President has exceeded the scope of the U.N. Security Council resolution imposing an embargo, a no-fly zone, and authorizing civil protection of the Libyan people.

The President has told us who we're against: Qadhafi. But he cannot tell us who we are for. Secretary Gates has indicated that we know little about the opposition or rebels. We do not know their geopolitical view towards their neighbors or us. We do not know their commitment to domestic diversity. Are we going to have atrocities?

We do not know their ideology, or their preferred form of government, or if they have a commitment to nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction, an issue that is incredibly important in the area of Libya.

The President has used the United Nations' approval of civil protection to wage an all-out war on Qadhafi, without congressional approval or American support.

U.S. Admiral Locklear, in charge of the NATO operations against Libya, recently stated that ground troops would be needed to provide stability in Libya once the Qadhafi regime falls. And yet the President has not provided us any information about what a post-Qadhafi Libya will look like or what will be our involvement. He is committing us to an extended military action; and for Congress to be relevant, the voices of this body need to be heard.

I support the passage of Mr. ROONEY's resolution limiting the use of funds appropriated in the DOD in support of U.S. activities in Libya unless otherwise authorized by law. This passage of this resolution is an important step to limit the role of the U.S. military.

I urge passage of H.R. 2278.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, if this resolution passes, and we weaken NATO's mission, Qadhafi may very well prevail. His forces will then kill, rape, and torture all those Libyans who opposed him, as he has already tried to do. Qadhafi has reportedly kidnapped thousands of people, including young students to serve as human shields and march at the vanguard of his forces. If any of his own soldiers refuse to gun down unarmed innocent civilians, they're shot immediately.

Once he's done with his own people, he'll turn his attention to those NATO and Middle Eastern nations that attacked him and seek revenge. Remember, this is a man who is already responsible for the deaths of 189 innocent passengers on Pan Am 103.

Let's face it. This is not about whether the Obama administration has been thorough enough in explaining the Libya rationale to Congress. Members understand why the President intervened. We can read. We can think; we can decide.

The real question is, will we politicize this effort in the same way that the Republican Congress politicized President Clinton's successful intervention in a NATO-led mission in Bosnia 15 years ago? The limited action we're taking to support the NATO mission in Libya does not rise to a level of conflict meant to be governed by the War Powers resolution. Presidents of both parties have initiated similar actions in Grenada, Panama, Somali, Bosnia, Haiti, Kosova.

What this really is about, the transcendent purpose of this mission is to seize an opportunity to show the world, particularly the young majority of the Arab and Muslim world who are thirsting for economic and political freedoms, that we are on their side. We have the opportunity to show the Arab world and every nation on Earth who we are as a people. It shouldn't matter who's in the White House. We should be united in the cause of democracy. We should debate; but when the debate is over, politics should take a back seat to policy.

The legacy of America is that we will fight tyranny and defend innocent people as best and as forcefully as we can, in good economic times and bad.

This debate should come to an end. We know exactly what's at stake. If Qadhafi is allowed to violently suppress the uprising in Libya, it will mean many more years of despotic rule. Isolated by his repulsive acts of repression and buoyed by oil wealth, he'd have nothing to lose by aiding violent subversive groups in neighboring countries, including those with vulnerable fledgling democracies like Tunisia and Egypt. That would not only be a defeat for democracy in the region; it would be a death blow for NATO, the most important military alliance the world has yet achieved.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MORAN. Imagine if, just 2 weeks after Secretary Gates excoriated some of our NATO allies for skimping on their commitments to the global security infrastructure that is a key to our economic system and the open societies that safeguard our prosperity and our way of life, imagine if now we turned our backs on NATO. What a global embarrassment.

Now is the time to stand together against a murderous dictator to give democracy an opportunity in a part of the world that has not experienced it, a part of the world which is vital to America's security.

That's why I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Mr. ROONEY's resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it's a sad irony that at the same time that we're committing our sons and daughters to an armed conflict in Libya in support of democracy and the rule of law, that we are also here at home trampling on the fundamental principles of separation of powers and the plain language of the United States Constitution, which is the supreme rule of law in our land.

I've heard several times now an argument that is about politics. Well, in fairness, politics is to Congress like wet is to water. We cannot avoid that.

But this issue is really one of substance, and the United States Constitution clearly states that the President's power as Commander in Chief to introduce Armed Forces into hostilities may be exercised only pursuant to three circumstances: first, a declaration of war; secondly, a specific statutory authorization; and, number three, a national emergency created by an attack on the United States or its territories. And none of those circumstances is in evidence here today.

So despite my great admiration and respect for our President, a lawful premise for this Libyan operation does not exist.

I've also heard the argument that we have to join with our international neighbors, that we can't desert them. Well, as a matter of fact, I've been to Iraq now 14 times. I've been to Afghanistan 10 times. When we first went into Afghanistan, when I first went over there after hostilities started, it used to be 50 percent United States and 50 percent the rest of the world. Now when I go, it's about 75 percent the U.S. and 25 percent the rest of the world. So they have migrated out of Afghanistan. At the same time, they're asking us to pick up the load in Libya.

□ 1250

Also on my trips, I don't meet any of our kids on their first tour of duty anymore. When I meet our kids, they're on their third, fourth, fifth tour of duty. We're stretched very thin. Our military families are stretched very thin. I think we should allow our international neighbors to pick up this load.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Rooney amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. 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 could materially harm our relationship with NATO allies from whom we will undoubtedly require support in the future. It would also undermine the worldwide effort to protect the people of Libya.

Now in this amendment, there are exceptions: search and rescue; intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; aerial refueling; and operational planning. I asked the majority if they would put in suppression, because you can't conduct these other missions without suppression, and if we don't have the ability to suppress enemy air defenses, the allies will not be able to continue the bombing campaign. So all of these things that the gentleman says he wants to do and have exceptions for will be undermined by not having suppression.

Today's F–18 Growlers go in on these missions and they suppress the enemy radars so that the bombing can continue. So I think this is fatally flawed because of the lack of suppression, and I feel that we now have to vote against this because of that fact. I tried to offer this as an amendment, but I was told that they weren't interested.

I just hope you understand that you are undermining this mission and you are undermining NATO. This deserves to be defeated.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York, Colonel GIBSON.

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me time to speak today.

I've been opposed to this operation in Libya from the very start. In terms of national security priorities, we should be focusing on rapidly and successfully completing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, reorganizing the national security establishment to more effectively wage counterterrorism operations against al Qaeda, and resetting the DOD to defend our cherished way of life in a manner consistent for a Republic, not an Empire. Going forward, we need to learn from these experiences and exercise more discipline; not getting involved in operations like Libya where vital national security interests are not present.

We should cease our involvement in Libya immediately. I'm supporting this resolution to cut off funds for combat operations. I view this as a good start, but I want to be clear: I will not be satisfied until all funds are cut off for this operation, no exceptions.

Then we need to revise the War Powers Act to ensure we never again end up with a President taking this country to war without proper authorization. We need to rediscover the Founders' intent on this critical issue, and I've introduced legislation, the War Powers Reform Act, to make it so. The War Powers Reform Act clarifies when the President may deploy forces into hostilities or imminent threat of hostilities: one, declaration of war; two, specific statutory authorization; or three, a national emergency created by an attack on the United States or an imminent threat of an attack on our country. If none of these circumstances are met, the President must first come to Congress to obtain authorization before deploying forces. The key change in the War Powers Reform Act is that without prior authorization, the President may not obligate or expend funds to deploy troops into combat.

Congress must act to restore constitutional balance and the voice of the American people. We need to reform the War Powers Act. I urge my colleagues to support both this bill and Mr. ROONEY's resolution on Libya that we are voting on today.

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

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

America is a beacon of light around the world. At a time when many were cowering in their house wondering if this genocide that Qadhafi was bringing to their doorstep would come tomorrow or the next day, American fighters came in and pressed Qadhafi's forces back and pushed him back into Tripoli.

America has stood for the side of freedom in this Arab Spring. America has stood for people that don't have a voice for themselves. Don't let a dispute between the legislative branch and the executive branch result in us pulling the rug out from standing up for freedom. America has a responsibility to finish this through, to stand with our allies.

To leave now means Qadhafi wins, period. I urge a ''no'' vote on this resolution.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this resolution. It's well-intentioned, without question. It's meant to limit our involvement in Libya, it's meant to support our allies, and it's meant to rein in a President who in my opinion is conducting an illegal and certainly unauthorized war.

It does both too little and too much. It does too little, frankly, because even after it's passed, the President will continue essentially to be able to operate as he's been operating for several weeks. And it does too much because it gets us into a situation where we effectively micromanage the military by literally listing what missions they should take.

The resolution neither holds the President accountable nor ends our involvement in Libya, and it essentially leaves things exactly where they are. Congress should reassert its constitutional authority, Mr. Speaker, by either authorizing the use of military force or ending it. This resolution avoids either course. It postpones a decision. In doing so, in my view, it erodes the constitutional war-making

authority of Congress and enhances an executive branch that is already overreaching. We will appear to do something and we will actually do nothing.

For that reason, I reluctantly urge the rejection of the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, when the President of the United States went to the United Nations Security Council to urge intervention in the Libyan civil war, he frankly missed a stop. He should have come here first, and this Congress should have debated the wisdom or lack thereof of that effort. Knowing what I know about this, had that debate taken place here, I would be one who would have voted against authorizing the use of force here because I do not believe we have a vital national security interest in the Libyan civil war.

I am going to oppose this resolution, however, because I think that two constitutional wrongs do not make a right. Again, I believe the President should have come here and sought the authorization of this Congress before he initiated these hostilities, and they are hostilities. But when we have people at risk, when we have lives on the line, I think this resolution raises a practical and a constitutional problem. The practical problem, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) alluded to a few minutes ago, and I can think of another variation. If a NATO ally is sending people into Libya on an intelligence-gathering function and asks us to provide air cover for that function, is that an intelligence operation or isn't it? I don't know, there's a good argument on either side, but it's an adjudication that I don't think a U.S. commander in the field ought to have to make. I think it's a practical confusion that does not serve us well when people are at risk.

Then, secondly, just as the President has the obligation, I believe, to seek approval of this body and the other one before he initiates hostilities, he also has the responsibility to conduct those affairs once they begin. Our role is to oversee and fund or not fund such activities, but it is not to interfere with them. I think this is an impractical interference; so I'm going to vote ''no.''

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington has 12 minutes remaining.

□ 1300

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill defunds Libya unless authorized specifically by law. If it passes, long before it's passed by the Senate, the President will come to us and ask for authorization, and I, for one, would want to grant limited, conditional authorization.

Now we just rejected an authorization provision that was, in effect, all authority and no limitation—at least that's certainly how it would be interpreted by the White House legal counsel given how it was drafted. The House should consider real binding limits and conditions because democracy and rule of law for the people of Libya is important, but democracy and rule of law for the people of the United States is more important.

There are those who regret that they cannot offer an amendment to this bill—yes, they can. The motion to recommit will be in order just as soon as we end debate.

I know that we've had important resolutions from the Arab League, the U.N., and NATO. Those are not substitutes for Congress. The War Powers Act is the law of the land, and if we don't stand up for it now, when will we? And if this President won't obey it, what President will?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and also a member of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, what we have here are two essential arguments; one is more of an intramural argument between Congress and the White House, but it is a misplaced argument because there is no President that has come to this Congress for a declaration of war since World War II—and granted, we've been in seven or eight major conflicts. So this is much greater than this conflict between the White House and this Congress.

Unfortunately, I believe that this measure is just an attempt to, rather in a strong way, get the attention of the President. It may be to chastise the President a bit. I think if you look at the RECORD there were communications here, but there is a larger profound message here. It's not a message that this is to send to the President. This is a bad-timed piece of legislation because it sends the wrong message to the world.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, we are the leaders of the free world. America is a great country, and our standing is at stake. And this move, this bill will pull the rug out from under NATO at precisely the time when we need to be sending a strong message of encouragement. The United States is in a support role here. So it is very important that we defeat this amendment and make sure that we send the right message to our allies, that we will not pull the rug out from under them.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to send a message to our allies. And I don't think we are pulling the rug out from under them. Look at these wealthy, populous nations of Western Europe. I believe it is a good thing to get rid of Qadhafi, but does America have to do everything? People say we're the indispensable nation. That's a terrible burden to impose on ourselves; we can't afford it, and it cannot be done effectively. Let's get people who can dispense with us.

My friend, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, says, look, we have to do this because NATO can bomb but they can't suppress. What a great bunch of allies—they can bomb unarmed people, but if they shoot back, they got to come running to us.

Yes, I want to send a message to NATO. Qadhafi is a bad guy. If England and France and Italy and Germany and Spain and the Netherlands and Scandinavia can't together muster the military force for this weakened, poor nation, then let's re-examine the value of these allies.

In ''The King and I,'' he says, If the allies are weak, am I not best alone? Yes, I want to tell our allies that it's time for once for them to step up. This is not to protect Qadhafi; it's to say that America can no longer be asked to be the one that does everything, everywhere, every time. Our allies have to step up.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rarely speak on the House floor, and almost never have I ever come to the floor two times in one day to speak on this one issue. But this is my fourth trip to the floor today on this issue because I consider it so important and so serious.

If I could rename this bill, I would call it ''a bill to authorize the use of force in Libya.'' That is what we're doing. We should not kid ourselves—we are authorizing the use of force. We are endorsing the Obama war in Libya.

Some see this as weakening our presence over there, but there is no doubt, if you read it carefully, we are expanding and giving authority because of the exceptions. The exceptions include search and re-search, intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, refueling, planning—contract labor probably can still go in, the CIA is in there already, special forces. And paying for it: How can you do all that without paying for it? So we are there.

This will be the first time the President will have received any information from the Congress that it's okay to pursue what we're doing. We're supposed to be sending the message that we're in charge of when we go to war and when we pay for this war. We're not just supposed to lie over and capitulate to what the President wants—as we have been for too many years.

So there is no doubt that I think the proper vote here, the proper constitutional vote, the proper vote for the best

of our national interests, the best vote for peace is to vote this resolution down just as we voted the previous resolution down. We should prohibit the use of funds.

A lot of us complain on this House floor because of the way the President went to war—he didn't come here, he went to NATO. But this supports NATO. One of the arguments in favor of this bill is we have the exceptions, so we don't want to break ties and our allegiance to NATO. Well, that's what we're supposed to be doing, we're supposed to be reclaiming the sovereignty and the responsibilities here in the House. We are not supposed to roll over for NATO and the United Nations. We're supposed to stand up for this country.

We are not supposed to go into war under these conditions. And under those circumstances, I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on this resolution.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

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

Somebody said a while ago we ought to be supporting the Arab Spring because there are movements toward democracy over there. We went into Libya to help in a humanitarian effort and get rid of Muammar Qadhafi, but who are we supporting? Nobody at the White House has come down here and said we're supporting this group of people. We don't know if it's the Muslim Brotherhood, we don't know if it's al Qaeda—now we do know there are al Qaeda operatives that came from Afghanistan fighting with the rebels in Libya; are we supporting al Qaeda? Are we supporting the Muslim Brotherhood?

The Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt has opened up the border—or the Government of Egypt, whatever that is right now—has opened up the border between Egypt and Gaza, which provides a mechanism for weapons to get into Gaza to fire on Israel.

So before we start supporting a rebel movement and going after somebody like Qadhafi, we ought to find out who we're for. We're spending billions of dollars before this is over in a war where we don't even know who we're supporting, and it's in violation of the War Powers Act and the Constitution. This is something we should not be doing.

The President should have come down here and made his case. He should have said what our goals are. He should have said who we're supporting and why we're supporting them. We are in a war against terrorism. We may very well end up with terrorists controlling Libya and Egypt, and that is a tinderbox that we don't want. We get about 35 percent of our energy from that part of the world, and if all hell breaks loose because we've gone with the wrong guys, we've got a real problem in this country economically. And the President ought to be thinking about all that and making his case to the Congress in accordance with the Constitution and the War Powers Act before he does it.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill purports to cut off funding for combat in Libya. In doing so, it simply forbids what the Constitution already forbids—the waging of war without explicit congressional authorization. But then it specifically grants to the President what up until now he has completely lacked: congressional authority to engage in every conceivable belligerent act short of actually pulling the trigger.

□ 1310

Refueling bombers on their way to targets, identifying and selecting targets, guiding munitions to their targets, logistical support, operational planning—these are all acts of war in direct support of belligerents at war, and this bill authorizes them.

The House has just considered whether to authorize war with Libya. It has specifically, categorically, and decisively rejected it. The President is now on notice that he is in direct defiance of Congress. That is the message we need to send today. Let's not enter a war through the back door, when we have already decided not to enter it through the front.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Texas, Judge GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is true, Qadhafi is a bad guy. He needs to go. But the problem is for those who say will this mean the end of the Bush doctrine, well, I don't know that this President has really been enforcing the Bush doctrine. But the problem is, as my friend Mr. BURTON pointed out, we don't know who is going to replace Qadhafi.

It is not in our national interest to help what may be another Iran, with Khomeini and Ahmadinejad coming to power, and especially when we are releasing oil at a time when that oil should be saved in case it all goes to blazes in the Middle East and we don't have any coming from there.

Now, I am not crazy about the exceptions either—the search and rescue, intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance, aerial refueling and operational planning—because this administration is probably going to describe everything they do as falling into those exceptions. But it is a step in the right direction. And some have said, and I know their hearts and I know they mean well, we want to support our troops, and I don't like it when people say let's back out and let's cut funding when troops are in harm's way.

I have talked to enough troops who want somebody in Washington to say, this is insane, don't get us involved, because they are good soldiers; and when they get their orders, they are going to salute and they are going to go follow through on the orders.

We are the body that must step forward and say, Enough. Mr. President, we are not responsible to the Arab League, to NATO or to the U.N. We are responsible to the American people.

So though I don't like the exceptions, I will vote for this. It is taking a step in the right direction.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote ''no'' on this resolution.

We just voted on a resolution on whether or not to authorize in Libya, and this House overwhelmingly voted ''no,'' no to authorizing that. I have been opposed to this action in Libya. I have not been persuaded that the U.S. has a vital interest there. And by the way, we were not attacked by Qadhafi.

I spent 2 hours in a tent with Qadhafi in 2003. We were the first congressional delegation in over 38 years to be there. In fact, we were there because he was voluntarily giving up his nuclear arms. I will say that there probably are few dictators who are going to do that again after watching what is happening over there. He is a bloody dictator; but one of the things I learned, he hates al Qaeda.

I also think that this action vividly demonstrates the weakness of NATO, quite frankly. It is a great organization. We appreciate their partnerships, of course. They are our allies. But it is an antiquated organization. The United States is paying 75 percent of the cost of NATO, and NATO can't even take out a two-bit dictator like Qadhafi. Why? Because we have enabled our allies, providing their defense for them for decades. And instead of spending money on their defense, as they said, 2 percent of their GDP, they are spending their money on their social programs; they are spending their money on lower corporate tax rates, et cetera.

So I would say, yes, Qadhafi is a bloody dictator. He is a terrorist. He did not attack us. And by the way, let us remember who let the Lockerbie bomber out way early as well.

We need to get out of Libya, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding.

Let me say that I am disappointed that we have reached this point here today. Mr. Speaker, it didn't have to come to this.

Nearly 100 days ago, the President initiated a strike against Libya without consultation from the Congress and without prior explanation to the American people. Then, as now, we all supported the removal of the regime of Libya, a regime that was slaughtering

and is slaughtering its own people. Yet rather than seek regime change from the start, the President chose to follow, not lead, and pursued a strictly humanitarian mission under the banner of the United Nations, with no plan for Colonel Qadhafi's removal.

So at the outset, we asked some very straightforward questions for the President: Why isn't removing Qadhafi a part of this mission? What if he doesn't leave? Who are the rebels that we are there helping to fight? How long is this going to last and at what cost? And what does success look like? These were questions that the administration would not, or could not, answer.

Under our Constitution, the Commander in Chief has the authority to take actions necessary to protect our national security. This is an authority which I and this House respect, but it does not free the President from accountability to the American people, to this Congress, or to the rule of law.

Now, whatever your opinion of the War Powers resolution may be, the fact is it is the law of the land and simply cannot be ignored. So 3 weeks ago, this House overwhelmingly passed a bipartisan resolution asking the President to explain how this mission is consistent with our national security goals, to justify continuing this operation without authorization. He responded by telling us he didn't need Congress because there are no ''hostilities'' taking place in Libya. Well, we soon found out even his own lawyers don't buy that argument.

Now, if the Commander in Chief is going to take our forces into war, he must take ownership of it. And if the President believes that missile strikes and drone operations taking place in Libya are critical, it is his responsibility to explain to the American people and to seek authorization from this Congress. Because the President has failed to do that, because he has failed to fulfill his obligations, we are here today.

Now, make no mistake: I support the removal of the Libyan regime. I support the President's authority as Commander in Chief. But when the President chooses to challenge the powers of the Congress, I, as Speaker of this House, will defend the constitutional authority of the legislature.

This bill represents, I believe, a reasonable approach. By allowing our forces to continue playing a limited support role, it would not undermine our NATO partners. It would, however, prevent the President from carrying out any further hostilities without Congress' approval, and it would exercise Congress' constitutional power to provide some much-needed accountability.

I believe this is a responsible approach, and I believe this House should support it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the House has made some very legitimate points, but then his conclusion is so contrary to the points he made. The proposition before us today, Mr. MCCLINTOCK is right, it is an authorization of a series of acts of belligerence, acts of war, that by their own definition cannot possibly help us either achieve the humanitarian goal of this mission or achieve the goal, the true humanitarian goal of removing Qadhafi from power.

We are authorizing intelligence-sharing, aerial refueling, operational planning, intelligence-gathering; but we are denying the only aspects of this operation that can allow us to achieve that goal—the suppression of air defense systems and the utilization of drones with missiles to stop Qadhafi from resuming his effort to massacre his own people.

I understand the argument. You don't buy my notions of our national security interests. You don't see the context of bringing this operation to a halt in terms of what it does to the stability of the democracy movements in Egypt and Tunisia. You don't see any consequences in terms of Syria or the larger Middle East or the damage to alliance. I understand and accept that argument.

But Mr. ROONEY tries to have it both ways and in fact comes up with a proposal that ensures that the mission is allowed to continue, but by definition cannot achieve its goals.

□ 1320

It is the worst. It is not the reasonable proposal. It is the worst of all solutions. If you're going to authorize an operation through airpower and other methods, you don't exclude the only parts that can possibly achieve success. If you're against this operation, you stop the funding of the operation.

Mr. ROONEY and apparently a number of members of the majority want to have it both ways. We don't like Qadhafi so we want to do something. We don't want to do anything that could work, but we don't want to come out against the operation. But the fact is you're ending the operation if this were to become law, because our European friends have said very clearly that, Those parts of this operation that this amendment prohibits, those parts of the operation we cannot undertake if you are not doing it.

So why not be straightforward? Why not do what a number of colleagues on the other side have called for: stop funding the operation. Don't try to have it both ways, ensure the operation's defeat and end the operation, while pretending to still be interested in seeing Qadhafi go and the operation succeed.

I urge a ''no'' vote from anyone who cares about the consequences of what they vote on.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2278.

My colleague has set forth a responsible plan that would effectively limit the United States' role in Libya. This bill would allow U.S. forces to continue to conduct search and rescue missions, aerial refueling, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, and provide operational planning assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this is what NATO has told us would allow them to continue to carry out the mission. These are very critical functions. That is all that they have asked us to do as we move forward. And it helps the President be truthful in saying that we're not engaged in hostile actions.

This bill would clearly end funding for all other military missions in Libya. Of particular concern to many Members is the United States' continued engagement in strike and suppression of enemy air defense missions. The President has repeatedly stated that the U.S. is not engaged in hostilities and that congressional authorization is not necessary to continue our role in this operation.

I share with many of my colleagues the view that firing a missile at a target in a foreign nation does indeed constitute hostile action. This disagreement is at the root of the issue at hand. H.R. 2278 would put an end to that debate by explicitly defining the congressionally authorized scope of the U.S. military mission in Libya.

The administration has yet to present Congress and the American people with a clear strategic objective for our involvement in Libya. Furthermore, to date we have not been informed of a specific end goal under which the U.S. military operations would cease. This threatens the effectiveness of our mission and can soon create an unjustifiable strain on our military while they remain engaged in two other theaters of operation critical to our national security interest.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKEON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Thank you.

Wouldn't you feel better if we could add, as a fifth item in this list of things, suppression of enemy air defenses? The reason I say that is I think we're going to have a difficult time doing any of these other missions unless we have suppression.

I was just over there at Aviano and Sigonella, and we were told by the Navy that the allies do not have enough suppression to be able to continue to do these bombing missions without U.S. help. I think it would help if we could clarify that that is not somehow abandoned.

Mr. MCKEON. Reclaiming my time, my good friend from Washington, there

are a lot of things that would make me feel better. If we could go back and start this whole thing over, there are a lot of things that would make me feel better. But the President has said we're not engaged in hostilities. And I think we would agree that when we're firing missiles, when we are having missions with our fighter planes suppressing ground fire, I believe that would be—most of us agree that that is hostile.

The NATO people, we met with the military from Great Britain. They told us what we have in here would allow them to continue successfully their missions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. There are a number of arguments about this issue and arguments in favor of ending the mission in Libya. I think the Speaker articulated one, which is basically we support the idea of the removal of Qadhafi and they support the idea of supporting the people in Libya who are asking for a representative government. They just don't like our President's process. But that argument doesn't really make sense because if, in fact, their big complaint is that Congress hasn't had the opportunity to authorize this, then the Speaker of the House has had, by his own admission, a hundred days to offer that voice, to come up and say, No, we support the mission but here's how we want to limit it. They have not done that.

I agree very strongly with Mr. BERMAN's statements. You can't have it both ways. You can't say we would like to remove Qadhafi, we would like to support the Libyan people, but we're going to offer up resolutions that are going to stop that from happening. Now, we can argue back and forth about that process, but clearly the Speaker of the House had an option in front of him to deal with that process issue, and this isn't it.

As has been pointed out, this will stop what we are doing in Libya. If you support that—let me just say I support Mr. KUCINICH in the sense that he is very honest. He doesn't like what is going on there. He wants it stopped. That's a legitimate position. But to stand up and say, Yes, we have to support the Libyan people; yes, Qadhafi should go, we're just going to cut the legs out from under the effort that would actually do that because of a complicated process argument is not a legitimate point.

I also want to point out people are legitimately concerned about the U.S. being too militant in our approach, and I agree with that. We cannot be the policeman for the world. We should not always carry the load. But in this case it is a very, very limited mission that we have. For once, NATO is actually carrying the bulk of the mission.

While I agree with Mr. FRANK's comments from earlier that NATO needs to step up and do more, we finally have an instance when they are stepping up and doing more, and we want to pull the rug out from under them for the tiny little piece of help that we are giving that makes this mission possible. This is a limited role, and we must recognize that.

The Speaker also emphasized that we would like to have all the answers going in. We'd like to know what the mission to get rid of Qadhafi is exactly. Well, you don't always have all the answers, and this has evolved. Initially, our mission was clear: Stop Qadhafi from crushing the forces who are trying to rise up and have a voice in their own government. And we did that.

Incidentally, we do have some answers about who these rebels are. Do you want to know who they are? Look at Benghazi. What's going on in Benghazi, the place that is controlled by the people in opposition to Muammar Qadhafi? It is not the Muslim Brotherhood. It is not al Qaeda. It is the people of Libya wanting a representative government who are running that place. So let's stop acting conveniently like we don't know who these people are. We do have a very good idea who they are, and they are deserving of our support.

We have a clear, limited vision. If we vote for Rooney, we pull the rug out from under that mission. We put Qadhafi in a position to stay in power, and we undermine a group of people who are asking for a legitimate voice in their government. And keep in mind, again, this is a very limited use of U.S. power in a very positive way. Whatever the process arguments are that brought us to this point, don't let them have the United States look like we don't support people standing up for the very values that we continually espouse throughout the world.

I urge defeat of this resolution and support for what we are doing in Libya.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I inquire as to the time remaining on our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROONEY. I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. I have during my tenure here voted twice to empower our military to take action. The first time was with Afghanistan; and the President came to the Congress and made a powerful case that it was in our national security interest to do so. I supported that. Then it was with Iraq; and the President came to Congress. He spent a significant amount of time providing evidence and making a case that there was a national security interest.

This time, however, it was a surprise to me and to most of my colleagues that this mission was occurring. There has been no attempt to define what the national security interests are, the United States' interests in this military action. Without that, I can't look my constituents in the eyes and tell them why we are in Libya right now and active in military strikes against that nation state.

So the one constitutional power that Congress has explicitly is the purse strings. We are exercising that right. I support the effort to pull those strings tight. Let's stop the flow of money into this action.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank Mr. ROONEY and thank my colleagues. I think this has been a very important debate for this country and for our Constitution.

I am opposed to this war and I want to end it. I think Mr. ROONEY's bill is a powerful step in the direction of ending the war, but it's not the only step that we should take. It's the first step. The first step is a vote for Mr. ROONEY's. You limit the war, and you stop the combat ops. Then the second step would be to vote on a defense appropriations amendment that would strike all funding for the war. So we take two steps here—the first step today.

We have some of the best people in this Congress who have been in this debate today, and they don't agree with Mr. ROONEY's bill. What they've said is that this bill would end the mission in Libya; and they've said that, if you don't have the ability to suppress, you couldn't continue with the bombing campaign. These are people on our side of the aisle who want to defeat this bill. They've made the argument, I think, as to why we should pass it.

I want to thank Mr. ROONEY for his leadership, and I urge a vote in favor of Mr. ROONEY's bill.

Mr. ROONEY. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of arguments today, and we've had a great debate—a debate we really should have been having over the last hundred days or so, one that could have been spurred on by the administration for coming here and making the arguments as to why we should authorize or should not authorize money for hostilities in Libya. The President had the opportunity to come and make the case to this body, and he chose not to.

The War Powers Act is clear. He has violated that law. Some have said it's unconstitutional, but the courts have never weighed in on it, so it is the law of the land, and it's one we have to abide by. But we can send resolution after resolution to the Senate and say that we don't agree, that we don't authorize. In the end, the power that we have is the power of the purse, as Mr.

TERRY just said, and we have to exercise that power in this House and say that we aren't going to spend money for hostilities in Libya.

We heard the mission ''if you want to take out Qadhafi'' or ''if you want to free the Libyan people and give them the liberty they deserve.'' Number one, it was never the mission to begin with to take out Qadhafi. That has somehow morphed over time. We don't even know who the people are we're supposedly setting free.

Without that debate and without that argument—and I appreciate the debate we've had today because I think it has been very helpful, quite frankly—all we can do is say, until the President comes and makes that case and gets authorization, he won't get funds; and at the same time responsibly say to our NATO allies that we'll support you in the rear, but we are not engaging in hostile acts.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

I wish our action today were unnecessary. As I noted earlier this year when the President initiated military action in Libya, he would have been better served by putting this matter before this body in advance of taking action, not afterwards. And as I predicted then, the President has been subjected to almost daily second guessing, criticism, and frequently partisan attacks over this operation. All of this was avoidable.

None of us wish to abandon freedom-seeking Libyans or our NATO allies, and a vote for this resolution does not mean we are doing either. Our logistical and intelligence support to NATO will continue uninterrupted. Our capacity to conduct cover action to assist the Libyan rebels will remain unimpeded. And the ability of the international community to continue to provide humanitarian aid to the people of Libya will be unaffected.

I am voting for the Rooney bill for what it says, not for what some in the majority say it says. This should not be used as a club to attack President Obama. I will support this measure because it is absolutely imperative for the Congress, as an institution, to remind the President that the power to authorize military actions and war resides in this body. We strengthen our democracy by passing this resolution, we strengthen this institution by passing this resolution, and we honor our NATO obligations, and we stand by Libyans seeking self-determination, and that is why I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this resolution.

Mr GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I have strong constitutional concerns regarding H.R. 2278. When the Founding Fathers met at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, the differentiation between which branch of the federal government initiates war and which branch conducts it was one of the most seriously debated topics. After deep thought and consideration, the Founders decided to grant Congress the power to declare war and left to the President, as Commander-in-Chief, the authority to conduct wars. Today, the Congress is asked to vote on a measure that would reverse the constitutionally prescribed war powers by directing the President on how to conduct the military conflict in Libya.

While I have supported past efforts to defund the military conflict in Libya, I cannot vote in support of a bill that only defunds some of the military effort while endorsing others. The Congress should and must debate the merits of our foray into Libya and either authorize it completely or demand that the President terminate our military engagement. This is the only constitutionally sound course for Congress to take.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2278. 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 continue the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, 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. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, 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 bill.

The bill 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 bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 238, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 494]

AYES—180

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Barletta
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carney
Cassidy
Chabot
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Conyers
Cravaack
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
DesJarlais
Duffy
Emerson
Farenthold
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinchey
Holt
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kingston
Kline
Kucinich
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (GA)
Quigley
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Runyan
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stark
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Waters
Webster
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—238

Ackerman
Adams
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Canseco
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Eshoo
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Labrador
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Neal
Nugent
Olver
Owens
Pallone

Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richmond
Rivera
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (SC)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bachus
Berg
Butterfield
Camp
Engel
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Hurt
Napolitano
Ryan (OH)
Sewell
Stivers
Towns

□ 1400

Mr. CARTER, Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, DUNCAN of South Carolina, ROHRABACHER, DONNELLY of Indiana, ISSA, ROYCE, MARCHANT, BURGESS, DOLD, and NUGENT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 494. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on 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.

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 494 on H.R. 2278. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Stated against:

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I was meeting with constituents and unfortunately missed the last vote on H.R. 2278. Had I been here, I would have voted ''no.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 493 on final passage of H.J. Res. 68, authorizing the limited use of the United States Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in my family which required me to immediately return to Georgia. Had I been present, I would have vote ''no.''

On rollcall No. 494 on final passage of 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, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in my family which required me to immediately return to Georgia. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

REPORT ON H.R. 2354, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–118) on the bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEEHAN) laid before the House the following communication from the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 25, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14, United States Code, as Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I am required to designate three Members of the United States Coast Guard Academy Board of Visitors. I designate Representative Frank Guinta (New Hampshire), Representative Andy Harris (Maryland), and Representative Rick Larsen (Washington) to serve on the Board of Visitors.

Since its founding in 1876, the Coast Guard Academy, based in New London, Connecticut, has accomplished its mission of ''educating, training and developing leaders of character who are ethically, intellectually, professionally, and physically prepared to serve their country.'' The Board of Visitors meets annually with staff, faculty and cadets to review the Academy's programs, curricula, and facilities and to assess future needs. The Board of Visitors plays an important supervisory role in ensuring the continued success of the Academy and the tradition of excellence of the U.S. Coast Guard.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
Chairman.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4303, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University:

Mr. YODER, Kansas

Ms. WOOLSEY, California

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2702, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment of the following member on the part of the House to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress:

Mr. Jeffrey W. Thomas, Columbus, Ohio

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Clause 2(g) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Robert Reeves, Deputy Clerk, and Kirk Boyle, Legal Counsel, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 112th Congress or until modified by me.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the efforts by the National Labor Relations Board to modernize their rules to promote efficiency and fairness in the labor organization process.

The charge of the NLRB is to ensure that our workers get a fair shake; but for far too long, working men and women have had to deal with an outdated and lopsided system that puts the wants of big corporations over the needs of employees. At a time when our middle class is consistently under attack, these new proposed rules represent a positive step in restoring a more level playing field for workers.

Our workers deserve a fair system. Those who work to make our world turn deserve the opportunity to make a living for themselves and their families. I look forward to the NLRB adopting and implementing these new provisions to bring their rules into the 21st century and give our working families a fighting chance to strive and achieve the American Dream.

TAPPING THE STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President made a decision to raid 30 million barrels out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Now, of course one thing the President did yesterday in that decision was he acknowledged that supply has an impact on price, which is a reversal of his previous statement.

The problem is rather than actually opening up known reserves of American oil where we can go and create tens of thousands of American jobs and get rid of some of this dependency on some of these Middle Eastern countries, what the President said instead was he's just going to go and raid America's, in essence, our safety net.

This Strategic Petroleum Reserve is there for national emergencies. It's not there just because maybe the President feels it would be politically popular for a couple of days to do something. This doesn't even get us past 2 days' worth of America's supply.

We have known reserves that this President is shutting off all across this country. And we can actually reduce our dependence on Middle Eastern oil if we go out and create those jobs, create that American energy, rather than raiding our savings account for oil.

And so the President's decision was a failed policy that doubles down on his previous failed policy on energy that has gotten us to skyrocketing gas prices. And of course we're going to be back here again in just a couple of days when this short-term fix runs out.

Instead, we should put a real energy policy in place that reduces our dependence on foreign oil.

CONGRESSIONAL NEUROSCIENCE CAUCUS

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had the inaugural briefing of the Congressional Neurologic Science Caucus. The caucus seeks to involve and inform people on Capitol Hill about advances, opportunities, and challenges that face us with neuroscience.

I appreciate the leadership of my colleague, KATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, who is founding cochair of this effort and someone who cares deeply about neuroscience issues, achieved in part through some difficult personal experience. I admire her courage and appreciate her adding to this important agenda.

We're discovering so many areas related to the brain and so much about how the neurological system works, how it's damaged, how it recovers, how the brain responds to our environment, understanding interrelationships between traumatic brain injury, hydrocephalous, dementia, Alzheimer's. We stand to gain so much from this research.

Developments in neuroscience offer the greatest opportunity for the 26 percent of American adults who suffer from mental disorders to reduce and perhaps avoid dysfunction, disease to live better, healthier lives.

The tremendous toll on victims and their families, their employees, employers and friends, the Federal Government needs to be aggressively involved and engaged. We hope the Neuroscience Caucus can help do just that.

□ 1410

ROLL CALL OF THE NOBLE 36

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEEHAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was said:

''From this day to the ending of the world, we in it shall be remembered. We few, we happy few, we band of brothers; for he today that sheds his blood with me shall be my brother.''

Shakespeare penned this hundreds of years ago in Henry V. It represents the unfailing commitment a warrior has for his fellow warriors.

Since 2004, 36 men and women from the Second Congressional District area of Texas that I represent have served honorably for this country, the United States, and they gave their lives for the cause of freedom in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Their photographs are over here to my left. You notice, Mr. Speaker, they are of all races. They are men and they are women. They are from all branches of the service. They are enlisted personnel and they are officers in the United States military.

I would like to honor each of them today by name and rank and branch of service and a comment or two about each one of them. These are the sons of liberty, the daughters of democracy of America. They are our heroes.

As we approach July 4, the Fourth of July as we like to call it, where America celebrates its independence and we celebrate not only our independence but our freedom and our liberty, we wave the flag, we attend parades and all of those are good things about America. See, it's okay to be a patriot and it's okay to show our patriotism as a Nation. But as we approach July 4, that important day in our history, I believe it is equally important that we remember that our freedom and our liberty has always cost America and it's cost America its finest, its youth. These men and women, like patriots before them, gave up their youth so that we can have a future.

Patrick Henry, the great orator during the revolutionary times, said:

''The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, to the active, to the brave.''

We are fortunate those words still ring true today, Mr. Speaker, and American warriors overseas carry those values into battle. These are 36 of them, the Roll Call of the Noble 36. Each of them have connections to southeast Texas. I would like to mention each one of them, because they deserve our recognition, but we also need to always remember them and their families. Because, you see, when these young men and women went off to war, their families went to war, too, but their families stayed stateside and they were ever vigilant while their sons and daughters and husbands and wives went overseas.

The first individual here, Mr. Speaker, is Staff Sergeant Russell Slay, United States Marine Corps, from my hometown of Humble, Texas. He was killed at the age of 34. He was killed on November 9, 2004. When Russell told his mother, Peggy Slay, that he was joining the United States Marine Corps after finishing high school, he told her that he knew she would not like it but he was going to do it anyway. And he did. He joined the Marine Corps and he was killed in action. Peggy Slay, his mother, whom I have known since Russell's death, has become very active in the Blue and Gold Star Moms in southeast Texas.

To refresh your memory, Mr. Speaker, a Blue Star Mom is an individual who has a son or daughter overseas and they carry a flag or they have a flag on their window at their home that has a blue star in that flag. Gold Star Moms are those who have lost a son or a daughter overseas in war, and they have a gold star. Peggy Slay is a leader in the Gold Star Moms in southeast Texas.

Next to him is Lance Corporal Wesley Canning, United States Marine Corps. He was 21, and he was killed on November 10, the day after Russell was killed. He is from Friendswood, Texas. He told his dad he always wanted to be a Marine, and he had that ambition to serve as a Marine for 20 years. He was a proud Texan, and when he was home on leave, he bought a new pickup truck so he could show his Marine buddies his new bumper sticker that said ''Don't Mess with Texas.'' He was that kind of individual, that loved Texas and loved his country.

The third individual, Lance Corporal Fred Lee Maciel. Fred Maciel, age 20, was killed on January 26, 2005. He was also a member of the United States Marine Corps. He was from Spring, Texas. He was killed in a helicopter crash in al-Anbar province on his way to begin security preparations for the historic Iraqi elections that took place a few days later in January 2005. Four days later, I was in Iraq to witness those successful elections. Lance Corporal Maciel made those first free elections for the Iraqi people possible, and those elections were important for the

history of that country. Lance Corporal Maciel was one of those individuals who gave his life so that another country, another people, could have those elections.

The fourth individual that is on this poster board is Private First Class Wesley Riggs of the United States Army. He was killed when he was 19 years of age on May 17, 2005. He was from Baytown, Texas, or Beach City, Texas. Both towns claim him. He graduated in just 3 years from high school, and he loved agriculture.

The fifth individual is Sergeant William Meeuwsen, age 24. Sergeant William ''Bill'' Meeuwsen is from Kingwood, Texas, near my area where I live, and he was a member of the United States Army. He went off to Texas A&M University, but he dropped out of school and enlisted in the United States Army because of 9/11. Amazing individuals, these people who left their careers after 9/11 and joined the United States military to protect the rest of us.

Over here on the far left is Lance Corporal Robert ''Robbie'' Martinez, United States Marine Corps. He was killed at the age of 20 on December 1, 2005. He was from a small rural community called Cleveland. Cleveland, Texas. He dreamed of getting a degree in education and becoming a baseball coach after his career in the Marines. Today, there is a post office in Cleveland, Texas, named in his honor. When we dedicated the post office for Robbie Martinez in Cleveland, Texas, the whole town turned out for it. In fact, the United States Air Force had a flyover during that ceremony and that dedication. The people of Cleveland loved Robbie Martinez and his family and appreciate his sacrifice for America.

The seventh individual is Staff Sergeant Jerry Michael Durbin, United States Army, from Spring, Texas. He was killed on January 25, 2006, at the age of 27. He's from Houston, Texas, and he was a gifted artist. The day he was killed, he called his wife to tell her he loved her. Shortly thereafter, he was killed in action.

The eighth individual is Tech Sergeant Walter Moss. Tech Sergeant Walter Moss was a member of the United States Air Force. He was 37 years of age, and he was killed on March 30, 2006. He also is from Houston, Texas. He joined the Air Force after high school and he served in Operation Desert Storm.

□ 1420

He specialized in detecting and diffusing makeshift bombs, and he was killed while diffusing an IED. I repeat, he was killed while diffusing an IED. An IED, Mr. Speaker, that is the way that the cowards we fight fight us. They don't come out in the open—heavens no. They won't do that. They would lose. So they lie in wait in their holes, in their caves, and they put bombs, land mines—IEDs, as we call them—where they know our troops will come by, and then they remotely set those off. Tech Sergeant Walter Moss was an individual that was trained to diffuse those IEDs, but one exploded while he was trying to protect other warriors.

The ninth individual is Private First Class Kristian Menchaca. Kristian Menchaca was a member of the United States Army. He is from Houston, Texas. He was killed at the age of 23 on June 16, 2006. When he joined the United States Army, he wanted to be in the infantry. Kristian's wife said that being in the military was what he always wanted to do. He was kidnapped and tortured and murdered by enemy forces. His murder made national news because of the brutality of the people we fight against after they captured Kristian Menchaca.

Number 10 on this poster is Staff Sergeant Ben Williams of the United States Marine Corps. He was 30 years of age when he was killed on June 20, 2006. He is from Orange, Texas, down in the refinery area of southeast Texas. He joined the United States Marines right after high school, and he served his country for 12 years. He was serving his third duty in Iraq when he was killed on June 20, 2006.

Lance Corporal Ryan Miller, at the age of 19, member of the United States Marine Corps, was killed on September 14, 2006. He was from Pearland, Texas. He was a third-generation Marine. He graduated early so he could enlist and follow in his father's and grandfather's footsteps. After his tour of duty was over, he wanted to become a Houston police officer just like his parents, who are Houston police officers.

Staff Sergeant Edward Reynolds, Jr., United States Army. He was killed at the age of 27 on September 26, 2006, just a few days after Lance Corporal Ryan Miller was killed. He is from Port Arthur, Texas, another refinery area in southeast Texas. He was looking forward to New Year's Eve because that's when he was going to get married. He was a man who, as his fellow warriors say, pushed others to succeed in what they do.

Next is Captain David Fraser, 13th individual on this poster. He was a member of the United States Army. He was killed on November 26, 2006, at the age of 25. He was from Spring, Texas. And you might notice—you can barely see it, but you might notice his uniform, Mr. Speaker. He was a West Point graduate. He wasn't just a regular cadet at West Point. He graduated top student in civil engineering. Captain David Fraser gave his life at the age of 25 for America.

Lance Corporal Luke Yepsen, member of the United States Marine Corps. He was killed on September 14, 2006, and he was from Kingwood, Texas. He was at the age of 20 when he was killed. He also attended Texas A&M University after high school, and he dropped out to enlist in the United States Marine Corps, just like Staff Sergeant Bill Meeuwsen left Texas A&M during school to fight for America.

Specialist Dustin Donica, United States Army. At the age of 22, he was killed on December 28, 2006. He was from Spring, Texas. And when he was asked why he joined the United States Army, here's what he said, Mr. Speaker: Most people in my generation want something for them. I just wanted to give something back. That's why I joined the United States Army.

The 16th individual of our roll call of the ''Noble 36'' is Specialist Ryan Berg. Here is his photograph, Mr. Speaker. He was a member of the United States Army. He was killed at the age of 19. He is from Sabine Pass, Texas. You've probably never heard of that place. Sabine Pass is a very small community. It is on the furthest southeastern point of Texas, right next to Louisiana. He joined the Army on his 18th birthday, and he was the first soldier from Sabine Pass to be killed in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Staff Sergeant Terrance Dunn, United States Army. Here is his photograph. At the age of 38, he was killed on February 2, 2007. He was from Atascocita, Texas. He enlisted in the Army several years after high school, and to his fellow soldiers he was known as ''Dunnaman'' because he could get anything done.

Next is Lance Corporal Anthony Aguirre. He was a member of the United States Marine Corps, and at the age of 20 he was killed on February 22, 2007. He was from Channelview, Texas. He entered the United States Marine Corps because he believed, like a lot of other people believe, it was the toughest branch of the military. You've got to love those Marines, Mr. Speaker.

Over here we have Private First Class Brandon Bobb, United States Army. He, likewise, was from Port Arthur, Texas, and he was killed at the age of 20 on July 17, 2007. He was always cheerful and was a soldier that others looked to for support and to lend a helping hand. He was always thinking about somebody else other than himself, according to his buddies in the military.

Number 20, Private First Class Zachary Endsley, United States Army, age 21, killed on July 23, 2007, from Spring, Texas. You might notice, Mr. Speaker, there's a pattern here—18-, 19-, 20- and 21-year-olds. America's youth go to war to represent the rest of us. But Zach was an appreciator of the arts. He enjoyed drawing and playing his guitar. It was his drawing ability that stood out. In high school, he entered and won a poster contest with his design, but after he joined the Army he was killed at the age of 21.

Number 21, Army Specialist Kamisha Block. She was a member of the United States Army. Kamisha Block was 20 years old when she was killed. She was from Vidor, Texas, and she was killed on August 16, 2007. Kamisha's best friend, Amanda Buck, they grew up together. And Amanda says: ''We rode

the school bus together from kindergarten all the way through high school.'' She said Kamisha knew where she was headed in life. She had a big heart and wanted to help people, and that's why she joined the United States Army.

Number 22, Specialist Donald Valentine III, United States Army, 21 years of age. He was killed September 18, 2007. He was from Houston, Texas. In the official statement on Donald's death, here's what the family said: Donald touched the lives of so many with his big heart. We will cherish those beautiful memories we shared with him. He made us very proud. Now heaven has another hero that continues to watch over us as an angel in heaven. Remarkable person, Specialist Donald Valentine III.

Number 23 is Lance Corporal Jeremy Burris, United States Marine, age 22, killed in action on October 8, 2007.

□ 1430

He is from Liberty, Texas. Liberty, Texas, according to the folks in Liberty, they claim that is the first settlement in Texas, before Texas was even a part of the United States or even a republic. Liberty, Texas. An interesting town for a warrior to be from.

He was an unapologetic person of religious faith, and he attended the nondenominational Cornerstone Church, where he led worship and praise services. He loved Texas, and his church pastor said at the funeral, ''No one had better say anything negative about his home State of Texas.''

Mr. Speaker, you got to love those Texas boys. They love our State. They love America.

Number 24 is Staff Sergeant Eric Duckworth. He is the last photograph on this row, Mr. Speaker. He was a member of the United States Army. He was killed at the age of 26 on October 10, 2007. He was from Houston, Texas. His father, Michael, described him as an outgoing and good-humored son. He further said, ''Eric was full of love and laughter and a godly spirit, but, above all, he was a true soldier and a proud warrior'' for the United States.

Number 25, Corporal Scott McIntosh. He was a member of the United States Army. He was killed at the age of 26 on March 10, 2008. He was from Humble, Texas, my hometown. His mission in life was to meet and make friends with every person he came in contact with. He shared his hearty laugh and always had a smile to give to other people that he came across. Scott always had a positive outlook on life. He loved to hunt and fish, but most of all he loved his family, the Army and the country he lived in and his life.

Staff Sergeant Shawn Tousha, number 26 on this poster, Mr. Speaker. He was a member of the United States Army. He was killed at the age of 30 on April 9, 2008. He was from a little small town called Hull, Texas. As a teenager, Shawn played football, and like most Texas rural boys, he loved it. He played at Hull-Daisetta High School. He liked to ride horses. He considered himself a cowboy. He liked to bull ride. He was a man from small town America, and he had a playful heart. He made a big impression on everybody that he knew growing up, and that was a positive impression.

Number 27 on here, Lieutenant Colonel Mark Stratton II. Lieutenant Colonel Mark Stratton is the highest ranking officer that has been killed from our congressional district area. He was a member of the United States Air Force. At the age of 39, he was killed on May 26, 2009. He was from Houston, Texas. He was remembered by his friends as a man of unquestionable character and total loyalty to the people he loved. He was a patriotic American who exemplified the very best that American airmen have to offer.

Number 28, this individual with the big grin on his face, Specialist Jarrett Griemel, United States Army. He was killed on June 3, 2009, at the age of 20. He was also from a little small town, La Porte, Texas. Jarrett was a member of the swim team and the surf club while he was in high school. He loved the outdoors and he, of course, loved the beach and the surf which were nearby in La Porte. He spent his spare time parachuting and cliff diving. Jarrett lived his life to the fullest, but like the others I have mentioned, he loved America, and he loved to excel and do what he could do to be all that he could be. He loved his family, and his family says that they will forever cherish the memories that he gave them because he touched every one of their lives.

Over here to the far left, Jeffrey Johnson was a member of the United States Marine Corps, age 21 when he was killed on May 11, 2010, from Tomball, Texas. At Corporal Jeffrey Johnson's funeral, his family remembered him as a son, a grandson, a brother and a hero. His vehicle commander said Johnson was different from most of the fellow Marines because, to sum up his commander, ''war is sheer misery, and the four of us in that truck, because of Jeff and his humor, were uplifted all the time.'' Corporal Johnson touched everybody and the lives that they lived with his life.

The 30th individual is this sailor over here on the far portion of this poster, Petty Officer Zarian Wood, who went by ''Z,'' a member of the United States Navy. He was from Houston. He was 29 years of age when he was killed in combat, and he was on his second tour of duty when he was killed. He graduated from South Houston High School in 1999 and after graduation he worked as a youth pastor and tutored children. He enlisted in the Navy in 2006 and was on his second tour of duty when he was killed in combat.

The last group of individuals are the most recent individuals. All of these people, all of these individuals are put on this poster in the order of their death in Iraq or Afghanistan. In my office here in Washington, in my offices in Humble and in Beaumont, Texas, we have larger photographs of all of these individuals. And you will notice, Mr. Speaker, as you go through the Halls of Congress and the offices of the House, you will see many such posters as this listing those who have given their lives for America in the war in Iraq.

But next on this list is Sergeant Brandon Bury. He was a member of the United States Marine Corps. He was killed at the age of 26 on June 6, 2010—June 6th, D-day. He was killed on the anniversary date of D-day. He was from Kingwood, Texas. He was a big guy. He was 6 feet 6 and he was all Marine. He was an impressive individual, and his friends say even back in middle school he knew what he wanted to do—he wanted to be a member of the United States Marine Corps.

Next to him, number 32, Specialist Matthew Catlett, United States Army. At the age of 23 years, he was killed on June 7, the very next day after Sergeant Brandon Bury was killed. He was from Houston, Texas, and he fought for liberty. He fought for a people that he did not know in a land where he had never been. He was an American, that rare breed that gave his life for people far, far away and for Americans in this land.

Staff Sergeant Edwardo Loredo, 34 years of age, a member of the United States Army, he was killed one day shy of his 35th birthday. He was from Houston, Texas, killed on June 24, 2010. His family says Edwardo was an adventurer. He adored his wife and his family, and he loved to cook for his neighbors and his family.

Mr. Speaker, we are blessed to have such a rare breed of people as Staff Sergeant Edwardo Loredo and his fellow patriots and warriors.

Number 34, Staff Sergeant Jesse Ainsworth, a member of the United States Army, 24 years of age, killed on July 10, 2010, from Dayton, Texas, another small town in southeast Texas. Jesse's mother, Margaret Ainsworth, said Jesse was her hero, and he was her only son. She said she used to pick him up when he was a little kid from kindergarten, and every Friday they would go to Wal-Mart and buy some toy. She said ever since Jesse was ''an itty bitty fellow'' he wanted to be a soldier in the United States Army, and he gave his life when he was 24 years of age for the rest of us.

Number 35 on this poster of the Noble 36 is Staff Sergeant Leston ''Tony'' Winters, United States Army, 30 years of age when he was killed on July 15, 2010. He was from Sour Lake, Texas. Once again, small town rural America. In 1998 he graduated from Hardin Jefferson High School. Winters had already completed two tours of duty in Iraq and decided in February of 2010 to leave his job and return to battle once more. He told his family that he felt compelled to be there with his buddies, even though he had a chance to stay

home in Texas. He left behind after his death his wife, Elizabeth, and their three children, Jonathan, Remington, and Emma.

Sergeant First Class Calvin B. Harrison, this individual over here in the bottom right-hand corner, he was killed at the age of 31 and he, like several of the others I mentioned, was from Cleveland, Texas. He was killed on September 29, 2010.

□ 1440

After he graduated from high school in 1998, he enlisted in the Army, following the path of his grandfather. His family said that he loved being a soldier and serving his country. He is survived by his two daughters, Azalia and Eleanna.

It's interesting about his funeral, Mr. Speaker, which I attended. The whole town of Cleveland, Texas, and nearby towns turned out for the funeral. Flags were strewn and hoisted all up and down Main Street in Cleveland, Texas. The businesses shut down, the school closed as the funeral procession came through Cleveland, Texas, honoring Sergeant First Class Calvin Harrison; that funeral ceremony and processional with hundreds of people, young and old, showing praise and honor and respect to Calvin Harrison for his sacrifice for America.

It was led by the Patriot Guard, those patriots that ride the Harley-Davidson motorcycles, most of them from the Vietnam era, who show their appreciation for the sacrifice by watching over the funeral procession and the funeral by riding those motorcycles with an American flag on the back.

These are the Noble 36 from southeast Texas, just a few of the people who have given their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan. I mention these individuals because they, like all Americans that have been killed in Iraq and Afghanistan, are important to America. They are important to our history because freedom is not free.

And that is not a trite expression. It's not free. It has always been expensive, going all the way back to the Revolutionary War. We're going to celebrate July 4th next week. And that war cost American lives, as has every war, because freedom is expensive. And it's our young people, men and women, who go and serve.

Mr. Speaker, just like everybody serving today in Iraq and Afghanistan, every one of these people—every one—volunteered. They raised their right hand and they stood forward and said, I will serve. I will go. Call me. And they went. And we are to admire them for what they have done. They have gone down into the valley of the gun and the desert of the sun, and they have sacrificed their lives.

Last week, I happened to be in Iraq with other Members of Congress. It's not even summer yet in Iraq. But we got off that Blackhawk helicopter and it was 120 degrees in Iraq. And there they were, the American warriors with their warrior uniforms on and all that equipment they carry. How hot they were. It was 120 degrees. In Afghanistan and Iraq it gets hot in the summer. And those days are coming. We should always appreciate them.

We should also appreciate the ones that serve in other places in the world. On that same trip, Members of Congress had an opportunity to go near the South China Sea and see some of our warriors on some island I'm not sure I could find on a map. But they're on this remote island, our Navy SEALs, our special forces, our marines, and our soldiers. They were doing an operation protecting the United States, representing the rest of us.

So we should be proud of those that go and serve, those that volunteer and those that are still there. We should appreciate the families that have stayed home while their loved ones go across the seas and represent this country. July 4th is coming up. It's a great day in our history. I hope Americans fly the flag. I hope Americans tell their kids about our country and our history. We should tell American children about these young people and others who every day raise their right hand and go off to war representing the rest of us.

One of our former Presidents once said, ''I like to see a man proud of the place in which he lives, and I like to see a man live so that his place will be proud of him.'' All of these were proud of America and America is proud of all of them and the rest that continue to serve. These Noble 36, we are proud of them.

Mr. Speaker, these are the few, the bold, the brave, the courageous. These are the Americans. These are the sons and daughters of southeast Texas who have fallen in battle for their country. We are forever grateful for their sacrifice, and we are grateful for every man and woman in uniform somewhere in the world today representing the rest of us.

And that's just the way it is.

MIDWEST FLOODING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege and honor to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. I would say at the outset that it is also my honor and privilege to have been seated here on the floor of the House of Representatives as I listened to a Congressman and judge, TED POE, address you on the brave patriots from Texas that were on the poster and as he went down through and said choice morsels of each individual's life and what happened in their sacrifice and talked to us about the values that they defended and their reasons that they have put their lives on the line.

I'm impressed by the honor that TED POE did to those who have given their lives from Texas, and I'm very convinced that he would agree with me that he'd appreciate it if that honor could be reflected across all of the brave patriots who have given their lives in the defense of this country in this conflict and in past conflicts. We always pray that there be no future conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor to address a different subject matter. Perhaps I'll digress or cross over into the national security side of this. But I find that I don't believe any Member of any delegation has yet come to the floor to talk about the natural disaster events that have been taking place in the Midwest, and in particular in the Missouri River basin area. I'm one who has grown up in that drainage basin area. I've lived there on that side of the great divide for most of my life. We have some circumstances today that eclipse the 500-year flood event of 1996.

In 1996, more water came down the Missouri River than ever before. It was the largest amount of cubic feet per second and the largest amount of over a million acre-feet that had come down. I will say there were a couple of events that would compete with that, depending on how you define it, Mr. Speaker. One would be a flood in 1943 that brought the attention of the world. We were in the middle of a world war. We didn't get to addressing the massive runoff in the Missouri River from the 1943 flood event.

In 1952, the huge floods came again and more water for a single month came down the Missouri River than ever before, or since. That amounted to a discharge in million acre-feet of 13.2 million acre-feet of water coming down in a single month, the month of April 1952.

□ 1450

That course flooded everything and put the water higher than it had been before, and it brought to it the attention of this Congress. The attention of this Congress, in paying particular attention to what happened in the flood event in '52, followed through on some plans that had been discussed after the 1943 flood, and they began to take action to move forward for the construction of what we now know as the Pick-Sloan Program.

The Pick-Sloan Program is the construction of six large dams on the Upper Missouri River. It starts at Gavins Point Dam in South Dakota, and it goes on up to Fort Randall Dam, to Oahe, and then on up into North Dakota where you see Garrison Dam and Fort Peck. I left out Big Bend. So we have Gavins Point, Fort Randall, Big Bend, Oahe, Garrison Dam, and then Fort Peck Dam. These are all built on the main stem of the Missouri River, but they collect water from all the tributaries.

The water that we have now coming down through the Midwest comes down out of Montana into North Dakota, where it's flooding now, and it's flooding also across South Dakota, all

across the bottoms, and is spilling out of the six dams one after another at discharge rates higher than we have seen at sustained rates ever before. It's the most water to come down the river since these six dams were built in this Pick-Sloan Program starting in the fifties and finishing in the early sixties. The discharge level at Gavins Point Dam, which is the lowest one—that's at Yankton, South Dakota—is now approaching 160,000 cubic feet per second. That's more discharge than we've seen before.

The result of this is we're in a flood stage all down this river in the areas that I've mentioned. From below the dams, the Missouri River is at a flood stage. Some of it has just not yet arrived in St. Louis in its peak form. But because of this, it has flooded some of our communities, and it has flooded hundreds of thousands of acres of our farmland. It has caused us to build many miles of levees that some would design as temporary and some would design as permanent; and some of them, I hope, do stay permanent because, again, the water is going to be semi-permanent.

This is not, Mr. Speaker, a short-term flood event that just happened because the clouds opened up and it gushed down into the river and it's going to wash by us and be gone in a few days like many floods are. This is a long-term national disaster flood event for the entire Missouri River basin all the way from Montana to St. Louis, Missouri. This is the highest water level that we have seen since the Pick-Sloan Program was built, and in some places, it's the highest water we've ever seen. It will certainly be the longest term that we'll have been underwater that has ever been.

So as I travel up and down the river—and I have the privilege, Mr. Speaker, of representing all of the Missouri River that Iowa touches, which would be from the Sioux City area where the Missouri River comes out of South Dakota and joins up and provides the border, the western border of Iowa, between Iowa and Nebraska. It's all Missouri River with Nebraskans on one side and Iowans on the other side; both of us are underwater on both sides of the river. It's also true in South Dakota.

The water that's coming down the river in this massive quantity has brought about a lot of criticism and a lot of scrambling. First, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the events that brought us to this are unprecedented in modern recorded history in that, of all of the area that the Pick-Sloan Program handles—all of the drainage area of the Missouri River and the Upper Missouri River in particular—the Corps of Engineers watches the precipitation; they watch the snowcap, and they anticipate how much water they will have.

We have gone through at least an 8-year record drought in the Upper Missouri River. These reservoirs—these six huge reservoirs that were not designed for the primary purpose at all of fishing and recreation but were designed for flood control and navigation and electrical generation and also to cool our generators where we have coal-fired generators along the river and for navigation—have been very valuable to the States—to South Dakota, North Dakota and Montana—because the tourism industry for recreation and fishing has so migrated to those beautiful areas that they have.

When they're out of water, when the pool drains down during an 8-year drought, which they have had, it might be three-quarters of a mile from where your dock was, where your boat was tied up to where the water actually is.

We've even engaged in a struggle here on the floor of the House of Representatives about who gets the water when there is a short water supply. Congressman DENNY REHBERG has tried mightily to keep as much water as possible up in Montana when they've needed it. I found myself in disagreement with him, trying to get the water down the river so we have enough to cool our generators, float our boats, bring some barge traffic up, and provide for flood control.

So the 8-year drought is over, Mr. Speaker. It's completely over. It was actually over the last year and a half or so. In thinking of them as six huge bathtubs that are nearly dry; the water level in the six huge dams has been coming up over the last year and a half or more. As of last fall, it caught up to the designed pool elevations, and then they had enough rain in the Upper Missouri that it overfilled these six dams.

The Corps of Engineers, operating under the Master Manual guidelines, which is the playbook that they have to manage these six dams by, lowered the pool elevations in the dams so that they had storage in order to be prepared for any future floods. They're required under the Master Manual to manage these levels so that they have 16.3 million acre-feet of storage capacity to manage the flood. They drew it down to that level—to those normal pool elevations, I will call them. They did so over the wintertime, and that was fine. It was all throughout November, December, January, February, and early March: stability within those pool levels and a storage capacity of 16.3 million acre-feet. They're prepared for spring rains. They're prepared for the snow runoff. That's manageable.

Then in very, very late March and early April, heavy snows in the mountains began, and the snow pack began to build in the mountains—and it couldn't have been anticipated—to 140 percent of the anticipated volume of snow that would have to, of course, melt and come down the Missouri River. In addition to that, they had spring rains across the Upper Missouri basin—across the plains and the foothills of the mountains. Those spring rains flowed down into the reservoirs and overfilled them as well. Once it happened, it was a situation where the storage capacity in the reservoirs was diminished significantly and when an unusual event took place on May 22.

That's when Billings, Montana, got 8 inches of rain and when some of the other areas got 10 and 12 inches of rain, and it was across a vast area of the Upper Missouri basin. As that water came down into the reservoirs, the Corps of Engineers began to watch the rain gauges and the runoff, and concluded that they had a rare event, an event that the Pick-Sloan Program was not designed to handle with ease.

They announced to us on that day, May 22, that they would open up the gates of the dams so that the lowest one at Gavins Point in Yankton, South Dakota, which is the one we watch for all the flow of the rest of the river, would be flowing at 110,000 cubic feet per second. That was May 22 or early May 23. By the 26th of May, the Corps of Engineers had evaluated the flow rates in the tributaries and the rainfall reports that they had and the forecast, and announced that they had to increase that flow to 150,000 cubic feet per second.

That makes a tremendous difference, Mr. Speaker, because the result of that necessary decision that the Corps of Engineers made was that the water tables, the water levels, would go up in the river above flood stage for what turns out to be almost the entire flow and maybe, actually, the entire flow of the Missouri River downstream from the dams.

Also, the flow that's coming through upstream from the dams is flooding significant areas—residential areas, commercial property areas, ag land in vast amounts—all the way up through the Dakotas and Nebraska, Iowa, Missouri, with some spilling over into Kansas. That's the situation that we have.

I should say also, Mr. Speaker, that my life's work has been the earthmoving business. We've gone in and built levees and dug ditches and built terraces and waterways and dams. We've bid work on the flood control work on the Missouri River; and I've watched the flows, studied the flows, floated the river for recreational purposes and engineering reasons. As a State senator in Iowa for 6 years and now as a Member of Congress into my ninth year, I've dealt with the public policies that have to do with the water coming down the river and the species that are affected by it.

With all of this together, if I look back upon it and try to become a Monday morning quarterback, Mr. Speaker, I'll come to this conclusion that, yes, knowing what we know today, it would have been possible to have prevented this long-term flooding that we have in the Missouri River bottom—but that's knowing what we know today. The Corps of Engineers could not have known that they were going to get the heavy snowfalls that would come down on the mountains, which would be

melting. Even now, perhaps half of that snow has melted today, and the balance of it has to still melt.

□ 1500

They couldn't have known that until the snow actually arrived in late March and earlier April. Neither could they have known that there would be this huge, unseasonal rain that would run off to the extent that it did and saturate the soil so that the big rain that hit Billings, as I mentioned, would run off to the extent that it did.

Once they knew about the flows coming in, they made the decision that they had to make, Mr. Speaker, and we are where we are. Now we're watching 160,000 cubic feet per second come out of Gavins Point. That's more than ever before. The water table is above the flood stage all the way along the Missouri River from below Gavins Point. And I presume that the gentleman who represents North Dakota and the gentlelady who represents South Dakota can speak to those issues up there, and I imagine that they can say that they have floods all the way up and down the Missouri River bottom completely throughout the Dakotas and likely Montana.

But, Mr. Speaker, these water levels are going to stay, and they're going to stay for all of the rest of June, likely all the rest of July, and partway into August, most likely. And, in fact, these water levels could stay into September or October, depending on whether we get unseasonably high rains. If we do, if there's additional rain to this, then these water levels or even, on the outside, higher water levels could be with us for a long time to come on into the fall.

The people that live in these States that I have mentioned have to live with high water for a long period of time, not like a tornado that comes and blows away your homes and your businesses and allows you to go back when the sun comes out and start to clean up the mess and rebuild. This flood is not like a tornado, not like a hurricane. It's not even like a flood, a normal flood. A normal flood will come up and wash over you and wash away some things and soak the rest, and the water table will go down.

Even on the Mississippi River, where the water comes up slow and goes down slow, this eclipses the duration of any flood that I know in that the Corps of Engineers, without a lot of choice, by June 14 this month, June 14, had opened up the gates to 150,000 cubic feet per second, now, as of about today, 160,000 cubic feet per second, and that discharge, that volume of water that floods the Missouri River bottom, I will say completely, will continue to be with us for 2 months perhaps, perhaps more. That's unprecedented in duration. It is unprecedented in volume. This is more water than has ever come down the Missouri River in a year that we know of since we've been recording these records.

I said 16.3 million acre-feet of storage capacity that they have, but the projected flow out of the Missouri River for this year is 54 million acre-feet, and that's more than even came down in the 1993 floods, which was a 500-year flood event or at least described to be the same. I lived under that, Mr. Speaker. It flooded four of my major projects and changed my life, and the long story I won't tell here, but I might not be in this Congress had it not been for the 1993 flood, which completely redirected my life.

This flood is redirecting the lives of thousands of people up and down the Missouri River bottom. It's changing businesses. It's changing residences. I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, that we will lose businesses over the long term and we will lose people over the long term who can't get back into their homes.

To give an example—and it's a South Dakota example of the Dakota dunes. It is a region that was built around a golf course, the Dakota Dunes Golf Course, just outside of Iowa, outside of the north Sioux City side, which some might call it a suburb of Sioux City itself. But in that area, people that had, I will say, wherewithal and vision developed an area in there for residences, and it's a very nice area. It's close to the river. The nicer the homes, the closer to the river they seem to be. And when the Corps of Engineers announced on May 26 that these discharge levels would be coming down the river, they went to work with private money and began building a temporary levee alongside the Missouri River to protect their homes.

This is a neighborhood coming together with their checkbooks to do emergency work to protect their homes, and while they were doing that, the Corps of Engineers let an emergency contract to build a levee that protects about half of the homes in that area, but it is not stable enough for them to build that levee to protect all of the homes. And so you have two levees: one private money, good homes protecting themselves; another one, Corps of Engineers' money to protect the balance of those homes. If we lose that levee near the river, about half of the homes in the Dakota Dunes and probably the nicest homes will be under a massive amount of water.

And as I was up there to visit, they were building this temporary levee. And, Mr. Speaker, I've spent my life in the construction business, specifically the earthmoving business. We've had a fair number of our own machines running at a single time, but this operation in that area of the Dakota Dunes, a small population area, had 170 trucks hauling dirt into these temporary levees, about 50 trucks hauling into the Corps of Engineers' levee, 120 trucks hauling into the private money levee that was there, most of them belly dumps and side dumps, semi size—not little short straight trucks, but big trucks with a full load of dirt on each one of them—building a levee as the river comes up.

We've done that in South Dakota. We've done that on the Iowa side and also on the Nebraska side of the Missouri River where we built several miles of levees around our critical companies and critical infrastructure.

CF Industries, which is the fertilizer company, built a levee about eight-tenths of a mile long, and then all the way around their plant put in about 14 to 16 wells with pumps in them to dewater the inside of their levee as the river runs around the outside. That's true also with the protein company that's there, and they have been protecting the generating plants with sandbagging and pumps and temporary levees.

And as you go on down the river, Nebraska, Omaha, has its story. Council Bluffs has its story. They're protected by a pretty good Corps of Engineers' levee, but the water is high, and these levees are not built for 2 months of high water and fast flows and turbulence up against these levees. So they have to be monitored 24/7 all the way through until the water goes down. And if there's a little boil, somebody's got to be there to fix that, as happened in down in the southwest corner of Iowa. We can lose a levee in a matter of just a minute or two.

I know that there was a levee that ended up that almost spontaneously had a 30-foot boil in it where the earth just a disappeared, and then a little bit later it was 200 feet long, then it was 300 feet long. Then it couldn't be repaired any longer, and the backup levee is what is protecting the city of Hamburg right now.

There has been a courageous effort, Mr. Speaker, on the part of Midwesterners to build the temporary facilities they could, and the short notice that they had, when you think that the Thursday before Memorial weekend is when the word came from the Corps of Engineers that these historically high flows would be released, and it takes a couple of days for that water to get down. Of course, they weren't going to peak out on this until June 14, but they had maybe 2 weeks to be ready for the highest water, and they had to get ready while the water was coming up, sometimes a foot a day.

They've done a phenomenal job. And as I go into the emergency command centers in places like Sioux City, Council Bluffs, Iowa, as I go into the little town of Blencoe, Iowa, 270 people there in the flat bottom of the Missouri River who had been told that they would see 2 to 3 feet of water everywhere in their town and there wasn't going to be a way to save the town, they looked around and said, What do we do? Do we let all of our property flood and stay under water for a couple of months? And five contractors came together and put 11 machines on the job, and a few days later they had built 5 miles of levee. It goes all the way around the mighty little city of

Blencoe and ties it back in together, and they have pumps sitting there and they're protecting themselves from the flood. And that little Blencoe doesn't need to be the Alamo for the flood of 2011. They can fight this flood off, and we want to be there to help them all that we can.

I have a business owner that builds trailers in Missouri Valley, Iowa. He had gone in and bought a business in downtown Missouri Valley a few years ago, and because of the floods from the nineties built a new location above the floodplain just on the outside of the town by the interstate, Interstate 29, which, by the way, is closed today because of the floodwaters covering the interstate highway. Mr. Speaker, he built a new plant above the floodplain so that he didn't have to be flooded out again.

And about 3 years ago, there was a quirk of weather and one of the major streams backed up and flooded his new plant, and he's one of the top trailer salespeople in America. It flooded his new plant with about 4 or 5 feet of water and destroyed some of his property that was in there. He picked his chin back up and went to work and cleaned up the mess and fixed the trailers that he could fix and junked the rest and started all over and put a smile back on his face and said, That's life, isn't it? And went to work in a courageous, American way.

□ 1510

Now his plant that is built above the flood stage and was flooded 2 or 3 years ago is back under—and I can't confirm today that it's under water, but they predict it will be under 4 feet of water. And he has moved his equipment back down to the old plant. He has moved from the nonflood zone to the flood zone, where the old plant was, where they predict that one won't be under water. But his new plant that's out of the flood stage will be underwater.

The irony of all of this is not lost on him nor is it lost on me. Sometimes whatever you do, it's just going to end up to be wrong. This time, we have a lot of people that are suffering that maybe have done everything that they can do to protect themselves. We have farmsteads, Mr. Speaker, that are completely flooded, and we have hundreds of them that are under water.

All up and down on the west side of Interstate 29 in the southwest corner of Iowa, we've evacuated some 600 homes because they are all going under water. In the little town of Percival and two other small towns in that area, it has now been announced they will be underwater and flooded. And I hesitate to report exactly where that water is now. I am going tonight, and by the weekend, I will have looked at all that.

But the water that we have is unprecedented. It's strange in its nature in that floodwaters we see as silty, muddy water that is full of mud and silt and junk. Some of this is. Maybe 40 percent of this water is silt-laden water, but more than half of it, perhaps 60 percent, Mr. Speaker, is clear water. And when you fly over it and you look down, you can see through that water, and you can see the striping on Interstate 29. You can see corn stalks, corn stems, little sprouted plants that grew up about this far before the water flooded them, and they are standing there underneath 1½ or 2 feet of clear water. It goes on and on. Bean stubble is the same way, little fixtures. You will see also irrigation systems standing out in the water. In 8 feet of water, there's an irrigation system standing there.

But this clear water that has emerged comes because the pressure from the river, hydrostatic pressure from the river, pushes down on the entire aquifer around there. As it pushes down, the water seeks its own level, so the silt and floodwater pushes down into the soil. When it does that, water equalizes, and it comes up out of the ground, sometimes on the other side of the levy on the east side of the interstate, in my case. It would be like the kind of water you would find in a drainage tile or well. It comes up and sits on the surface everywhere, clear and clean as can be, shutting down our transportation units, our interstate highway, and flooding family farms and businesses all up and down this river, and most of it has yet to reach St. Louis. This is a problem all the way across Missouri, from St. Louis all the way up into St. Joe and north. It's a problem for the entire Missouri River bottom, Nebraska, Iowa, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana.

To put it in perspective also, Mr. Speaker, the flow coming down this river, when people think that the Corps of Engineers could have done something different, marginally they could have, as I said, but they would have had to have been clairvoyant, and they would have had to have violated the terms of the Master Manual.

But the flow coming down the river at 150,000 cubic feet per second happens to be the amount of water that's just coming out of the Yellowstone River, itself. So those people who want to turn these American rivers back to what they were before we managed them and controlled them and built the Pick-Sloan Program, I would ask you all, Mr. Speaker, to think: If 150,000 cubic feet per second is flowing out of the Yellowstone River—and it is—and 150,000 cubic feet per second is flowing past out of Gavins Point and past down through Sioux City, if the Pick-Sloan Program had not been built, if we had no dams in the Missouri River, if all the tributaries of the Missouri River were completely dry except for the Yellowstone River, that little tributary up there in Montana, we'd still have the same amount of water there right now. It wouldn't last as long, but it would be as high as the levels we have today. That's how much this helps us. We know those other tributaries are flowing a lot of water. There's a massive amount. It's more than ever before. It's 54 million acre-feet for this year. It was a 500-year event in 1993. This is a 550-year event today.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have called upon the President to declare this entire area a national disaster area. I know that Governor Branstad has made that request. I know that the Governors in some of the States, such as Nebraska and Montana, have made that request. I believe that that request has been granted in a couple of cases, not yet for Iowa. I know that Governor Branstad has made this request for Iowa. And I thank the entire Iowa congressional delegation for joining with me in a letter to President Obama in making the request that he declare this a national disaster.

We have had a long time to be working with this water. A lot of sandbags have been filled. Some more will be filled. Many have to be emptied when this water goes down. And what we are going to need the most is the prayers of the American people and perseverance.

So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention to this matter. I appreciate the Iowa delegation for standing with me and the delegations up and down the river who have stood together. We need to stand with the people whose property is under water and help them get through this. They are stoic people. They are determined people. They are not going to be standing there, complaining. They are going to be doing all they can to help themselves. And to honor their efforts, I and others are determined to do all we can to help them.

So that is the update on the 2011 flood, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your attention.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BACHUS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending the funeral of his aunt, Nettie Butterworth, in Birmingham, Alabama.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 28, 2011, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2193. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Madison, Wisconsin, and Southwestern Wisconsin Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas (RIN: 3206-

AM32) received June 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2194. A letter from the Director, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures Governing Administrative Review of a United States Trustee's Decision To Deny a Chapter 12 or Chapter 13 Standing Trustee's Claim of Actual, Necessary Expenses [Docket No.: EOUST 103] (RIN: 1105-AB16) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2195. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Coast Guard Use of Force Training Exercises, San Pablo Bay, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0324] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2196. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Blue Crab Festival Fireworks Display, Little River, Little River, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0097] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2197. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Underwater Hazard, Gravesend Bay, Brooklyn, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2010-1126] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2198. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Air Power Over Hampton Roads, Back River, Hampton, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0288] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2199. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Fireworks Display Kanawha River, WV [Docket No.: USCG-2010-1015] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2200. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Chester River, Chestertown, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0126] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2201. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Ohio River; Sewickley, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0253] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2202. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Disestablishing Special Anchorage Area 2; Ashley River, Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0852] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2203. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fourth Annual Offshore Challenge, Sunny Isles Beach, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0034] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2204. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ford Estate Wedding Fireworks, Lake St. Clair, Grosse Pointe Shores, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0165] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2205. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Wicomico Community Fireworks, Great Wicomico River, Mila, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0390] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2206. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Repair of High Voltage Transmission Lines to Logan International Airport, Saugus River, Saugus, Massachusetts [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0297] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2207. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Marysville Days Fireworks, St. Clair River, Marysville, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0190] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2208. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Coughlin Wedding Fireworks, Lake St. Clair, Harrison Township, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0164] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2209. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reorganization of Sector North Carolina; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0368] (RIN: 1625-ZA30) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2210. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Second Annual Space Coast Super Boat Grand Prix, Atlantic Ocean, Cocoa Beach, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0143] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2211. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Catawba Island Club Fireworks, Catawba Island Club, Port Clinton, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0216] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2212. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Red River [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0260] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2213. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Vessels Carrying Hazardous Cargo, Sector Columbia River Captain of the Port Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2009-1134] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2214. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Olympia Harbor Days Tug Boat Races, Budd Inlet, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2010-1024] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2215. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bellingham Bay, Bellingham, WA and Lake Union, Seattle, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0250] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2216. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (AIWW), at Wrightsville Beach, NC; Cape Fear and Northeast Cape Fear River, at Wilmington, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2010-1139] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received Juen 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2217. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Big Rock Blue Marlin Air Show; Bogue Sound, Morehead City, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0168] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2218. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Alleghney River, Pittsburgh, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0160] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2219. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 2011 Memorial Day Tribute Fireworks, Lake Charlevoix, Boyne City, Michigan [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0325] (RIN: 1625-A008) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2220. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Miami Super Boat Grand Prix, Miami Beach, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0289] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2221. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Patapsco River, Northwest Harbor, Baltimore, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0182] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2222. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fleet Week Maritime Festival, Pier 66, Elliott Bay, Seattle, Washington [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0062] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2223. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service,

transmitting the Service's final rule — Deferral of Dates Related to the 2011 Branded Prescription Drug Fee [Notice 2011-46] received June 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. FRELINGHUYSEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2354. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. First Semiannual Report on the Activities of the Committee on the Judiciary for the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. First Semiannual Report of the Activities of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. First Semiannual Report on the Activities of the Committee on Financial Services for the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Agriculture. First Semiannual Report on the Activities of the Committee on Agriculture for the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCKEON: Committee on Armed Services. First Semiannual Report on the Activities of the Committee on Armed Services for the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MICA: Committee on Transportation and Infrastruture. First Semiannual Summary on the Activities of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–124). 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. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 2348. A bill to require the Director of National Intelligence to submit a report on the foreign development of electromagnetic pulse weapons; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 2349. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to annually assess the skills of certain employees and managers of the Veterans Benefits Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 2350. A bill to secure public investments in transportation infrastructure; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 2351. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 2352. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust the boundary of the Stephen Mather Wilderness and the North Cascades National Park in order to allow the rebuilding of a road outside of the floodplain while ensuring that there is no net loss of acreage to the Park or the Wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. LATHAM):

H.R. 2353. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and increase the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MACK, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. AKIN):

H.R. 2355. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to exclude individuals who have been convicted of committing certain sex offenses from receiving certain burial-related benefits and funeral honors which are otherwise available to certain veterans, members of the Armed Forces, and related individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 2356. A bill to enhance homeland security by improving efforts to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from an attack with a weapon of mass destruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Foreign Affairs, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUINTA (for himself and Mr. CARNAHAN):

H.R. 2357. A bill to amend section 139 of title 49, United States Code, to increase the effectiveness of Federal oversight of motor carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2358. A bill to prepare disconnected youth for a competitive future; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CHU, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 2359. A bill to amend title VI of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safe use of cosmetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANDRY:

H.R. 2360. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to extend the Constitution, laws, and jurisdiction of the United States to installations and devices attached to the seabed of the Outer Continental Shelf for the production and support of production of energy from sources other than oil and gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 2361. A bill to improve the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act by explicitly barring debt collectors from bringing legal action on a debt in which the statute of limitations has expired against any consumer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 2362. A bill to facilitate economic development by Indian tribes and encourage investment by Turkish enterprises; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2363. A bill to establish performance-based quality measures, to establish limitations on recovery in health care lawsuits based on compliance with best practice guidelines, and to provide grants to States for administrative health care tribunals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MOORE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CHU, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H.R. 2364. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 and title 5, United States Code, to permit leave to care for a domestic partner, parent-in-law, adult child, sibling, grandchild, or grandparent who has a serious health condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. REYES, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 2365. A bill to provide for additional Federal district judgeships; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 2366. A bill to establish a program for State licensing of Internet poker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 2367. A bill to provide for the safe disposal of Federal Government-owned transuranic waste for the benefit of all Americans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H.R. 2368. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to make grants to States, units of general local government, and Indian tribes for the purpose of creating employment opportunities for unemployed and underemployed residents in distressed communities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ALTMIRE (for himself and Mr. ROONEY):

H.R. 2369. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to provide for an additional power for the American Legion under its Federal charter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 2370. A bill to provide funds to the Army Corps of Engineers to hire veterans and members of the Armed Forces to assist the Corps with curation and historic preservation activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 2371. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that scientific studies used in a rule making be published, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BUERKLE (for herself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 2372. A bill to reduce the amount otherwise available for the payment of salaries and expenses of the Budget Committee and the Office of the Majority Leader of a House of Congress if that House does not adopt a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2011 or 2012; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2373. A bill to establish a regulatory system and research program for sustainable offshore aquaculture in the United States exclusive economic zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2374. A bill to require automobile dealers to disclose to consumers the presence of event data recorders, or ''black boxes'', on new automobiles, and to require manufacturers to provide the consumer with the option to enable and disable such devices on future automobiles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado:

H.R. 2375. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to identify high-potential oil and gas leases located on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 2376. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human stem cell research, including human embryonic stem cell research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. BOREN):

H.R. 2377. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for expedited procedures for the consideration of certain veterans claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. OLSON, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas):

H.R. 2378. A bill to establish the Buffalo Bayou National Heritage Area in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 2379. A bill to improve the literacy and English skills of limited English proficient individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona):

H.R. 2380. A bill to prescribe procedures for effective consultation and coordination by Federal agencies with federally recognized Indian tribes regarding Federal Government activities that impact tribal lands and interests to ensure that meaningful tribal input is an integral part of the Federal decision-making process; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. BOSWELL):

H.R. 2381. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to encourage and facilitate efforts by States and other transportation right-of-way managers to adopt integrated vegetation management practices, including enhancing plantings of native forbs and grasses that provide habitats for pollinators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 2382. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the logical flow of return information between partnerships, corporations, trusts, estates, and individuals to better enable each party to submit timely, accurate returns and reduce the need for extended and amended returns, to provide for modified due dates by regulation, and to conform the automatic corporate extension period to longstanding regulatory rule; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 2383. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use electronic communication to provide required notice to claimants for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 2384. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct cost-benefit analyses of certain contracts; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2385. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow seniors a one-time, tax-free retirement plan distribution to pay for essential repairs to a principal residence, for medical expenses, or for expenses attributable to a Federally declared disaster; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia):

H.R. 2386. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to facilitate the ability of persons affected by oil spills to seek judicial redress; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 2387. A bill to provide for preferential duty treatment to certain apparel articles of the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2388. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the submission of information by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California):

H.R. 2389. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to modify the surface transportation project delivery pilot program to carry out a demonstration program using State environmental laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2390. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to eliminate the leasing authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2391. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a renewable electricity integration credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 2392. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into building leasing agreements; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 2393. A bill to require each Federal agency to submit an annual forecast of grant solicitations expected to be issued in the next fiscal year by the agency to the Office of Management and Budget for publication on a website, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend qualified school construction bonds and qualified zone academy bonds, to treat qualified zone academy bonds as specified tax credit bonds, and to modify the private business contribution requirement for qualified zone academy bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CHU, Mr. WU, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. POLIS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 2395. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to permit the establishment of Jobs Corps centers in territories of the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. WU, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CLARKE of Michigan):

H.R. 2396. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to award grants for electronic device recycling research, development, and demonstration projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SCHILLING:

H.R. 2397. A bill to amend chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code, to set the age at which Members of Congress are eligible for an annuity to the same age as the retirement age under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2398. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to clarify the circumstances under which the enhanced penalty provisions for subsequent convictions apply; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2399. A bill to establish a research, development, demonstration, and commercial application program to promote research of appropriate technologies for heavy duty plug-in hybrid vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H.R. 2400. A bill to prevent States from prohibiting male circumcision; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. OLSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky):

H.R. 2401. A bill to require analyses of the cumulative and incremental impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WEBSTER:

H.R. 2402. A bill to specify the priority of the obligations of the United States Government if the debt ceiling is reached; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 2403. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to State National Guards to provide counseling and reintegration services for members of reserve components of the Armed Forces ordered to active duty in support of a contingency operation, members returning from such active duty, veterans of the Armed Forces, and their families; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. COSTELLO):

H.J. Res. 70. A joint resolution to grant the consent of Congress to an amendment to the compact between the States of Missouri and Illinois providing that bonds issued by the Bi-State Development Agency may mature in not to exceed 40 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. NEAL, Mr. WELCH, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. HONDA):

H. Res. 331. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should immediately reassess the United States mission in Afghanistan and redirect funding to strengthen homeland security, to create jobs, and to reduce the Federal deficit and debt; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H. Res. 332. A resolution calling for an impartial and independent investigation into the massacre of the Iranian Opposition Members in Camp Ashraf, Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PLATTS, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H. Res. 333. A resolution welcoming and commending the Government of Japan for extending an official apology to all United States former prisoners of war from the Pacific War and establishing in 2010 a visitation program to Japan for surviving veterans, family members, and descendants; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H. Res. 334. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National HIV Testing Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H. Res. 335. A resolution recognizing the need for safe patient handling and movement; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H. Res. 336. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 2011 as ''National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 2348.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of he United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 2349.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2350.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Articles I–XIV

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 2351.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 2352.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2353.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 2354.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2355.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this Act rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in article I, section 8, clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2356.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 2357.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 2358.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, the Spending Clause.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2359.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clause 3), which grants Congress the power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. LANDRY:

H.R. 2360.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2361.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate foreign and interstate commerce).

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 2362.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which allows Congress to regulate trade amongst foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

This bill is enacted pursuant to treaties lawfully entered into and ratified pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article II, Section 2, Clause 2.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2363.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Clause 9, and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 2364.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 2365.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Article III, Section 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas:

H.R. 2366.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 2367.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2368.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 2369.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 2370.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: ''Make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval forces;''

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 2371.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Ms. BUERKLE:

H.R. 2372.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I states, ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

and

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I states, ''The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado:

H.R. 2375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power of Congress to make law regarding the needful rules and regulations respecting the property of the United States, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana:

H.R. 2377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 12, 13, and 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 2378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States), Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate commerce among the several states and with the Indian Tribes), and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 2381.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 2382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 2383.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 2384.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2385.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution which states that ''Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes'', and the 16th Amendment to the Constitution which states that ''Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income''.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2386.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2387.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 2389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 14 and 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 2392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Goverment of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 2393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 2394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 2395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 2396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHILLING:

H.R. 2397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2398.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 2400.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Amendment 14, Section 5 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 2401.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WEBSTER:

H.R. 2402.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution enumerates the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excise, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.J. Res. 70.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: ''No state shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any duty of Tonnage, keep troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 58: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 85: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 91: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 111: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 121: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 122: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 218: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 298: Mr. THORNBERRY and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 305: Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 374: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. WEST.

H.R. 389: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 436: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 451: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 452: Mr. HURT.

H.R. 466: Mr. LONG, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 469: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 527: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 563: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 583: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 602: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 603: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 604: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 615: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 674: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 704: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 718: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 719: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 721: Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 733: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 735: Mr. REED.

H.R 763: Mr. MARINO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 787: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 870: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 886: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 905: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 908: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 931: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 935: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 936: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 948: Mr. WU.

H.R. 1005: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1031: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1041: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1063: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1092: Mr. MICA and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1103: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1147: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1167: Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 1170: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1175: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1186: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 1204: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1206: Mr. HANNA and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1244: Mr. BERG, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. RIVERA.

H.R. 1259: Mrs. ADAMS and Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 1265: Mr. CALVERT

H.R. 1281: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 1288: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 1311: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H R. 1325: Ms. NORTON and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas

H.R. 1327: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1351: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. HOCHUL.

H.R. 1367: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1370: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. YODER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1392: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1425: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1426: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1439: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1449: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1462: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1465: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1489: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1509: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 1533: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1537: Ms. FUDGE and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 1546: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 1576: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 1585: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1588: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1591: Mr. HANNA, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. PETERSON, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 1609: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado and Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 1656: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1672: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1697: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. JONES, and Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 1706: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1724: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1744: Mr. WEST, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. AUSTRIA, and Mr. RIVERA.
H.R. 1756: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 1775: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1776: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1792: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1815: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. HIMES, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 1817: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1842: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. CHU, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1848: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1856: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 1861: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 1873: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1885: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 1897: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. WU.
H.R. 1955: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1976: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1985: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1987: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1995: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1996: Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. ADAMS, and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 2000: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 2005: Mr. BARROW Mr. STARK, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2009: Mr. POSEY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 2018: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2019: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2029: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2033: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2046: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2061: Mr. TONKO and Mr. HURT.
H.R. 2096: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 2104: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2111: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2124: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 2139: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 2140: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 2164: Mr. QUAYLE.
H.R. 2167: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 2169: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2186: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2192: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2194: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2206: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 2210: Mr. FARR and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2211: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2230: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2248: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2271: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 2277: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 2299: Mr. MARINO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 2304: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2305: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 2307: Mr. HANNA and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2315: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2328: Ms. LEE of California and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2329: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 2334: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. BOREN and Mr. CARTER.
H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. STUTZMAN and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H. Res. 13: Mr. WOLF.
H. Res. 16: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H. Res. 130: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 177: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H. Res. 229: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H. Res. 239: Mr. PLATTS.
H. Res. 253: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mrs. ELLMERS.
H. Res. 268: Mr. DENHAM, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H. Res. 270: Ms. BERKLEY.
H. Res. 282: Mr. HONDA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. HEINRICH.
H. Res. 295: Mr. DENT and Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 317: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KING of New York, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H. Res. 319: Mr. COURTNEY.
H. Res. 325: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.J. Res. 69: Mr. HOLDEN.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT NO. 37: Page 136, line 23, insert before the period at the end the following: ''*Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer $2,000,000,000 to the Secretary of Homeland Security to increase funds available for the State Homeland Security Grant Program under section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT NO. 38: Page 156, line 6, insert after the period at the end the following: ''Of the funds referred to in the preceding sentence, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer $50,000,000 to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration for Small Business Development Centers.''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT NO. 39: Page 135, line 11, insert before the period at the end the following: ''*Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer $236,000,000 to the Secretary of Transportation for the National Infrastructure Investments program''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT NO. 40: Page 150, line 13, insert before the colon the following: ''*Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer $227,000,000 to the Secretary of the Treasury for the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. COHEN

AMENDMENT NO. 41: Page 133, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $200,000,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. COHEN

AMENDMENT NO. 42: Page 135, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $14,000,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $14,000,000,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. HOLT

AMENDMENT NO. 43: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to close the defense commissary store at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. HOLT

AMENDMENT NO. 44: Page 135, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $35,000,000)''.

Page 146, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.