



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 3, 2011

No. 79

## House of Representatives

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 thank You that You have been our help in decades past and will be our hope for years to come. We pause in Your presence and ask guidance for the men and women of the people's House.

Send Your Spirit of Wisdom as they face this day with difficult decisions to be made, work to be done, burdens to be carried, and life to be lived as best they can.

Keep love's banner floating over all of us as we walk in the way of those who act with justice, love with mercy, and walk with humility before You. Help us to fashion our desires, our duties, and our deeds in accordance with Your will, that we may labor for a better world filled with good people who labor for the well-being of all.

Bless us this day and every day. And may all that is done within the people's House this day be done 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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. CHU 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.

### AMERICAN FAMILIES NEED JOBS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this morning's announcement of an increase in the unemployment rate indicates yet again that the President's economic policies are failing American families. The out-of-control spending is killing small business job creation.

Sadly, more than 14 million people are still without jobs, and the average price of gasoline is almost \$4 a gallon. The President pledged to reduce unemployment to 8 percent and failed. He pledged to skyrocket energy costs and he succeeded. This is a failure of leadership on job creation and gas cost. American families are at risk.

Earlier this week, the President asked Congress to increase the debt limit by \$2.4 trillion with no meaningful reforms. Reforms are needed because American families need jobs. The President's request was defeated in a bipartisan vote.

House Republicans presented the "Cut and Grow" congressional plan. It's a commonsense plan: first cut spending, then the economy will grow. That's how to create jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

### REPUBLICAN PLAN TO END MEDICARE

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are trying to sell America's seniors a false bill of goods. Republicans claim that seniors won't be impacted by their plan to end Medicare. That simply isn't true.

What's true is that insurance bureaucrats will be placed in between seniors and their doctors. What's true is that a senior in my State of California will be forced to pay \$6,000 extra in out-of-pocket expenses; then, once the Republican plan to end Medicare takes full effect, those out-of-pocket expenses will double. Imagine our seniors being turned away at the pharmacy. Imagine seniors having to reach deeper into their wallet after a doctor's visit.

The GOP plan to end Medicare is unacceptable. We must keep our promises to our seniors.

### COMMENDING NORTH DAKOTA VOLUNTEERS

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

Mr. BERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the countless volunteers who have given time and resources in the wake of unprecedented flooding.

As thousands of North Dakotans fight to protect their homes and communities, North Dakotans have come together to fill sandbags, to help those in need, providing food for volunteers and shelter for those who have been displaced by flooding.

This has truly been a team effort, working together with Senator CONRAD and Senator HOEVEN, Governor Dalrymple, mayors and Federal officials to ensure that North Dakota receives the vital support to fight this

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g.,  1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3989

flood and rebuild as soon as the flood is over.

I commend State and local officials and the North Dakota National Guard for the tremendous work that they have done, working tirelessly to prepare for this flood and quickly responding to those who need help, and most importantly, to the tens of thousands of volunteers who embody North Dakota's spirit and show that in times of hardship that they will pull together and get the job done.

Again, I thank all the volunteers, and our hearts go out to those who are fighting the flood.

#### DON'T END MEDICARE

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, my constituents are wondering when the House majority will hear their cries: Don't end Medicare. In fact, a recent CNN poll showed opposition to the Road to Ruin budget that ends Medicare, with the highest amongst those being senior citizens at 74 percent opposed to the plan.

In addition, the voters in the 26th Congressional District of New York recently made their voices heard when they elected Representative KATHY HOCHUL to be the newest Member of Congress. Their top concern was that the Republican budget threatens to end Medicare. They know that under the plan, anyone under the age of 55 will be forced to save an extra \$182,000 just to pay for their future health care costs in retirements. That number rises to a startling \$400,000 for those in their thirties. These statistics are even more astounding when you consider the billions of dollars in tax breaks Republicans have given away to our country's wealthiest individuals as well as Big Oil companies.

Enough is enough. If Republicans are serious about protecting our Nation's seniors, they would work with us to strengthen Medicare, not end it.

□ 0910

#### THE PLAN TO END MEDICARE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are doubling down on their plan to end Medicare, voting this week for a second time on their Road to Ruin budget that ends Medicare. Republicans instead should listen to the will of the people, who overwhelmingly oppose their Medicare plans, and instead work in a bipartisan way to address deficits and strengthen Medicare.

The Republican budget more than doubles costs for future generations and puts insurance companies back in charge. According to the CBO, in 2022 the average senior will see their costs

increase by more than \$6,000, and the Republican budget also cuts benefits for today's seniors. It reopens the prescription drug doughnut hole, increasing costs for the estimated 4 million seniors who fall into the coverage gap by as much as \$44 billion over the next decade, including \$2.2 billion in 2012 alone. It also increases costs for preventive care and eliminates the annual wellness benefit.

The Republican budget has the wrong priorities and makes the wrong choices for seniors and middle class families.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 292, REGARDING DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN LIBYA, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 51, LIBYA WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 294 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 294

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 292) declaring that the President shall not deploy, establish, or maintain the presence of units and members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Libya, and for other purposes. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Libya, if called up by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or her designee. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for one hour, with 30 minutes controlled by Representative Ros-Lehtinen of Florida or her designee and 30 minutes controlled by Representative Kucinich of Ohio or his designee. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to its adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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. SCOTT of South Carolina. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. House Resolution 294 provides for a closed rule for consideration of two measures, House Concurrent Resolution 51 and House Resolution 292.

This rule allows for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 51, consistent with the War Powers Act, and provides for an alternative measure introduced by the Speaker of the House. I support the Speaker's resolution and the ability to have up-or-down votes on both resolutions.

This approach is consistent with the Speaker's and our conference's goal of a more open and transparent process, allowing the House to work its will on both resolutions. Members can vote for one of the resolutions, both of the resolutions, or neither of them.

The underlying legislation addresses the administration's actions in Libya. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 2011, President Obama ordered U.S. military intervention in Libya as a part of a multinational coalition. Well over 60 days later—let me say that one more time—over 60 days later the President has still not asked for, nor has he received, authorization from Congress to commit troops to such action.

Mr. Speaker, article I of our Constitution states that Congress, and only Congress, has the power to declare war. This point was made best in 2007 by then-Senator Barack Obama, who said: "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."

Just in case we missed that, the current President got it right in 2007 when he was a Senator. I want to quote him one more time. He said that "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."

While the United States must play offense in the war on terror, and we should not have to wait for threats to materialize before acting. It is not clear, it is simply not clear that Libya posed a threat to our Nation that justified the use of troops, the United States' troops.

It is undeniable that Qadhafi is one of the most notorious terrorists of our time, and the world will be a better place when he is gone. But at the same time, there is no shortage of dictators who should be removed from power. Syria's Assad is butchering his own people as we speak. Iran, under Ahmadinejad, sponsors terrorism around the world, he persecutes religious minorities, and is working to develop a nuclear bomb.

Moreover, the President has not outlined the purpose or the scope of our action in Libya. Is the objective the removal of Qadhafi from power? If so, who will replace Qadhafi? And what assurances do the American people have that the alternative will be any better than Qadhafi?

House Resolution 292 accomplishes four objectives. First, it establishes that the President of the United States, President Obama, has not asked for congressional authorization for a military involvement in Libya, and that Congress has not granted such authority. Second, the resolution reasserts that Congress has the option to withhold funding for any unauthorized use of the United States Armed Forces, including such activities in Libya. Third, the resolution requires the President to provide within 14 days information to Congress which should have been provided from the start. Fourth, the resolution reaffirms the vote that Congress took just last week that says that there should be no U.S. troops on the ground in Libya unless they are there to rescue American troops.

It is unfortunate, it is very unfortunate that our President has made this resolution necessary. Yet at the same time, we are mindful that the congressional action must consider our responsibilities to our allies, including those that are currently in harm's way. America keeps its promises. We keep our commitments. And we stand by our soldiers and our allies. I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from South Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last week the House spoke quite clearly on the question of Libya during the debate on the fiscal year 2012 National Defense Authorization Act. By a vote of 415-5 on a bipartisan amendment offered by Congressman CONYERS, the House voted against U.S. deploying ground troops in Libya. So the House has clearly stated its position on U.S. military operations in Libya.

But that vote did not touch upon two serious matters, each very much connected to the other. First is the fact that the President did not seek a congressional authorization for a U.S. military operation in Libya in coordination with our NATO allies; nor did the leadership of this House insist on one or pursue one.

Second, under the War Powers Resolution, the President has not sought the authorization of Congress during the required time period to maintain U.S. Armed Forces in military operations in Libya. Simply put, under the War Powers Resolution, the President must obtain congressional authorization for military action that lasts longer than 60 days. If Congress does not authorize military action, the

President must withdraw troops within 30 days.

The 60-day authorization deadline expired on May 20, and the 30-day withdrawal deadline expires on June 19. Therefore, the Congress now has the responsibility to call for the end of U.S. military operations in the absence of a clearly defined authorization for U.S. military operations in Libya.

□ 0920

Last night, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee considered two resolutions: one offered by Representatives KUCINICH, BURTON and CAPUANO, which clearly addresses the violation of the War Powers Resolution and would require the withdrawal of U.S. forces from military operations in Libya. If passed by the House and the Senate, it would have the force of law. The other, offered by the Speaker of the House, is a simple H. Res, a nonbinding resolution, a document which is simply advisory in nature and relevant only as a statement of the House, which reprimands the President for failing to seek proper authorization for our military operations in Libya, asks for reports to provide the House with necessary information regarding national security interests and costs of the Libya operation, and then does nothing. Nothing, Mr. Speaker. It again shirks the responsibility of this House and this Congress as a whole to either take up and pass an authorization for U.S. military operations in Libya, or pass a resolution requiring a withdrawal of U.S. forces and an end to U.S. military operations in Libya.

Mr. Speaker, it's easy to complain, it's easy to lay blame, but it takes leadership to own up to our own responsibilities and take appropriate action, and it takes leadership to handle this process in a responsible way. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, this process does not do that. The Republican leadership rushed their resolution through the Rules Committee without any hearings and without any markup, violating their 3-day pledge to allow people to read the bill. So much for the new, open House of Representatives.

This would be sad, Mr. Speaker, if it weren't so important. War is a serious issue. Whether we are sending unmanned drones, armed jets or American soldiers into harm's way, war must be debated and considered by the Congress in a responsible manner. The Republican leadership, however, is not treating this issue the way it deserves to be treated. This debate deserves better, quite frankly. The American people deserve better.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Just one clarification: The concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 51, does not become law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I am honored to be here with the newly elected freshman member of the First District of South Carolina, TIM SCOTT. I appreciate his leadership on the Rules Committee. The people of South Carolina are very proud of his service. The people of the First District of South Carolina are noted for their strong support of the military. They elect Members to Congress like TIM SCOTT who work for a strong military, a strong national defense in the tradition of Ronald Reagan, of peace through strength.

In the First District, the Congressman has the Citadel, the military college of South Carolina; the Charleston Air Force Base, the Naval Weapons Station, SPAWARS. In fact, I actually grew up there adjacent to a U.S. Coast Guard base, so we know the value of a strong military.

Personally, in fact, Congressman SCOTT's brother was the Command Sergeant Major at Landstuhl, one of the largest military hospitals in the world in Germany. Through his Army experience and family connection, we know that TIM SCOTT is for a strong military and understands as I do how important it is that military force should only be used when it is in America's vital interests.

I have the perspective of being the son of a World War II veteran, a Flying Tiger. I served 31 years in the Army National Guard. I have four sons currently serving in the military. I want our military to be used properly. When the President is right, as he was to follow the advice of General David Petraeus to add troops, the surge in Afghanistan, the resulting success that we see in Afghanistan today, we're happy to support him. But this resolution is very important, because we have not seen from the President of the United States, there has been a failure of leadership in regard to explaining why military forces are being used in Libya.

I'm very pleased with the resolution. The key point that the American people need to know is declaring that the President shall not deploy, establish, or maintain the presence of units and members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Libya. To put troops on the ground, I believe, is highly irresponsible. A case has not been made of why this is in America's vital interests. We know there is great conflict as to who the rebels are. What are these rebels? Are these al Qaeda elements that are attacking the Qadhafi forces? The Qadhafi forces themselves? What would happen if we got involved with troops on the ground? These issues need to be resolved on behalf of the American military, on behalf of the American people, and we urge through this resolution that the answers be provided to the American people, to the American military, to our allies, why are we there? What is America's vital interest?

And so I urge support of the rule and commend the freshman Congressman from South Carolina for his leadership.

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

Again, just so we're all clear here, under the War Powers Act, if a concurrent resolution is passed demanding that the troops are removed from a particular country, then they will be removed, if you believe that the War Powers Act carries any weight, and I believe that the War Powers Act is relevant here. That's what the resolution by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) does.

What the resolution my friends in the Republican leadership have drafted does is nothing. Your resolution doesn't even have to go to the Senate. It won't go to the Senate. It directs the President to do a whole bunch of things that, quite frankly, he can ignore, because this bill doesn't mean anything. What this is—and let's be clear about what this is—is this is a way for some of my friends on the other side of the aisle to kind of cover their back sides, to be able to say to their constituents, We did something tough on Libya. Let me read to you how tough the language is in the bill that the Speaker of the House has drawn up. A lot of tough language. It sounds good. Except when you look a little bit more closely, you realize that this is an H. Res, which doesn't mean a thing.

So if you're into symbolism, if you're into therapy, you know, vote for the Boehner resolution. If you are interested in action, if you are interested in actually living up to our responsibilities as lawmakers in the United States Congress, then I would suggest that you look at the resolution that the gentleman from Ohio has drafted.

You can talk all you want about how the Republican alternative here is somehow meaningful, but it really isn't. Again, I shouldn't be surprised. No one should be surprised here, because most of what they have done since they assumed control of the Congress has been meaningless, has been symbolic. Whether it's dealing with health care or jobs, which they don't want to talk about, you name it, a lot of it has been mostly symbolic. I think on the issue of war, we should take it more seriously and be more honest with the American people as to what we're doing.

At this point I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, what we are confronted with today is not primarily a question of foreign policy or even of war policy. We are presented with a question of constitutional law and of the prerogatives of the United States Congress. Shall the President, like the King of England, be a dictator in foreign policy? Shall the President have the unfettered right to take this country to war without so much as a "by your leave" from Congress as the King of

England could do without authorization from Parliament?

The authors of our Constitution answered that question in the negative. They said, "No, we don't trust kings, we don't trust executives to make a decision to go to war. We want that to be the prerogative of the people as represented by the Congress."

□ 0930

A whole series of Presidents since World War II have forgotten that, starting with Harry Truman in the Korean War and Lyndon Johnson in the Vietnam War right up to the present.

Now, there are reasons for this, and I will go into that when I speak on the Kucinich resolution a little later. I would simply observe now I am going to vote for the Boehner resolution, but I am also going to vote for the Kucinich resolution.

The Boehner resolution is fine as far as it goes, but it doesn't deal with the basic problem. The Boehner resolution says the President has failed to provide Congress with a compelling rationale based upon U.S. security interests for current United States military activities, that is true. Frankly, I do not understand why we are in Libya.

The Boehner resolution then says the President shall transmit to the House of Representatives all kinds of information, basically saying why we are there, and that's good. You should have done that before we went there, but it's good that we demand this information now. But then the Boehner resolution stops.

All it demands of the President is that he gives us his reasons. And his reasons, maybe we will agree with him, maybe we won't. Maybe they are sufficient, and maybe they are not.

Then it says, "Findings.

"(a) The President has not sought, and Congress has not provided, authorization for the introduction or continued involvement of the United States Armed Forces in Libya."

That's true.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman.

"(b) Congress has the constitutional prerogative to withhold funding for any unauthorized use of the U.S. Armed Forces, including for unauthorized activities regarding Libya."

That's also true, but so what. It doesn't direct anything. It doesn't say that what the President did was outside his powers. It doesn't direct that the activity stop. It doesn't do anything. I think we should do something, because if in this situation we do not reclaim congressional powers, I can think of no set of circumstances under which the President cannot go to war without going to Congress first, no set of circumstances. And that turns the Constitution and the intentions of our Framers and the intentions of our whole constitutional law system on its head.

Therefore, I urge a vote of "yes" on the Boehner resolution and a vote of "yes" on the Kucinich resolution, which, unlike the Boehner resolution, actually does something about the situation we find ourselves in.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

Mr. DENHAM. You know, this could not be any more serious. It's important for us to debate what our servicemembers are doing in foreign conflicts.

The War Powers Act, it is important to make sure that the President understands from Congress exactly what we are willing to do with our American troops and where we are willing to fight.

But I do agree he has to give us his reasons. In Desert Storm, we knew why we were there. We knew what our role was, we knew what our goals were, we knew what our exit strategy was.

These are the very reasons that we are looking for before we appropriate funds, before we put our troops at risk, before any boots go to the ground, before this conflict escalates any further, before a new government comes into play, we expect these answers to be given to us. We expect the President to do his job, to show leadership, to address Congress and explain why he is committing American servicemembers.

So this is very serious. It is very serious and it's long overdue. The President should have come here first. He certainly should have come here within 60 days. It is long overdue, it is very serious, and the time to demand answers is now.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I hear a lot of talk on the other side about the Boehner resolution requires the President to do this, it directs him to do that, he must do this, he shall do this. But the way you have presented this in this H. Res. form, the President doesn't have to do anything. So let's not fool ourselves, and let's not fool the American people that somehow this is meaningful.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. This could be no more a somber debate than what we are doing here today, and I thank the manager, Mr. MCGOVERN, and the gentleman from South Carolina for recognizing, through the leadership of our House, that the American people must be engaged in the constitutional duties that have been set out for the three branches of government.

Under the Constitution, the war powers are divided between Congress and the President, and among other relevant grants, Congress has the power to declare war and raise and support armed forces while the President is the Commander in Chief.

The congressional duties fall under article 1, section 8, and the Commander

in Chief can relate his or her duties to article 2, section 2.

It is generally agreed that the Commander in Chief role gives the President power to utilize the armed services to repel attacks against the United States. But there has long been a challenge or controversy over whether he or she is constitutionally authorized to send forces into hostile situations abroad without a declaration of war or congressional authorization.

And so here we are today indicating that it is important for the Commander in Chief, no matter how much respect there is, to be able to respond to the call of the Congress. There are now two resolutions that swirl around the violence and horrific acts in Libya. Compounding the problem is a continued violence, an assault on the people of Libya.

So for a moment let me focus on General Qadhafi to ask him the question, is he reasoned, and does he recognize that the slaughter of his people must stop? The President of South Africa engaged in peace talks with General Qadhafi, and many of us thought that the white flag would be raised and that there would be an opportunity for resolution. We see that not coming.

So my message to General Qadhafi is to stop this senseless and violent war, to allow your people to accumulate the privileges of human dignity, that is to be able to live in peace and hopefully to secure democratic rights for themselves. But at the same time we in the United States cannot stand by and watch as violence proceeds. We must have procedure. We must have process.

I believe the Boehner amendment gives at least some tracking as to what you are asking the President for, but I still quarrel with the debate and the question as to whether or not that is enough.

I am supporting this rule so that we can move forward to begin to debate this question of the War Powers Resolution, and it is important that the branches of government understand you cannot roll over the Constitution. The Constitution does not allow us to ignore the Supreme Court's decisions on war. It does not allow us, in essence, to ignore the responsibilities of Congress.

So I rise today to support this debate and to support the premise that Congress must exercise its authority to declare war.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the 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 for yielding and congratulate him on his management of this extraordinarily important rule.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by saying that I listened to my friend from Worcester. I was upstairs, and I want to express my appreciation to him for

his very sincere institutional commitment, his commitment to our recognizing the preeminence of the first branch of government, and the fact that we, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. BOEHNER, all of us, Democrat and Republican alike, recognize that the President of the United States, under article 2 and article 1, has the responsibility, the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to, in fact, engage the United States Congress.

Now, I think that a little clarification may need to be made at this juncture because, as I listen to the debate there seems to be quite a bit of confusion. People often talk about the "War Powers Act."

Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as the "War Powers Act." There was a War Powers Resolution that passed that does not have the power and the strength of an enacted law.

□ 0940

Similarly, Mr. KUCINICH's resolution, which we will be considering and this rule makes in order, is a measure that will not have the force of law. Yes, it is true that it is an H. Con. Res, meaning that it will be considered in the Senate as well, assuming it passes this House, but it does not have the force of law. And no one, Mr. Speaker, should try to make that claim.

Similarly, the H. Res. that Mr. BOEHNER has offered I personally believe is more responsible because the notion of our calling for withdrawal within 2 weeks is something that virtually everyone has said cannot be done. That's why I believe that Mr. BOEHNER's resolution is a more responsible one than the one offered by my good friend from Ohio. But it, too, does not have the force of law.

So, as we proceed with this debate, I think it's very important for us to recognize that the terms that are being used need to be used correctly.

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

Just, again, we want to make sure everybody has got the right terminology correct and we are clarifying the RECORD. The H. Res. that Mr. BOEHNER has introduced, that my friends on the Republican side are touting as something substantial, gives the appearance of doing something, when in reality it does nothing.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me just say that the characterization that my friend just made of Mr. BOEHNER's resolution would also have to apply to the resolution offered by our friend from Ohio. We're talking about resolutions here. We're not talking about measures that have the power of law. This is not an act. These are resolutions, which are statements being made by this institution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, I'm sorry that the gentleman has

such a low opinion of the War Powers Resolution, but I think it carries more weight than he does.

But I would again say to my colleagues that what Mr. BOEHNER has proposed here has all this tough language in it requiring the President to do this, directing the President to do that, when, in fact, if we pass this, the President is under the obligation to do nothing.

At this point I would like to yield 3 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, because the Constitution vests the authority to declare war in the Congress, I oppose the administration's decision to dispatch American troops into hostilities in Libya without coming here first. I think that was an error. But because I take those constitutional obligations very seriously and because each of us should take them very seriously, I oppose this rule and the underlying resolution from Speaker BOEHNER.

I find it ironic that, at a time when the institution is trying to assert its rightful constitutional place, the Speaker has proposed a resolution which is wholly ineffective and purely symbolic. This resolution pursues a gravely important objective in a rather frivolous and ineffective way.

If we believe that the conduct of a military operation is inappropriate for the country, there are tools available to us under the Constitution. Each one of those tools, whether it involves ceasing appropriations or involves other types of remedies, requires the consent of both the House and the Senate. To be effective, we must be bicameral. And to be bicameral, we have to put a resolution on the floor, the passage of which would lead to consideration by the Senate. The Boehner resolution, by its own terms, does not do that.

So the question the Members ought to be asking themselves here, whether they are for or against the incursion in Libya, whether they think it should cease or continue, is: What is the effect of passing the Boehner resolution?

As a practical and legal matter, the effect is nothing—nothing. All of the items the President would be directed to do, any of the steps the President would be prohibited from taking are meaningless if the Boehner resolution passes because the Boehner resolution does not contemplate being considered by the Senate.

So I would offer this to Members, that if they are looking for a resolution that, in fact, has effect and meaning, Mr. KUCINICH's resolution has real effect and meaning because it is a due exercise of the constitutional authority of the Congress.

The Speaker's resolution, which I take certainly in good faith, has none of that effectiveness and none of that practical consequence. So I would urge

a “no” vote on the rule precisely because of the principle of congressional authority.

If you believe that we should exercise our constitutional authority, then let’s really exercise it. Let’s put something before the body that has real and practical meaning.

I would urge a “no” vote.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our friends on the left continue to call House resolutions frivolous and meaningless. My good friend Mr. MCGOVERN himself just last term had House Resolution 278, Global Security Priorities Resolution.

The fact of the matter is the House needs to position itself so the American people understand what this House is trying to convey to the President of the United States. The fact of the matter is this President continues to do things that, as a Senator, he said were inconsistent with the Constitution. So we are making sure that this House and the people who voted in this House are represented in the public forum.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about our Constitution and the specific role that it grants this Congress.

My constituents back in the Third Congressional District of South Carolina know that I carry a United States Constitution with me every day, and the first time I spoke on this floor, it was to read a portion of this great document. Specifically, I read the article that we’re talking about today, Article I, section 8, clause 11, the enumerated power of Congress and of Congress, alone, to declare war.

Our Founders did not give that right to the executive branch. They invested that responsibility with us. Now, previous Congresses have delegated some of that responsibility with the War Powers Resolution. That’s what’s being used by this President. But I think the time has come for us to have the debate about the wisdom of that and the constitutional obligation our Founders defined for Congress.

Over the past few years, our country has seen a renewed appreciation for the Constitution, a recognition of the wisdom and divine guidance our Founding Fathers had when they crafted this sacred document. The Constitution lists our rights, these rights which were given us directly by God, but also contains the mechanisms to protect our rights from being trampled upon by man.

Among the most important of these protections is the separation of powers. Seeing firsthand the tyranny that can arise from a corrupt centralized power, our Founding Fathers sought to divide the power of government into three independent branches that serve as checks on one another.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress need to know: What is the national interest at stake in Libya? The President cites humanitarian needs, regional stability, and supporting the international community as his justification. I do not believe that these reasons suffice as national security interests. We did not go into Libya with a clear, attainable objective. The risks and costs do not appear to be fully analyzed.

As the President said, we would only be in Libya for days, not months. We’ve been there days. As a matter of fact, we’ve been there 73 days. Seventy-three days after we’ve gotten involved, we still don’t have that answer. We don’t know who we’re supporting. We don’t know whether we have a viable end game, and we don’t have a congressional declaration of war or an authorization of force.

And yet this President chooses to continue to risk American lives, American servicemen and -women, and he continues to spend American treasure at the whims of the United Nations. This President should not be able to simply have wars of choice. He said this action in Libya would be limited.

Our troops have, once again, as always, performed admirably and done the job the President gave them to do. But we now have to do ours.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution is very clear. Only Congress has the power to declare war. If this Congress allows our President to make wars of choice without the rule of law to guide him, we will be just as guilty in not upholding our constitutional obligations.

□ 0950

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

My colleague, Mr. SCOTT, talked about the fact that I have supported House resolutions in the past and that, therefore, we should have more respect for the document that Mr. BOEHNER has put together. I have no problem with House resolutions. They state the views and the beliefs of Members of the House of Representatives.

But what I have a problem with is anybody coming to the floor and holding up the Boehner resolution and saying that it does something that it does not. What the Boehner resolution simply does is it just expresses the view of Congress. Even though it has pretty strong words in it, it doesn’t require the President to do anything. He doesn’t have to do anything if this thing passes.

The other thing I want to say, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee came on the floor here and just kind of pooh-poohed the War Powers Resolution as if it were just some other mere resolution. Quite frankly, I am stunned by his characterization. It is astonishing to me that he would come on the floor and say such a thing.

The fact of the matter is the War Powers Resolution is a joint resolution of Congress, passed by the House and the Senate. It was vetoed, and then it

was overridden. It has the power of law. It is not just a mere resolution. So let’s not put this on the same level as what the Speaker of the House has brought to this floor. It is two different things.

What Mr. KUCINICH does is he responds to the obligations that Congress has under the War Powers Resolution. This is serious stuff. This is important stuff. If we are going to get our terminology straight, we ought to get it straight.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rushed, hyper-partisan process that we are watching today on a very serious issue of war resolution. It is absolutely a given that Congress has a role to play in terms of the President’s action that it should be scrutinized and that we should have the opportunity to weigh in on it. Our Armed Services Committee has been meeting on a regular basis, holding administration officials’ feet to the fire on those very questions. We had a hearing yesterday.

The fact of the matter is, though, just because Congress has the right to weigh in doesn’t mean that we should pass a resolution for resolution sake. The batting average of Congress in terms of rushed resolutions, frankly, folks, is not very good. The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was rushed through the Congress, and we know now today that historians have uncovered the fact that misinformation was presented to the Congress. The Iraq War Resolution in 2002 was rushed through this Congress with bad information.

And we are now seeing today language which was drafted literally overnight being presented to the Members of this body and being asked to weigh in in a deliberative fashion. This is a polemic we are voting on. This is not a carefully balanced, bipartisan process which the people of this country and the people who wear the uniform of this country deserve.

If you read the statement of policy, it is devoid of any of the lead-up to the President’s decision which included a resolution by the Arab League on March 12 to impose a no-fly zone; the U.N. Security Council on March 17 to impose a no-fly zone; and on March 1, the United States Senate voted unanimously, not 51 percent, not 81 percent, not 91 percent, 100 percent in support of a no-fly zone, a Republican and Democratic bipartisan resolution calling on the President to do exactly what he is doing today.

Now, again, there is no question, 70 days is a long time.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COURTNEY. It is longer than certainly it was originally presented to

this Congress; but the fact of the matter is this resolution, which was drafted in a partisan fashion, is so disappointing to the people who care so profoundly about whether or not the decisions on war and peace are actually going to be deliberated, debated, and voted on in a serious fashion. We are left with this truncated process that is, again, almost an insult to the people of this country.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when you look at what we are doing here today, the gentleman to the left got it wrong. The bottom line is that Members of the House of Representatives have a choice. They can do one of two or three things. They can vote for House Resolution 292, or they can vote for Concurrent Resolution 51. They can do both, or they can do neither.

The fact of the matter is, to trivialize or to belittle the process we are undertaking on behalf of the American people ought to give us cause to pause and ask ourselves: Who is playing the games?

We want the President of the United States to abide by the Constitution. You've heard Democrats and Republicans agree this morning on one clear fact: he didn't; and that's why we are here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from South Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say from the very beginning that Mr. MCGOVERN and I don't often agree on issues, but we do agree that this is a very serious issue that we are dealing with today. And yesterday in the Rules Committee, all of us dealt with this in a very serious way.

Mr. Speaker, we live in the greatest country in the world. A major part of what makes us so great is that we are a Nation of laws and not of men, and our rule of law is based on God's laws and our Constitution. Indeed, each one of us in Congress takes an oath to uphold the Constitution when we take our office. The President and Vice President, as well as members of the Cabinet, do the same thing.

We are here today to debate a rule and two resolutions related to the inattention of the President to the Constitution; and I dare say that none of us takes any joy in this, but we feel compelled by our dedication to our founding document to do this because we love our country. By doing all that we can to safeguard the constitutional powers granted to Congress, we are doing our part to keep the United States great and strong.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be very clear about what is not at issue today. This debate is not about our troops. We owe a huge debt of gratitude to our men and women in the military and their families. The troops do what they are sworn to do, what the law requires

them to do: obey the orders of the Commander in Chief. The troops are doing their duty. By refusing to get congressional authorization for military action in Libya, it appears that their Commander in Chief is not.

The Constitution was designed to be a check on the power of our government, hence the term "enumerated powers." Each of the three branches has very limited powers with Congress having its own unique role and powers, one of which, an important one of which, is the power to declare war.

My focus this morning will be on the abrogation of the constitutional and statutory responsibility by the President in regard to his actions on Libya. In other words, the authorization to use military force is given to the President by this body and none other. And it is in accordance with our Constitution that we are here asserting our sworn constitutional duty and telling the President he does not have the support nor the authority that he claims to have in order to continue military operations in Libya.

I have often urged people to read Orwell's book "1984" because the language used by President Obama in particular on the Libya issue to muddy the waters is so reminiscent of the language used in that book about a country where the government controls everything, including the minds of the people, partly by the use of language that is completely distorted.

Mr. Speaker, I have read the letter that President Obama sent to Congress. He should have come in person to make his case, but even then I doubt we would agree to continue operations in Libya. The letter that the President sent does not even begin to comply with the requirements of the War Powers Resolution. Let me read parts of it and enter the entire letter into the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

Here is how the letter begins: "On March 21, I reported to the Congress of the United States, pursuant to a request from the Arab League and authorization by the United Nations Security Council, had acted 2 days earlier to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe by deploying U.S. forces to protect the people of Libya from the Qadhafi regime. As you know, over these last 2 months, the U.S. role in this operation to enforce U.N. Security Council Resolution 1973 has become more limited, yet remains important."

Here is where I want to get into this convoluted language.

□ 1000

Thus, pursuant to our ongoing consultations, I wish to express my support for the bipartisan resolution drafted by Senators KERRY, MCCAIN, LEVIN, FEINSTEIN, GRAHAM, and LIEBERMAN, which would confirm that the Congress supports the U.S. mission in Libya and that both branches are united in their commitment to supporting the aspirations of the Libyan people for political reform and self-government.

Mr. Speaker, this is doublespeak of the worst kind—a resolution drafted, never introduced or passed, which would confirm that Congress supports the U.S. mission. The President is dreaming when he talks about this language.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate: This debate is not about our troops; it's about our Constitution. Our men and women in uniform are doing their duty by following orders. They make me and the rest of us very proud. We are a blessed Nation to have such men and women in the military.

This is about our oath to protect and defend the Constitution, about the checks and balances our Founding Fathers had in mind when they broke away from an imperial monarchy. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

#### LETTER FROM PRESIDENT OBAMA

On March 21, I reported to the Congress that the United States, pursuant to a request from the Arab League and authorization by the United Nations Security Council, had acted 2 days earlier to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe by deploying U.S. forces to protect the people of Libya from the Qadhafi regime. As you know, over these last 2 months, the U.S. role in this operation to enforce U.N. Security Council Resolution 1973 has become more limited, yet remains important. Thus, pursuant to our ongoing consultations, I wish to express my support for the bipartisan resolution drafted by Senators Kerry, McCain, Levin, Feinstein, Graham, and Lieberman, which would confirm that the Congress supports the U.S. mission in Libya and that both branches are united in their commitment to supporting the aspirations of the Libyan people for political reform and self-government.

The initial phase of U.S. military involvement in Libya was conducted under the command of the United States Africa Command. By April 4, however, the United States had transferred responsibility for the military operations in Libya to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the U.S. involvement has assumed a supporting role in the coalition's efforts. Since April 4, U.S. participation has consisted of: (1) non-kinetic support to the NATO-led operation, including intelligence, logistical support, and search and rescue assistance; (2) aircraft that have assisted in the suppression and destruction of air defenses in support of the no-fly zone; and (3) since April 23, precision strikes by unmanned aerial vehicles against a limited set of clearly defined targets in support of the NATO-led coalition's efforts.

While we are no longer in the lead, U.S. support for the NATO-based coalition remains crucial to assuring the success of international efforts to protect civilians from the actions of the Qadhafi regime. I am grateful for the support you and other Members in Congress have demonstrated for this mission and for our brave service members, as well as your strong condemnation of the Qadhafi regime. Congressional action in support of the mission would underline the U.S. commitment to this remarkable international effort. Such a Resolution is also important in the context of our constitutional framework, as it would demonstrate a unity of purpose among the political branches on this important national security matter. It

has always been my view that it is better to take military action, even in limited actions such as this, with Congressional engagement, consultation, and support.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for her remarks, much of which I agree with—and I don't always agree with her. I especially appreciate her emphasis on the importance of the War Powers Resolution and how it applies here.

I again want to emphasize the importance of the War Powers Resolution because I was really surprised by the way the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee kind of diminished what the War Powers Resolution is all about. I want to read to you and read to my colleagues a section from a briefing paper that the Congressional Research Service put together. Let me just read this part here:

“Section 1 establishes the title ‘The War Powers Resolution.’ The law is frequently referred to as the ‘War Powers Act,’ the title of the measure passed by the Senate. Although the latter is not technically correct, it does serve to emphasize that the War Powers Resolution embodied in a joint resolution, which complies with constitutional requirements for lawmaking, is a law.”

What I find puzzling is that we're all talking about the importance of the War Powers Resolution, and my friends on the other side of the aisle are saying, Well, that's why you need to support the Boehner H. Res, which, again, does nothing. I mean we could do a press release, and it would have the same impact that the resolution Mr. BOEHNER has introduced would have on the President of the United States and, unfortunately, on the President of the United States to do certain things.

Again, I want to emphasize that there is a War Powers Resolution. It is law. It is important that we understand that and understand we have a role in that. What Mr. KUCINICH is trying to do is to assert the proper congressional role with regard to War Powers Resolution. What my friends on the other side of the aisle are trying to do is, I guess, either provide cover for Members so they don't have to vote for Mr. KUCINICH's resolution or to make a statement, but it doesn't really do anything.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I applaud Speaker BOEHNER for raising this important issue today before the House.

I cannot agree more with the Speaker that the President has failed to explain to the Nation the purpose and goals of our military operation in Libya. The Speaker's resolution rightly demands answers from the President with regard to U.S. security interests

and military objectives in our engagement in Libya. I would go even further than that to suggest that the President has been in violation of the law and has set out specific responses from Congress.

But let's be clear: Congress must engage in a full, open and honest debate about sending our brave men and women into harm's way, into combat. We owe that to them, and we owe that to the American people. The Founders intended such a debate when they granted Congress the power to declare war.

The President's complete failure to consult with Congress and receive specific authority as required by the War Powers Act and by the Constitution leads to only one conclusion: that President Obama is in violation of the Constitution and the authority under the War Powers Act as well.

The United States Congress cannot now sit idly by any longer as the President refuses to abide by his constitutional and his legal requirements. So, in conclusion, I believe that Congress must hold this President accountable, and the Speaker's resolution is a first step in that direction.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. I would like to thank my friend and Rules Committee member, Mr. SCOTT, for the opportunity to speak in support of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, we are already fighting a war on two fronts—Iraq and Afghanistan. Our troops and resources are already spread very thin.

On March 19, the President announced that U.S. military forces had joined with our NATO allies to commence operations in Libya. The President did this not only without congressional authorization but without even consulting Congress on the matter. For the first 10 days of this operation, it was under U.S. command before shifting control of all ongoing operations to NATO on March 30. To this day, the President still hasn't come to Congress to ask for formal approval. When the President first committed our military to operations in Libya, he said we were talking about days, not months. Today, we are talking about months, not days.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama has put us in a trick bag with our NATO allies. He knew he was committing our military forces and assets to a mission that would be unpopular, unjustifiable and unconstitutional. So, in an attempt to avoid Congress and Article I of the U.S. Constitution, President Obama transferred operations over to NATO. Although we may not be in control of the mission, there is no doubt that NATO could not move forward without U.S. assets. As my colleague from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) will point out, 93 percent of the cruise missiles, 66 percent of the personnel, 50 percent of

the ships, and 50 percent of the planes are estimated to have cost this Nation over \$700 million to date.

I will support our troops wherever the President sends them. However, I cannot support President Obama's decision to commit our military forces to operations without the constitutionally required congressional authorization.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I can say this to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: While I've been sitting here this morning, I haven't heard anything from either side that I disagree with. I am going to support Speaker BOEHNER's resolution, and I am going to probably oppose Representative KUCINICH's resolution for this reason the Speaker convinced me of, and I listened very carefully to him: With regard to within 2 weeks pulling everything that we have in Libya out and coming home, it would set a dangerous precedent in regard to our NATO allies.

Make no mistake about it, this President got us into this mess. It was his ignoring of the War Powers Resolution. I don't know who was advising him in regard to that, whether or not it was the Attorney General, but it was an absolute mistake. Now that he has committed us—the United States of America and our troops—to NATO through this U.N. resolution, I feel it would be a mistake to immediately, within 14 days, pull the rug out from under that operation.

I am not completely satisfied with the Boehner resolution, but I think it does lay down a marker. It makes a statement. The Speaker was very clear in speaking to us that this is not the end of this, that this is the beginning. We have the ability to amend, if we need to, the War Powers Resolution. We need to make it very clear. I don't know who the President notified in regard to this operation. What did he do—send a tweet to the chairmen of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees and the respective Select Committees on Intelligence? That's not good enough for me, a Member, one of 435 in this body. It should never happen again, and that's what this is all about today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me say that this is not a partisan issue. I hear a lot of partisan rhetoric, but it is not a partisan issue. This is an issue about where we deploy troops, who has the authority to do it and whether or not what the President has done is constitutional.

I will probably support both resolutions, but one of the concerns I have about the Speaker's resolution is that



it says the President shall not deploy, establish or maintain the presence of units and members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Libya.

Most of our wars that we fight now are fought from the air or from battle-ships. We've had about 250 missiles fired in Libya, and about 226 of them are American. We've spent almost three-quarters of \$1 billion already, and it probably will go over \$1 billion. "Boots on the ground" says that we're not going to put troops into Libya, but we've got ships offshore; we've got planes in the air; we've got airmen who are at risk every single day; and we're committing military forces in Libya even though we don't have boots on the ground.

□ 1010

This goes further than boots on the ground. The President does not have the constitutional authority to do what he did.

Now, I think that the Boehner resolution is a good step in the right direction, except for one thing: it limits it to no boots on the ground. We shouldn't have any troops over there.

This was not approved by Congress, by the people. It was approved by the Arab League. It was approved by the United Nations. It was approved by the French and English, but not the American people. And it's costing billions of dollars, or will cost billions of dollars. This is something that should not have happened, and it should never happen again.

Now, if we limit this to boots on the ground, what if the President decides in a week, while we're out on recess, to go into Syria. And they say, well, it says no boots on the ground. He could still attack Syria, Assad there in Syria, with airplanes and missiles.

We must stop this President from making unilateral decisions that the American people do not support and the Congress of the United States does not support.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 5 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious issue, and I want to commend many of my colleagues who have come to the floor today who have spoken very thoughtfully about this issue.

But on this issue, quite frankly, we should have come together in a bipartisan way and crafted a bipartisan resolution and come to this floor as one and spoken as one. That did not happen because politics got in the way.

Anytime over the last several weeks, the Armed Services Committee or the Foreign Affairs Committee could have reported out a resolution on Libya. They didn't. Mr. KUCINICH came to the

House with his resolution. It went through a process that would have compelled a vote. And all of a sudden, the Republican leadership got nervous, and they came up with the Boehner resolution in an attempt to undercut the Kucinich resolution.

If you question whether or not politics had anything to do with it, I would advise you to read the Politico piece that ran: "Boehner told the House Republican Conference during a closed-door meeting on Thursday that he doesn't 'want to turn the floor over to DENNIS KUCINICH,' the liberal Ohio Democrat who has been a driving force against the administration's military action in Libya."

Okay, I get it. But you know what? We could have come together, and the chairman and ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee could have come together, and we could have crafted a bipartisan resolution and done something truly meaningful here. Because, quite frankly, it doesn't matter what political party a President may be. It needs to be made clear that Congress plays a role in war-making. And, unfortunately, in this case I think there's a bipartisan consensus that Congress was just ignored. And that cannot stand.

My problem, again, with the Boehner resolution is that it doesn't do anything. If anybody thinks that passing this resolution is going to compel the White House to do anything differently or provide us with anything that they haven't already provided us with, they're gravely mistaken. It doesn't force the President's administration to do anything. It's a strong statement. I think it's written in a very partisan way, unfortunately; but my friends on the other side of the aisle can do what they want.

But it reminds, I think, all of us who care deeply about these issues that there has to be a better way to do this. And on issues like this, we should come together in a bipartisan way and try to craft resolutions or joint resolutions that mean something and that both sides can feel comfortable supporting.

I also, again, want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for reminding us again of the importance of the War Powers Resolution. It is not just some mere resolution. It is law. It is law. And the reason why we are here today is because we believe that the War Powers Resolution needs to be upheld and that Congress needs to assert its proper role on this issue.

So having said all of that, I will urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule because I think this process is not appropriate. I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Boehner resolution. And I will vote for the Kucinich resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote their conscience on that.

But if you really want to send a message, let's not send a press release. Let's do something that resonates,

that, once again, asserts Congress's proper role in this debate.

We're involved in too many wars. We're going broke. We're losing too many brave men and women in these conflicts. And in the case of Libya, I, like many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, wonder what the point is and what our mission is. It's not clear. That's one of the reasons why Congress should be involved. That's one of the reasons why there should be debate. We need to take this out of the realm of partisanship and kind of return it back to where it belongs. This should be a bipartisan issue here, and I regret that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle chose not to do that.

So I urge a "no" vote on the rule, a "no" vote on the Boehner resolution. I will vote for the Kucinich resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote their conscience on that.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this rule lets the House work its will, without any question. You have a choice. Take the opportunity. Vote your conscience.

This is a place where we are confident and not nervous, but we want to close in a bipartisan way because there's no doubt that we want Americans to come together. And I can think of no more appropriate way to close than to quote then-Senator Barack Obama once again:

"The President does not have the 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."

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, some have argued that under the War Powers Resolution, a concurrent resolution has the force of law. That just is not correct.

Under the Constitution, a law requires the signature of the President. That is true for a declaration of war, for an appropriation, establishment of weights and measures, or any other exercise of legislative power under Article I of the Constitution. Without the Signature of the President, or an override of his veto, it is not a law and just does not bind the Executive.

The Supreme Court highlighted this particular point in its landmark case *INS v. Chadha* which overturned the concept of the legislative veto. The War Powers Resolution predates the Chadha decision, and most constitutional scholars believe that decision creates a constitutional infirmity for resolutions passed pursuant to its terms as they would constitute a legislative veto.

So while both the Speaker's resolution and Mr. KUCINICH's resolution express the policy of the legislative branch, neither has the force of law.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. 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.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 257, nays 156, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

YEAS—257

Adams Gerlach Nugent  
Aderholt Gibbs Nunes  
Akin Gibson Nunnelee  
Alexander Gingrey (GA) Olson  
Altmire Gohmert Palazzo  
Amash Goodlatte Paul  
Austria Gosar Paulsen  
Bachmann Gowdy Pearce  
Bachus Granger Pence  
Barletta Graves (GA) Petri  
Bartlett Graves (MO) Pitts  
Barton (TX) Green, Gene Platts  
Benishek Griffin (AR) Poe (TX)  
Berg Griffith (VA) Pompeo  
Biggert Grimm Posey  
Billray Guinta Quayle  
Bilirakis Hall Rahall  
Bishop (NY) Hanna Reed  
Bishop (UT) Harper Rehberg  
Black Harris Reichert  
Blackburn Hartzler Renacci  
Bonner Hastings (WA) Ribble  
Bono Mack Hayworth  
Boren Heck Richardson  
Boustany Hensarling Rigell  
Brady (TX) Herger Rivera  
Braley (IA) Herrera Beutler Roby  
Brooks Holt Roe (TN)  
Broun (GA) Huelskamp Rogers (AL)  
Buchanan Huizenga (MI) Rogers (KY)  
Bucshon Hultgren Rogers (MI)  
Buerkle Hunter Rohrabacher  
Burgess Hurt Rokita  
Burton (IN) Issa Rooney  
Calvert Jenkins Ros-Lehtinen  
Camp Johnson (IL) Roskam  
Campbell Johnson (OH) Ross (AR)  
Canseco Johnson, Sam Ross (FL)  
Cantor Jones Royce  
Capito Jordan Runyan  
Carter Kelly Ryan (WI)  
Cassidy King (IA) Scalise  
Chabot King (NY) Schilling  
Chaffetz Kingston Schmidt  
Chandler Kinzinger (IL) Schock  
Clarke (NY) Kline Schrader  
Clay Kucinich Engel  
Cleaver Labrador Schweikert  
Coble Lamborn Scott (SC)  
Coffman (CO) Lance Scott (VA)  
Cole Landry Scott, Austin  
Conaway Lankford Scott, David  
Connolly (VA) Latham Sensenbrenner  
Cravaack LaTourette Sessions  
Crawford Latta Shimkus  
Crenshaw Lewis (CA) Shuster  
Culberson LoBiondo Simpson  
Davis (IL) Long Smith (NE)  
Davis (KY) Lucas Smith (NJ)  
Denham Luetkemeyer Smith (TX)  
Dent Lummis Southerland  
DesJarlais Lungren, Daniel Stearns  
Diaz-Balart E. Stivers  
Dold Lynch Stutzman  
Dreier Mack Sullivan  
Duffy Manzullo Terry  
Duncan (SC) Marchant Thompson (PA)  
Duncan (TN) Marino Thornberry  
Ellison Matheson Tiberi  
Ellmers McCarthy (CA) Tipton  
Emerson McCaul Turner  
Farenthold McClintock Upton  
Fincher McHenry Walberg  
Fitzpatrick McKeon Walden  
Flake McKinley Walsh (IL)  
Fleischmann McMorriss Webster  
Fleming Rodgers West  
Flores Meehan Westmoreland  
Forbes Mica Whitfield  
Fortenberry Michaud Wilson (SC)  
Foxx Miller (FL) Wittman  
Frank (MA) Miller (MI) Wolf  
Franks (AZ) Miller, Gary Womack  
Gallegly Mulvaney Woodall  
Garamendi Murphy (PA) Yoder  
Gardner Neugebauer Young (FL)  
Garrett Noem Young (IN)

NAYS—156

Ackerman Green, Al Pascrell  
Andrews Grijalva Pastor (AZ)  
Baca Gutierrez Payne  
Baldwin Hanabusa Pelosi  
Barrow Hastings (FL) Perlmutter  
Bass (CA) Heinrich Peters  
Becerra Higgins Peterson  
Berkley Himes Pingree (ME)  
Bernan Hinojosa Polis  
Blumenauer Hirono Price (NC)  
Boswell Hochul Quigley  
Brady (PA) Holden Rangel  
Brown (FL) Hoyer Reyes  
Butterfield Inslee Richmond  
Capps Israel Rothman (NJ)  
Capuano Jackson (IL) Roybal-Allard  
Cardoza Jackson Lee Ruppersberger  
Carnahan (TX) Ryan (OH)  
Carney Johnson (GA) Sanchez, Linda  
Carson (IN) Johnson, E. B. T.  
Castor (FL) Keating Sanchez, Loretta  
Chu Kildee Sarbanes  
Cicilline Kind Schakowsky  
Clarke (MI) Kissell Schiff  
Clyburn Langevin Serrano  
Cohen Larsen (WA) Sewell  
Conyers Larson (CT) Sherman  
Cooper Lee (CA) Sires  
Costa Levin Slaughter  
Costello Lewis (GA) Smith (WA)  
Courtney Lipinski Speier  
Critz Loeb sack Stark  
Crowley Lowey Sutton  
Cuellar Lujan Thompson (CA)  
Cummings Maloney Thompson (MS)  
Davis (CA) Markey Tierney  
DeFazio Matsui Tonko  
DeGette McCarthy (NY) Towns  
DeLauro McCollum Tsongas  
Deutch McDermott Van Hollen  
Dicks McGovern Velázquez  
Dingell McIntyre Walz (MN)  
Doggett McNeerney Wasserman  
Donnelly (IN) Meeks Schultz  
Doyle Miller (NC) Waters  
Edwards Moore Watt  
Engel Moran Waxman  
Eshoo Murphy (CT) Weiner  
Farr Nadler Welch  
Fattah Napolitano Wilson (FL)  
Filner Oliver Woolsey  
Fudge Owens Wu  
Gonzalez Pallone Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Bass (NH) Kaptur Rush  
Bishop (GA) Lofgren, Zoe Schwartz  
Frelinghuysen McCotter Shuler  
Giffords Miller, George Visclosky  
Guthrie Myrick Young (AK)  
Hinchey Neal  
Honda Price (GA)

□ 1043

Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CAPPs, Messrs. NADLER, RANGEL, DOGGETT, and BECERRA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. ALTMIRE and FRANK of Massachusetts changed their 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 for:

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 410, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

#### REGARDING DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN LIBYA

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 294, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 292) declaring that the President shall not deploy, establish, or maintain the pres-

ence of units and members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Libya, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 294, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 292

*Resolved,*

#### SECTION 1. STATEMENTS OF POLICY.

The House of Representatives makes the following statements of policy:

(1) The United States Armed Forces shall be used exclusively to defend and advance the national security interests of the United States.

(2) The President has failed to provide Congress with a compelling rationale based upon United States national security interests for current United States military activities regarding Libya.

(3) The President shall not deploy, establish, or maintain the presence of units and members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Libya unless the purpose of the presence is to rescue a member of the Armed Forces from imminent danger.

#### SEC. 2. TRANSMITTAL OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH INFORMATION RELATING TO OPERATION ODYSSEY DAWN AND OPERATION UNIFIED PROTECTOR.

The House of Representatives directs the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General, respectively, to transmit to the House of Representatives, not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, copies of any official document, record, memo, correspondence, or other communication in the possession of each officer that was created on or after February 15, 2011, and refers or relates to—

(1) consultation or communication with Congress regarding the employment or deployment of the United States Armed Forces for Operation Odyssey Dawn or NATO Operation Unified Protector; or

(2) the War Powers Resolution and Operation Odyssey Dawn or Operation Unified Protector.

#### SEC. 3. REPORT TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) CONTENTS.—Not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, the President shall transmit to the House of Representatives a report describing in detail United States security interests and objectives, and the activities of United States Armed Forces, in Libya since March 19, 2011, including a description of the following:

(1) The President's justification for not seeking authorization by Congress for the use of military force in Libya.

(2) United States political and military objectives regarding Libya, including the relationship between the intended objectives and the operational means being employed to achieve them.

(3) Changes in United States political and military objectives following the assumption of command by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

(4) Differences between United States political and military objectives regarding Libya and those of other NATO member states engaged in military activities.

(5) The specific commitments by the United States to ongoing NATO activities regarding Libya.

(6) The anticipated scope and duration of continued United States military involvement in support of NATO activities regarding Libya.

(7) The costs of United States military, political, and humanitarian efforts concerning Libya as of June 3, 2011.

(8) The total projected costs of United States military, political, and humanitarian efforts concerning Libya.

(9) The impact on United States activities in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(10) The role of the United States in the establishment of a political structure to succeed the current Libyan regime.

(11) An assessment of the current military capacity of opposition forces in Libya.

(12) An assessment of the ability of opposition forces in Libya to establish effective military and political control of Libya and a practicable timetable for accomplishing these objectives.

(13) An assessment of the consequences of a cessation of United States military activities on the viability of continued NATO operations regarding Libya and on the continued viability of groups opposing the Libyan regime.

(14) The composition and political agenda of the Interim Transitional National Council (ITNC) and its representation of the views of the Libyan people as a whole.

(15) The criteria to be used to determine United States recognition of the ITNC as the representative of the Libyan people, including the role of current and former members of the existing regime.

(16) Financial resources currently available to opposition groups and United States plans to facilitate their access to seized assets of the Libyan regime and proceeds from the sale of Libyan petroleum.

(17) The relationship between the ITNC and the Muslim Brotherhood, the members of the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group, al-Qaeda, Hezbollah, and any other group that has promoted an agenda that would negatively impact United States interests.

(18) Weapons acquired for use, and operations initiated, in Libya by the Muslim Brotherhood, the members of the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group, al-Qaeda, Hezbollah, and any other group that has promoted an agenda that would negatively impact United States interests.

(19) The status of the 20,000 MANPADS cited by the Commander of the U.S. Africa Command, as well as Libya's SCUD-Bs and chemical munitions, including mustard gas.

(20) Material, communication, coordination, financing and other forms of support between and among al-Qaeda operatives, its affiliates, and supporters in Yemen, the Horn of Africa, and North Africa.

(21) Contributions by Jordan, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, and other regional states in support of NATO activities in Libya.

(b) TRANSMITTAL.—The report required by this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, with a classified annex, as deemed necessary.

#### SEC. 4. FINDINGS.

(a) The President has not sought, and Congress has not provided, authorization for the introduction or continued involvement of the United States Armed Forces in Libya.

(b) Congress has the constitutional prerogative to withhold funding for any unauthorized use of the United States Armed Forces, including for unauthorized activities regarding Libya.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The 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.

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

I rise in strong support of House Resolution 292, sponsored by our distinguished Speaker. As the resolution states at the outset, the Armed Forces of the United States may only be used to defend and advance the national security interests of the United States, not to enforce, to quote the President, "the writ of the international community," nor because of the United Nations, nor because of the Arab League. Yet these are what the President has repeatedly pointed to in justifying sending U.S. forces into action in Libya.

But what he has not done is explain to the American people and to Congress how the situation in Libya, if allowed to spiral out of control, poses a threat to U.S. national security interests.

It is an increasingly important region, Mr. Speaker, with implications stretching into other areas that are vital to our Nation. Little, if any, details have been provided in response to repeated questions regarding U.S. goals, the costs of the operation, the scope of the operation, and other issues of direct relevance to our national security. It is an open question as to whether the administration simply won't tell us or whether they just don't know the answers.

Members on both sides of the aisle are increasingly frustrated. I share that frustration. Many question the importance of Libya to U.S. interests, and especially the need for military engagement. Many more are outright angry about the disregard with which the President and his administration have treated Congress on the Libya military engagement.

But it is not surprising that there is a desire to simply say "enough" and to force the President to withdraw precipitously, regardless of the consequences. But I believe that we would only make a difficult situation worse by taking such drastic action. The negative impact would be widespread, Mr. Speaker. The news that the U.S. House of Representatives had mandated a withdrawal of U.S. forces would send a ray of sunshine into the hole in which Qadhafi is currently hiding. It would ensure his hold on power. It would be seen not only in Libya, but throughout the Middle East and North Africa as open season to threaten U.S. interests and destabilize our allies.

Pulling out of the NATO operation would also undermine our NATO partners, who, after years of prodding by us, have finally begun to take more responsibility for ensuring security and stability in the region. How could we then argue that they must maintain their commitment to our allied efforts in Afghanistan when we have just pulled the rug out from under them in Libya?

We must not let our frustration with the President's contempt for Congress cloud our judgment and result in our taking action that would harm our standing, our credibility, and our interests in the region. But clearly, we must speak out.

This resolution offered by Speaker BOEHNER would send an unambiguous warning to the President that he must either change course in his dealings with Congress and the American people or have the decisions regarding U.S. involvement in Libya taken out of his hands.

□ 1050

It states a fundamental truth that I assume that most in this Chamber agree with that U.S. forces must only be used to defend and advance the national security interests of the United States. It underscores that the President has not made a compelling case for U.S. military involvement based on U.S. interests, and it prohibits the employment of U.S. ground forces in Libya so that mission creep would not gradually lead us into an ever-expanding conflict.

It also requires the President to provide to Congress the information that we should have had at the outset, including, Mr. Speaker:

What are the political and military objectives of the United States and Libya?

How do we intend to achieve them? What specific commitment have we made to our NATO operations, and how might these impact our commitments in Afghanistan?

What is the anticipated scope, the duration, and the anticipated cost of continued U.S. military involvement in Libya?

What is the relationship between opposition forces that are grouped under the Interim Transitional National Council and the Muslim Brotherhood, the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group, al-Qaeda, Hezbollah, and other extremist groups?

How well armed are these and other extremist groups, and how extensive are their activities in Libya?

Who controls thousands of shoulder-fired antiaircraft missiles and stocks of chemical weapons that Qadhafi has acquired?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this resolution bluntly states that the President has neither sought nor received authorization by the Congress for the continued involvement of the United States Armed Forces in Libya. If this clear warning doesn't get the attention at

the White House, then more forceful action may be inevitable. The President can choose to act with the support of Congress and with the support of the American people, but he will not be allowed to proceed without it.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this strong and necessary resolution.

With that, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

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

In March, when the President committed our troops to NATO's mission in Libya, I said that he had a responsibility to the American people to define the mission, to explain what America's role was in achieving that mission and lay out how it was to be accomplished. He has not effectively done so. The American people and the Members of this House have questions and concerns that have gone unanswered.

The President of the United States is our Commander in Chief, and I have always believed combat decisions should be left to the Commander in Chief and to the generals on the ground. But the House also has an obligation to heed the concerns of our constituents and to carry out our constitutional responsibilities.

The resolution I have put forward expresses the will of the people in a responsible way that reflects our commitments to our troops and to our allies.

Let me lay out exactly what this resolution does.

First, it establishes that the President has not asked for and that the Congress has not granted authorization for the introduction or continued involvement of our troops in Libya.

Second, it reasserts Congress' constitutional role to fund our troops.

Third, it requires the President to provide, within 14 days, information on that mission that should have been provided from the start.

And, lastly, it reaffirms the vote that we took last week that says that there should be no troops on the ground in Libya.

I hope the President will recognize his obligations outlined in this resolution and provide this information to Congress and, in doing so, better communicate to the American people what our mission in Libya is and how it will be achieved.

The resolution offered by my colleague from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) conveys the concerns of the American people, but it also mandates a precipitous withdrawal from our role in supporting our NATO allies in Libya. In my opinion, that would undermine our troops and our allies, which could have serious consequences for our broader national security.

In my view, the gentleman's resolution goes too far. We may have differences regarding how we got here, but we cannot turn our backs on our troops and our NATO partners who have stuck by us over the last 10 years.

In 1991 in my first vote as a Member of this body, I voted to authorize the use of force in the first Gulf War. It was a consequential time, but I think we did the right thing. And today is no different. On behalf of the American people and our country, we have an obligation to support our troops in harm's way and to support our allies.

This resolution puts the President on notice. He has a chance to get this right; and if he doesn't, Congress will exercise its constitutional authority and we will make it right.

I urge a "yes" on the Boehner resolution and a "no" on the Kucinich resolution.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

If the Members of the House choose to pass the Speaker's one-Chamber resolution, it should add one finding: that we declare ourselves to be one big constitutionally created potted plant.

This resolution casts all kinds of aspersions on the President. It states the President has failed to provide Congress with a compelling rationale for operations in Libya. It implies that there has been a withholding of documents and information from this body.

Could the President provide more information to the Congress? Of course. But we need to look not just at the President's failure to seek an authorization, but the refusal of this body to exercise its authority in this area. The onus rests with us to recognize the sacred duty of authorizing the use of force.

A resolution like this, with no operative language, with no invocation of the War Powers Resolution and which was presented to Members for the first time just 14 hours ago, simply perpetuates a dynamic of congressional acquiescence and acquiescence that, for the most part, has gone on truly since the Korean War.

There are two choices here. If the majority thinks that the President's initial efforts to stop a humanitarian catastrophe were wrong or that current operations in Libya do not have a compelling national security rationale, it should support Mr. KUCINICH's approach and offer a concurrent resolution pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution requiring the removal of U.S. forces.

If the majority has concerns with Mr. KUCINICH's approach, as many of us do, and believes terminating military action would have grave consequences for U.S. national security, it should simply authorize the use of force in Libya, incorporating the restrictions on ground forces that this resolution has, that the Conyers language in the DOD bill had. I would gladly join the Speaker in co-sponsoring such an authorization of the limited use of force.

But pursuing a nonbinding House Resolution that takes potshots at the

President and amounts to nothing more than a sense of the Congress is just an exercise in political gamesmanship. It is a pedantic effort to embarrass the President without taking any ownership for the policy of the intervention.

The majority, not the President, puts this body in a position of powerlessness through such toothless efforts. We are 60 days into this operation. Either we should authorize this action or terminate, not play around with reporting requirements.

The resolution is also confusing. It states that the President shall not deploy or maintain the presence of U.S. military units on the ground in Libya.

□ 1100

But as the majority well knows, U.S. military activities are limited to air operations and nothing more. So does this language mean the majority is okay with the current intervention in Libya? The majority seems to be raising a fuss while winking at the White House. That's not the way to legislate.

Finally, I object to the resolution because it is downright inaccurate. The resolution implies that there is no compelling national security rationale for operations in Libya. But U.S. interests are clear. They have been forcefully articulated by the administration and, ironically, by conservative advocates like Bill Kristol.

We are in Libya because we are averting a probable massacre against civilians. We are in Libya because our NATO partners need our help. Refusal to act there would send a message to NATO allies, who are putting their forces on the line in Afghanistan, that we are not a dependable partner. We are in Libya because our friends struggling for democracy in the Middle East are watching events there. If we failed to act, or worse, seek withdrawal today, what will we be saying to the activists in Tunisia and Egypt, whose fragile movements for democracy could be stifled by the destabilizing effect of a Qadhafi-led government remaining in power? And what message would we be sending to Assad and to other dictators and enemies about our staying power?

Let's not kid ourselves. A Qadhafi who is unleashed to commit acts of terrorism around the world will do so with unspeakable barbarity. We know Qadhafi's record of bloodshed, and we know his readiness to use terror, especially now that he has nothing to lose. I cannot think of a more compelling rationale for current operations in Libya.

I object to the characterization that U.S. national security interests and humanitarian objectives are incompatible. In Libya, it is quite clear that stopping murder and preventing a refugee crisis very much correspond with U.S. national interests.

The Republican sponsors of this resolution are trying to have it both ways. They want to criticize the President for taking the very action that many of them called for 3 months ago. And

they want to do so without taking any responsibility. In the process, they are offering nothing but criticism, obstruction and endless second-guessing.

President Bush once accused the Democratic Party of becoming “the party of cut and run.” Well, it seems the running shoe is now on the other foot. It is a Democratic President that is taking on a brutal tyrant, and it is the Republican Party that refuses to back him.

I urge my colleagues to take seriously U.S. military involvement in Libya and vote “no” on this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam 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 House Resolution 292 and H. Con. Res. 51.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman on the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say that the Constitution of the United States and the War Powers Act prohibit the President from doing what he did. And I'm kind of torn because I stayed up late last night thinking about this whole issue. I believe that we shouldn't have gone into Libya in the first place, and we certainly shouldn't go into Syria or another place without the authorization of the Congress of the United States.

And that's the reason why I cosponsored the Kucinich resolution, because we have to send a very strong signal that we're not going to go to war without the people of this country supporting it. And the President did this unilaterally after talking to the Arab League and the U.N. and others without the consent of the people of this country. That's the first thing.

The second thing is the Boehner resolution I'm going to support, but it doesn't go far enough. As far as it goes, it's fine. But it talks only about boots on the ground. Most of the wars in which we've been involved are fought in the air with drones, missiles and airplanes. And about two-thirds of the missiles and over half of the sorties flown by the airplanes that are involved in this war, over two-thirds of those are used by the United States. This is an American conflict. And so when we talk about boots on the ground, that's not sufficient.

Now, I'm going to support it as far as it goes because the Speaker is trying to move this in the right direction, but we shouldn't just limit this to boots on the ground. It should involve no military operation whatsoever without the

consent of the Congress and the people of this country. And when the Speaker says boots on the ground only, unless we are going in to save one of our troops that are downed in an air fight or shot down when they go in on a bombing run, then that, in effect, is putting boots on the ground anyhow to get those people out of there.

So, I will support the Boehner resolution, but I prefer the Kucinich resolution because it sends a very strong signal and tells the President, in no uncertain terms, that he cannot take us to war without the consent of the people of this country.

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

I think it's important to get the record straight on what we're doing and what we're not doing. “No boots on the ground” did not come because of this resolution we are considering now. This was the decision of the President, the Commander in Chief, at the time. But the figures given by my friend from Indiana don't reflect the reality of our participation.

What are we doing now? While we're not in the lead, the United States is contributing significantly to the operation: fighter aircraft for the suppression of enemy air defense, ISR aircraft, electronic warfare aircraft, aerial refueling aircraft, one guided missile destroyer and predatory armed unmanned aerial surveillance systems. Twenty-four percent, not two-thirds of the total aircraft; 27 percent of the total sorties flown; over 75 percent of all refueling sorties; 70 percent of intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance.

Now there's no boots on the ground, but to me that involvement implicates the War Powers Resolution. This is within the meaning of that bill. And, once again, only KUCINICH has before us a proposal that seeks to deal with the requirements of the War Powers Resolution.

I just think we should get the record straight about what our involvement is. It's not as large as the previous speaker said, but it is significant. And in my opinion, it's within the terms of the War Powers Resolution.

I'm now pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend from California, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, let me thank our ranking member for yielding. And let me just say, first of all, I rise in opposition to the Boehner resolution.

This debate is long overdue. On March 30, I, along with Representatives WOOLSEY, HONDA, GRIJALVA and WATERS, sent a letter to Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader CANTOR requesting that they hold a debate and floor vote on the President's authority to continue the use of military force in Libya.

I would like to insert the letter into the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, March 30, 2011.

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

Hon. ERIC CANTOR,  
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MAJORITY LEADER CANTOR: We, the undersigned Members of Congress, write to request the U.S. House of Representatives immediately take steps to hold a debate and floor vote on the President's authority to continue the use of military force in Libya.

Under Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution, the responsibility to declare war rests with Congress alone. The War Powers Act of 1973 further clarified the important separation of powers and checks and balances in these matters. Consideration of the Presidents continued military engagement in Libya is our responsibility as elected representatives in the U.S. Congress, and essential to reasserting the undisputed role and responsibility of the Legislative Branch in overseeing and providing for our nation's commitments while at war.

The United States has now been engaged militarily in Libya since March 19, 2011. While we firmly believe that a robust debate and up-or-down floor vote should have occurred in advance of U.S. military action in Libya, it is without question that such measures are still urgently required. Beyond defending Congressional authority in these matters, these deliberations are essential to ensuring that we as a country fully debate and understand the strategic goals, costs, and long-term consequences of military action in Libya.

Many questions remain unanswered regarding our short and long-term responsibilities in Libya as well as our strategy for ending U.S. military operations. The Department of Defense has indicated that the costs of U.S. military operations in Libya totaled \$600 million in the first week alone, and are estimated to mount by as much as \$100 million per week, in the future. At a time of severe economic distress here at home, as well as in recognition of the continued strain on our military service members already engaged in two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, these concerns are especially worthy of congressional deliberation.

It is our position that the President has a constitutional obligation to seek specific, statutory authorization for offensive military action, as he should have done with regard to U.S. military engagement in Libya. We look forward to working with you to address this matter on the House floor as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

BARBARA LEE,  
Member of Congress.

LYNN C. WOOLSEY,  
Member of Congress.

MICHAEL M. HONDA,  
Member of Congress.

RAÚL M. GRIJALVA,  
Member of Congress.

MAXINE WATERS,  
Member of Congress.

Madam Speaker, I would like to read parts of this letter, dated March 30, if I may:

Dear Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader CANTOR: We, the undersigned Members of Congress, write to request the United States House of Representatives immediately take steps to hold a debate and floor vote on the President's authority to continue the use of military force in Libya.

We cite the Constitution, article I, section 8.

We go on to say that the United States has now been engaged militarily in Libya since March 19, 2011. While we firmly believe that a robust debate and up-or-down floor vote should have occurred in advance of U.S. military action in Libya, it is without question that such measures are still urgently required. Beyond defending congressional authority in these matters, these deliberations are essential to ensuring that we as a country fully debate and understand the strategic goals, costs, and long-term consequences of military action in Libya.

That is one paragraph of this sentence.

Now, Madam Speaker, over 60 days since our letter, the Speaker has suddenly and hastily scheduled a resolution that, frankly, does nothing but serve to politicize what is an extremely serious and what should be a non-partisan issue.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

□ 1110

Ms. LEE. As we know, the War Powers Act specifically forbids Armed Forces from engaging in military action in foreign lands for more than 60 days without congressional authorization or the use of military force or a declaration of war.

We have been actively fighting now for 77 days. This is not just about our mission in Libya. And let me just say that I think our President, frankly, has done a commendable job in handling the very complex range of foreign policy issues, but it is about any President, any administration. It is not about that; it is about standing up for congressional power granted in the Constitution. As our ranking member said, the Kucinich amendment is the amendment that addresses this head-on in a very honest and direct way.

So we should reject this politically motivated resolution. It is a resolution that has just come up. We asked again the Speaker and majority leader on March 30 to conduct a debate and an up-or-down vote. We conclude in our letter that it is our position that the President has a constitutional obligation to seek specific statutory authority for offensive military action, as he should have done with regard to U.S. military engagement in Libya.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a valued member of our Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding me this time. I rise respectfully in support of House Resolution 292, which reasserts the congressional war-making authority of section 8, article I of the Constitution, and I respectfully disagree with my ranking member of the

House Foreign Affairs Committee, for whom I have enormous respect.

I don't think this resolution takes gratuitous potshots at the President of the United States. I think it is a thoughtful exposition of the issues in front of us and the requirements that we want to put on the President, and it buys the President time to comply without the disruption that the Kucinich resolution would cause, not only in Libya, but the ramifications for NATO relationships and in the Arab democratic spring.

The resolution prohibits the President from deploying ground troops in Libya, and declares Congress has the constitutional prerogative to withhold funding for any unauthorized use of U.S. Armed Forces. It requires the administration to transmit to the House of Representatives any records regarding congressional communication and Operation Odyssey Dawn in Libya within 14 days of passage.

Madam Speaker, since before the passage of the War Powers Resolution in 1973, the executive branch, regardless of party or leader, has argued that there are inherent constitutional powers contained in the constitutional reference to the President as Commander in Chief. If one argues that section 2, article II of the Constitution grants the President inherent powers as Commander in Chief, then logically one ought to acknowledge that Congress also has inherent powers as the only entity expressly granted the power to declare war in that document.

According to the House report regarding the War Powers Resolution, "consultation . . . means that a decision is pending on a problem and that Members of Congress are being asked by the President for their advice and opinions and, in appropriate circumstances, their approval of action contemplated." This report language makes the intention of the War Powers Resolution clear: Consultation ought to be active, not merely informative. In the War Powers Resolution, the term "hostilities" was used deliberately instead of "armed conflict" precisely because of the former phrase's broader nature. The Constitution and the War Powers Resolution are clear: Congress must have a role with regard to the use and deployment of U.S. forces. The extent of that role has been the subject of debate as old as the United States itself.

To go even further, a strict constructionist would argue that the War Powers Resolution itself limits congressional authority. The act of even acknowledging the need for a statutory framework to codify Congress' powers in the Constitution in fact dilutes those powers and may have the unintended effect of enhancing the Executive's powers directly at the expense of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution, House Resolution 292, to assert congressional authority and to buy the President time with which to comply.

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

I would like to respond to my friend's arguments. I agree with every word he said except that this is a manifestation of the Congress exercising its authority. This is an abdication of Congress exercising its authority, because nowhere in this resolution is the authorization for the operations that we want to authorize, that we should be authorizing if we think they are appropriate.

The gentleman from Ohio doesn't think they are appropriate. Some of us do think it is appropriate, and this isn't about buying time. We are not a supplicant to go to the executive branch and ask for them to request of us authorization. We have the institutional power to decide what to do, and this resolution fails to take that option.

I think the gentleman makes a wonderful case for why this resolution is not sufficient to step up to our responsibilities under the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution.

With that, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have been here a long time, and I have never come to this floor for the purpose of opposing innocuous resolutions. In fact, I've voted for every piece of innocuous legislation and post office renaming in the last 15 years, as far as I can remember. And this is innocuous legislation.

First, it starts with a sense of Congress about our opinion as to what should or shouldn't be done. It has a sentence that purports to prevent the President from putting ground forces in Libya, but in fact just states that's our policy. It is certainly not designed to prohibit the President from doing so; it just says that it's our opinion that he shouldn't. And, by the way, in the Defense authorization bill, we have real legislation that already prohibits putting ground forces in Libya.

It then goes on to ask that a number of questions be answered. There are some who think, that's important. Those who think that the questions propounded in this resolution are actually going to get us useful information are insulting the faculty of the law schools of America, because both the Pentagon and the State Department have lawyers capable of writing long and meaningless answers to every question we propound. And as for getting documents, some of the documents demanded we already have, and as for the rest, those same lawyers will be writing long documents about executive privilege.

So we have here a document that at most is just questions for the RECORD that the chairwoman of our committee allows me to add at the end of so many hearings; hardly earthshaking, certainly innocuous.

But, okay, so it's innocuous. Or is it?

This is innocuous legislation that plays a particular role in avoiding the constitutional role of this Congress. It allows us to sidestep the War Powers Act. It gives cover to those who don't want to authorize, or refuse to authorize. It says we're an advisory body. We ask some questions so we can give good advice. We will give the President some advice. It is part of the trend of an aggrandizing executive and a derelict Congress, a Congress that almost is complicit in this slow process by which we are not legislators, we are not deciders; we inquire and we advise.

The Constitution is clear, but the War Powers Act is more clear: the President must ask for congressional authorization. Then we actually have to act, and that is tough. We have to review the proposals, and I believe our ranking member (Mr. BERMAN) would have one that would say, What are we going to authorize? Under what conditions? What demands will we make of our allies in Libya to perhaps turn over to us, or at least disassociate themselves from, the al Qaeda operatives in their midst? Are we going to limit the duration? Are we going to limit the scope? Are we going to impose limits on the total cost?

With this resolution, we can avoid all of those questions. We can avoid demanding a withdrawal. We can avoid limiting the authorization, and we can allow the President to continue to write the blank check that apparently he believes he has, and we can do it all while disassociating ourselves with anything unpopular that ever happens over the skies of Libya.

Now is not the time for us to shirk our responsibilities. Our responsibility is to act as a policy-making body.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask the gentleman for 1 more minute.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

□1120

Mr. SHERMAN. Now is the time for us to play the role that the War Powers Act provides, because this is not an immediate short-term emergency situation. It has gone on for much longer than 60 days. It should not go further.

Now, 208 Members of this Congress voted for my amendment yesterday to say that we should not expend funds in violation of the War Powers Act, and you were willing to vote for it even though I put it on a bill as to which it really didn't pertain. Thank you for those votes, but now please come back here and say, It's time to enforce the War Powers Act. It's time not to dodge the War Powers Act. It's time for our policy over the skies in Libya to be determined by the President and Congress, not the President advised by Congress.

Vote "no" on this resolution. Don't use it as a sidestep. Instead, go back to your constituents and say, You are for voting either for a withdrawal from Libya or for a full authorization or for a limited authorization.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to my friend and colleague from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank my friend and the chairman for yielding me this time because I think it is important to stress the importance of the Boehner resolution. Especially on page 4 and page 7 of the resolution, it deals specifically with the Constitution and the constitutional responsibility of the administration and the Congress to work together, especially in matters of national security.

As chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, as my colleague has said, my responsibility is to provide for the funding for any military operation that is approved by the Commander in Chief and approved by the Congress.

On the matter of Libya, on April 1, I sent a letter to the President, trying to exercise my responsibilities as chairman—a conciliatory letter, actually—expressing support for our troops but asking certain questions: How long do you think this will last? How much do you think it will cost? How much of a future commitment have we made? What will be the source of the funding for this operation? Here, more than 2 months later, this official request from the Appropriations Committee still remains unanswered by the administration. That's just not right.

The Constitution is pretty clear. Article I, section 9 of the Constitution, in part, reads, "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."

So far, on the Libya issue, this article I, section 9 has been totally ignored. It's just not right. That's a violation, in my opinion, and contravenes the Constitution, itself. When I asked for that information, the only thing I got on the cost of this Libyan operation was in bits and pieces. We have added it, and we have come to about \$750 million already spent on the Libyan mission. They've not confirmed that, but we have put together, with our own addition, bits and pieces on that. Again, we have received no reply whatsoever.

What I'm wondering is: Where is the money to pay for the Libyan operation coming from? What account is it coming from? Is it coming out of personnel costs—soldiers' pay? Is it coming out of medical care? Is it coming out of the training for our troops? What accounts are being used? We have a right and an obligation under the Constitution to know the answer to that.

Speaker BOEHNER's resolution calls very, very sharp attention to that issue, so I think it is important that the House passes the Boehner resolution to let the President know that we are not going to allow him to ignore the Constitution any further when it comes to war powers, when it comes to spending for the welfare of our troops, when it comes to appropriating money for the defense of our Nation and for the defense of our allies.

Madam Speaker, I do ask that the letter that I sent to the President, which has remained unanswered for more than 2 months, be included at this point in the RECORD so that my colleagues can see that it was a very, very legitimate and a very conciliatory request, basically an offer to support our troops in any legitimate activity. So we are still waiting. We are standing by, hoping that we do hear from the President very soon, maybe shortly after we pass the Boehner resolution.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,

Washington, DC, April 1, 2011.

President BARACK OBAMA,

The White House,

Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Recent events across northern Africa and the Middle East demonstrate the powerful effect that the prospect of self-government and basic human rights can have on an oppressed population. Governments have fallen and nations have changed, all in the name of freedom. Operation Odyssey Dawn (now Unified Protector), based on United Nations Security Council Resolution 1973, is another chapter in this remarkable story that history is writing before us.

The Members of the House Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations stand ready to support our brave men and women in uniform as they carry out their mission, but it is essential that we know precisely what that mission is, and what role U.S. troops have in achieving that mission. For example, enforcement of a no-fly-zone is one thing, but the use of AC-130 gunships and A-10 aircraft denote an entirely different battle. And without knowing what goals we hope to achieve, our long-term commitment is unclear. Indeed, as history has taught us, without defined goals or objectives the probability of an open-ended campaign increases. As our nation continues to struggle through the current fiscal crisis, an exit strategy seems all the more prudent. There was, however, little to no consultation with Congress prior to these actions, and almost two weeks after our first engagement, many of these concerns remain unaddressed.

The Department of Defense has indicated that through March 28, they spent approximately \$550 million in support of Operation Odyssey Dawn; and they expect to spend at a minimum another \$40 million a month as we continue to support the now NATO-led Operation Unified Protector. This assumes a reduced U.S. role, which could change significantly if NATO requires additional support. It was also made clear that there would be no additional funds requested by your Administration, either in the form of a supplemental request or a budget amendment. In fact, you stated that the costs of this mission could be paid for out of previously appropriated funds. As this Committee works to finish fiscal year 2011 and begins work on fiscal year 2012, I feel it is imperative that we know where you believe these funds will come from. Based on the above Department

of Defense rate, costs for fiscal year 2011 could reach \$800 million, and depending on the length of our commitment, another \$500 million in fiscal year 2012. I do not need to remind you that the Department of Defense fiscal year 2012 request is already \$13 billion below where it was estimated it would be just a year ago—the reduction taken in the name of efficiencies.

As the nation's military continue to serve in harm's way, I feel it is imperative we proceed with complete openness and transparency. I pledge that I will continue to do everything I can to support these soldiers, sailors, Marines, and airmen, as I have done throughout my career, and I ask for your help and support in doing the same.

Sincerely,

C. W. BILL YOUNG,  
*Chairman, Defense Subcommittee.*

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

In defense of Mr. BURTON's description of U.S. involvement already in Libya, I would like to have entered into the RECORD an article from the Guardian U.K., dated May 22, which talks about the United States having 50 percent of the ships, 50 percent of the planes, 66 percent of the personnel, 93 percent of the cruise missiles.

I just want to say briefly, Madam Speaker, that this article was written about 10 days ago. If it's true, it points out that we've undertaken a huge mission through the United States in the name of NATO—now, without coming to the Congress, and that's what we're debating, of course. Yet if, on the other hand, the information that the administration has communicated as of late to the Congress suggests a lighter footprint, then there should be no difficulty in pulling out of Libya in 15 days. If there is, we need to start asking questions about how deeply enmeshed we are if our participation is truly no boots on the ground.

[From the guardian.co.uk, May 22, 2011]

LIBYA: BRITAIN'S £1BN WAR

(By Richard Norton-Taylor and Simon Rogers)

Britain's involvement in the Libya conflict will cost the taxpayer as much as £1bn if it continues into the autumn as expected, according to expert analysis and data gathered by the Guardian.

Two months after western powers began bombing Libyan targets to protect civilians in Operation Unified Protector, the cost to Britain so far of the dozens of bombs dropped, hundreds of sorties flown and more than 1,000 service personnel deployed is estimated at more than £100m, according to British defence officials.

But defence economists have told the Guardian the costings are conservative. Francis Tusa, editor of the Defence Analysis newsletter, estimates that by the end of April Libyan operations had already cost the UK about £300m and that the bill was increasing by up to £38m a week.

Defence chiefs in the UK and US are also said to be concerned that some NATO countries are unwilling to commit air power to the campaign. It is not only the cost that is worrying the Ministry of Defence, and, indeed, defence chiefs in the Pentagon. The reluctance of most countries to commit their air forces to action—Norway, which has

dropped about 300 bombs, is to pull out at the end of June—is causing serious concern among military commanders throughout the alliance about whether NATO countries have the political will and military capability to continue operations that now have the stated aim of removing power from Gaddafi, his sons, and closet advisers.

For Britain, the Libyan conflict has also presented military commanders and ministers alike with an uncomfortable reminder of the perilous state of the defence budget. As Paul Cornish, head of the international security programme at the thinktank Chatham House, has observed, many of the military capabilities used in and around Libya—HMS Cumberland, the Nimrod R1 eavesdropping plane, the Sentinella surveillance aircraft, and Tornado jets—are among the first casualties to be scrapped or their numbers reduced (in the case of Tornados) as a result of last year's strategic defence and security review.

"The obvious question to ask," Cornish writes in the latest issue of *The World Today*, "is whether Britain could have made a contribution to the intervention in Libya had the crisis developed later in 2011 when most of the decommissionings, disbandments, and retirements would otherwise have taken place."

The U.S. led the assault, during the first week flying more than 800 sorties in Libya, of which over 300 were strike sorties. It fired more than 200 Tomahawk cruise missiles from its ships. Britain has fired fewer than 20 Tomahawks, costing an estimated £1m each, from the submarine HMS Triumph.

Britain, which has accounted for some 25% of all sorties, was so worried about the gap left by the U.S. when it ceded command to NATO, and stood down its aircraft—including low-flying A10 tankbusting "Warthogs" and C130 gunships.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), a member of the Financial Services Committee and a lieutenant colonel in the United States Army, with a distinguished 26-year military career.

Mr. STIVERS. I would like to thank the chairwoman for yielding me time.

I rise in support of the Speaker's resolution. With 26 years of military service, my experience has taught me many lessons, and those lessons give me pause and concern with regard to the Kucinich resolution. I think we need to be prudent, thoughtful and measured in the way we end our involvement in Libya, and I don't believe that the Kucinich resolution does that.

Even though the President did not follow proper procedures and even though he should have allowed Congress to debate and decide the issue, a 15-day withdrawal would cause other issues. Currently, the U.S. is providing important refueling, logistics and other support functions for our NATO allies. Unfortunately, if you create a 15-day time line, those allies might not have time to plan or build capacity to resource their plan and effectively continue their operations.

I don't agree with how the President has handled our current military mission in Libya, and I don't think he has currently explained the national security interest of our mission. However, I think the troops that have been called to action have performed admirably,

and I thank them for their service. But now we are involved, and the time frame for withdrawal in the Kucinich resolution would hurt our NATO allies, the same allies who have stood by us in Afghanistan for 10 years. They deserve our cooperation in any transition. I support the Speaker's alternative resolution on Libya. I think it asks tough questions of the President, and requires him to explain our national security interests and to justify his strategy to Congress and to the American people. If the President doesn't answer those questions within 14 days, I believe Congress should continue to assert its constitutional authority.

In response to the gentleman from California, I would like to say that I think it is important we get information to make timely decisions. Therefore, I support the Speaker's alternative resolution as a way forward in Libya.

□ 1130

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds in response to the previous speaker.

What I'm curious about is what the resolution doesn't tell us. If the President doesn't provide us the information within 14 days, what are we doing? The resolution is silent. This is a resolution filled with things we want and are asking for and demanding and are harumphing about with no consequences.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), former member of the committee.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this is a "here we go again" moment on the House floor.

Two weeks ago the Kucinich amendment passed the House overwhelmingly with a total bipartisan vote because it was the right thing to do. But, no, the other side of the aisle can't stand to let us have an initiative, the right thing to do, that they really could agree to.

So here we are today debating the Boehner resolution to take the air out of the question of whether the United States Congress or the White House has responsibility for the War Powers Resolution and begging them to know that it is our responsibility.

Members should not be fooled into voting for the Boehner resolution because it delays action. We should vote for the Kucinich resolution that insists that the Congress reclaim its authority, take its responsibility, and do the right thing regarding Libya.

Vote "no" on the Boehner resolution.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, the resolution offered by the Speaker is the responsible approach. It expresses congressional intent. It affords one last opportunity to the President and his administration



to work with us in Congress to advance U.S. interests in the region. I hope that the President is listening and that this resolution will serve as a wake-up call leading to immediate consultation. And, frankly, we have not had that as we would like.

If, in 14 days, as it says in this resolution, the President has not complied with the requests included in the resolution, then this House will consider the next steps.

I therefore urge a “yes” vote on the Boehner resolution, a responsible approach to the President to work with us and a plea to give us the information that we requested.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McKEON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. I do not believe that the President has provided adequate justification for our military operations in Libya nor why continued intervention in a humanitarian stalemate is in our national interest.

More than 2 weeks ago, I sent a letter to the President outlining my concerns regarding our strategy, our role within NATO operations, and the escalating costs of these operations at a time when the administration is asking the Department of Defense to make an additional \$400 billion in cuts. To date, I have not received a reply.

Yet I believe that forcing the hasty withdrawal of U.S. forces from NATO operations in Libya would embolden Qadhafi and gravely damage our credibility with our allies. Consequently, such a move could have dramatic, negative, second-order effects on operations that are critical to our national security, such as operations in Afghanistan.

I believe Speaker BOEHNER’s resolution addresses much of the frustration shared by Members of this body. The resolution reinforces provisions in the recently passed National Defense Authorization Act prohibiting the escalation of U.S. participation without express authorization from Congress. This resolution requires the President to clearly outline the strategic interests that justify intervention in Libya, to explain how the operational means being employed will secure them. It requires a prompt and transparent accounting of costs as well as information regarding the capacity and intentions of the rebel forces. This information is essential to allow Congress to execute its constitutionally mandated oversight role of military operations.

Again, I fully agree that the administration has been disturbingly dismissive of Congress’s role in the authorization of military force. But I also feel that passing this resolution is the most effective way of holding the President accountable without sacrificing other vital national interests

that would be damaged by a precipitous withdrawal from NATO operations.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do thank both Speaker BOEHNER and Representative KUCINICH for bringing these resolutions and bringing this issue to the floor because I completely agree that this is an issue that Congress should debate, discuss, and should ultimately express its opinion on. We have not done that. We are now past 90 days that this mission has been going on in Libya, and I feel we should have brought this up much sooner.

Now, I would prefer a much cleaner resolution that simply came out and made a resolution of approval of the President’s mission and of the mission that we and NATO have undertaken in Libya and gave Members the chance to vote it up or down. In that sense, Mr. KUCINICH’s resolution is much more straightforward. It’s a resolution of disapproval, but, again, it gives us the opportunity to at least debate the issue and express the will of Congress.

I do, however, oppose Mr. BOEHNER’s resolution. I also oppose Mr. KUCINICH’s resolution because I don’t think we should pull away from this mission, should pull out of what NATO is doing and the very important work that is going on in Libya.

□ 1140

Mr. BOEHNER’s resolution doesn’t do any of that, but it does rather boldly state that the President has not made a case for the mission in Libya, and I very strongly disagree with that assessment.

Now I will agree—and Mr. McKEON and I share the frustration—that prior to the launching of this mission, there was an inadequate amount of communication between the President and this Congress, indeed, between the President and the American people, explaining the reasons for getting into that mission; but since that time the President has made it very clear why we went into Libya.

We had a unique situation. I do not believe the American military should intervene in every conflict in every country. In fact, I don’t believe it should intervene in almost any of them. It takes a unique set of circumstances to call for that intervention; and in Libya we had, I believe, that unique set of circumstances.

Number one, we had broad international support. The U.N., NATO, the Arab League all looked at that situation and said intervention was necessary.

Number two, we had a clear humanitarian crisis. There was no doubt at the time that we intervened that if we had not, Muammar Qadhafi would have slaughtered his own people and re-

asserted control over Libya. He made it clear that is what he was going to do. It was clear that the people rising up for the legitimate opportunity to be heard in their government did not have the power and the force to stop him. We did.

If we had not acted, there is no question that Muammar Qadhafi would be back in charge of Libya, and we would bear at least some piece of the responsibility—at least that is the way the rest of the world would have looked at it. We in the United States had the power and the force to stop a humanitarian catastrophe and chose not to act.

And that’s one of the most critical elements in deciding whether or not to intervene: Can we intervene in a successful way? Yes, there are many countries throughout the world that face crises right now, in Syria, in Sudan, in the Congo, a whole bunch of places. But most of those places—in fact in all of those—there is no clear military mission that we could accomplish and achieve. In Libya, there was. If we intervened, we could stop Qadhafi from regaining control of his entire country.

At the time we understood there was no guarantee that that would mean that he would be driven from power immediately, but we could at least stop him from doing that. It was a humanitarian crisis that our actions could prevent. I think it made sense, and I think the President has clearly articulated that.

So for the Congress to pass a resolution saying they have no earthly idea what the President is doing in Libya simply means that they haven’t been paying attention for the last couple of months. It has been made clear.

Now, I think it is appropriate that we ask the President to regularly keep in touch with us, let us know where the mission is going. I supported the resolution that said no ground troops in Libya. I think that is a step too far. I don’t think that is something that would clearly be able to be accomplished militarily, so I do think that’s appropriate.

But the part of this resolution that I must oppose is the part that says the President has made no national security case for why we should be involved in Libya. I believe that he has, and I don’t think we should support a resolution saying otherwise. To have simply allowed Libya to fall apart and not helped a people that we could clearly help, that were legitimately calling for greater freedom and greater opportunity, I think, would have been a mistake.

So I will oppose the Boehner resolution, and I will also oppose the Kucinich resolution because I don’t believe we should pull out of the mission. But again, I thank all of those involved for bringing this debate to the House floor so that we can have that debate so that we in Congress can assert our authority and express our opinion on this very, very important issue.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Tactical Error and Land Forces, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the Boehner resolution.

I am not here today to argue whether or not we should be in Libya. That is an argument for another day. What I'm here today concerned with is how we got into Libya, because I think that was a very important precedent.

We went into Libya on March 19, Operation Odyssey Dawn. Just 12 days later, a House committee met and Secretary Gates was there and I made this statement: "I'm among many people who feel that President Obama has involved the United States in an unconstitutional and illegal war in Libya."

That same day I dropped H.R. 1323, which asked the President to find offsets in non-defense discretionary spending to pay for the war in Libya that was not authorized by the Congress because we have no money, and I shouldn't ask my kids and my grandkids to pay for that war. This is not the king's army. The power to move our Army into Libya is not inherent in Commander in Chief. If it were, they would not have put in article I, section 8, the responsibility of the Congress to declare war.

This is an unconstitutional and illegal war. I think it sets a very dangerous precedent, and I hope that we make that very clear in our deliberations today.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Boehner resolution, but not because I feel that the President has stated a correct policy for us being in Libya. I think he hasn't. All that you'll hear on the floor today would lead to a policy that, if we adopt it, would put us in war with five or six other countries tomorrow. But, secondly, I don't support the fact of how we got in there because I think clearly he didn't go through the proper procedures that we need and didn't comply with the War Powers Act.

But, Madam Speaker, I also realize that regardless of that disagreement he is the President of the United States; and as such he has information about our national defense that many Members of Congress don't have that we need to have shared with us.

And, second, Madam Speaker, as the President of the United States, when it comes to foreign policy issues of this magnitude, we need to give him some latitude to present that case and make it to this Congress.

Madam Speaker, the Boehner resolution does that in a reasonable way by giving him 14 days to present that information. But I believe, as many people do, at the end of that 14 days, if he hasn't done so, if he hasn't made that case, if he hasn't given us that information, we need to be prepared to launch the subpoenas to get the information, or we need to be back on this floor taking action to cut off the funding of what's taking place there.

Madam Speaker, I hope we will support the Boehner resolution. I think it's a reasonable approach and the correct approach.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Chairman MCKEON.

The President has not made the case for our military conflict in Libya. He has told us who we are against, Qadhafi, but he has not told us who we are for.

Secretary Gates has told us that we know very little about the opposition; we know very little about the rebels. We do not know their geopolitical view to their neighbors; we do not know their geopolitical view to us. We do not know their commitment to domestic diversity. Are we going to have atrocities? We do not know their ideology, we do not know their preferred form of government, and we also do not know their commitment to nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction, an issue that is important in Libya.

The President has used United Nations approval of civil protection to wage 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. Yesterday, White House Press Secretary Jay Carney said he believes that the President has the support of the majority of the Members of Congress. I do not think so.

I offered a resolution, House Resolution 58, that would voice this body's disapproval of the President's actions in Libya. Seventy-five Members have co-sponsored this resolution. I believe it's important for this body's voice to be heard.

The President has not provided us any information as to why we are doing this, what a post-Qadhafi regime will look like in Libya, and what will be our involvement. He is committing us to an extended military action; and for Congress to be relevant, our voices need to be heard.

I support the Speaker's resolution, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor House Concurrent Resolution 58.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose this motion.

The War Crimes Tribunal is about to prosecute Ratko Mladic—16 years later, but they've finally gotten him. Why? Because he masterminded the massacre of over 8,000 innocent civilians in Srebrenica. Serbia is now a democratic ally, thanks to President Clinton's taking action against congressional resistance.

We took the lead in the Balkans. It was a NATO effort, but I think we all know that NATO could not have put an end to those massacres, that genocide, had we not taken the lead. We had to act responsibly, and we had to act in a timely and forceful manner.

Now, more recently there have been more than a dozen times since 2000 when the President has had to use American troops to intervene for humanitarian reasons against terrorist threats, against whatever endangered American civilians and troops.

To tie the President's hands in such situations, whether it be a Republican or Democratic President, is wrong. We should not be doing this. Of course we should be advising the President, working with the President, whoever that President might be. And through our committee leadership, we have any number of opportunities to do that. But to pass legislation that is designed to tie the President's hands at a time of military crisis is inconsistent with the legacy of this body, which is to do what is necessary to protect America's interests at home and abroad.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentleman from Virginia 1 additional minute.

□ 1150

Mr. MORAN. With regard to Libya, we don't know what the outcome is going to be in Libya. We do know that Muammar Qadhafi is a bad guy. He's not an ally. He's not even reliable in terms of working with us in any economic or foreign policy measure. This is an opportunity to establish a government that we can work with. We can't control that government, we're not sure of the outcome, but we know the people putting their government together today want to work with the United States. But they need American support, obviously under the umbrella of NATO—that's NATO's purpose—but none of us should be so naive as to think that NATO can operate independent of United States leadership. That's just not the case. We have made the investment in our military capability, we have established ourselves as the world's superpower, and with that role comes a concomitant responsibility to use it when and wherever necessary for the advancement of world peace and security.

Let's defeat this resolution.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL).

Mr. RIGELL. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman MCKEON for yielding, and I rise in strong support of House Resolution 292.

I object to the U.S. military intervention in Libya, and my friend and colleague from Virginia actually has far more confidence in the intent and the purpose of the rebels than I do. I've heard in testimony in the Armed Services Committee from multiple top leaders in our country that we simply don't know enough about the rebels, and in my view not one single provision of the War Powers Resolution has been met that would legitimize the President's intervention in Libya.

Since President Obama announced the military strikes, Secretary of State Gates admitted that Operation Odyssey Dawn "was not a vital national interest to the United States."

This legislation, the Boehner resolution, reflects and meets the deep obligation we have to support our troops and to uphold the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO).

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Speaker, the citizens of Mississippi's Fourth Congressional District overwhelmingly do not support the President's handling of Libya, and I agree with my constituents.

Our country, our military, and their families are fatigued by 10 years of war in Iraq and Afghanistan. The White House has yet to clearly explain to the American people why we should commit more of our precious blood and treasure to a third war.

Where is the leadership Americans expect and deserve when it comes to committing our troops to foreign wars?

With reservation, I will support House Resolution 292—only because the United States must honor our commitment to our friends and allies engaged in the Libyan conflict. This resolution gives the President 14 days to explain to Congress the scope of our objectives in Libya. If he fails, we should immediately withdraw our support from the conflict, and as much as we care for our friends and allies, we cannot cast aside the laws of our land.

Mr. President, the American people and this Congress have questions and deserve answers. We cannot afford a failure in leadership when Americans' lives are on the line.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The President has said from the outset that

our role in this mission will be limited; limited but critical. We are not committing troops, we are not committing the full force of the U.S. military, but what we are contributing, as Mr. MORAN said, is absolutely critical to the success of the mission. We are supporting our NATO allies in making sure that this mission is carried out in a very limited and very critical way.

I just want to emphasize again that Muammar Qadhafi is not someone who is in the best national security interests of the United States of America. He has a long, long history of weapons of mass destruction, of supporting terrorist groups, of committing terrorist acts against United States citizens, and of in general being an unstable and destabilizing figure. When the people of Libya decided to rise up to throw him out, it was a very appropriate thing for them to do.

Now we all wish that Mr. Qadhafi would have gone quietly and simply—that certainly would have been the easier way to go—but he didn't. And to protect those people who have legitimate aspirations for a better government, we needed to intervene militarily to assist.

Now I think in this instance the best thing about this is we were not alone. The Arab League, the United Nations, NATO, took the lead. There is a great deal of instability throughout the Middle East and that is unquestionably in the national security interests of the United States of America to do whatever we can to try and reduce that instability and make sure that we have friends, allies and also governments that legitimately represent the aspirations of their people. That is one of the greatest problems we've had. We have supported governments in the past in the Middle East who didn't have the support of their people. We need not just the support of governments, we need the support of the people in that region. This is a critical opportunity to gain that support. I believe that's clearly in the national security interest of the American people.

So, I do not agree with the gentleman from Ohio's resolution in saying that the President has not articulated a case. He has. We in the House should vote whether we approve it or not, but I don't think it is correct to say that the case has not been made. Let's have a vote in this body, as we will, on the Kucinich resolution, of whether or not to support what is going on there or not, but we should not simply be asking the President for something he has already provided.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, a member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. YOUNG.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I rise in support, as so many of my colleagues have, of House Resolution 292, because

this Congress is a coequal branch of government, and we must never be a quiet coequal branch, especially on military matters.

When the U.S. sends its sons and daughters into harm's way, it must only be done to protect America's vital national security interests and where there is a clear plan to advance those interests.

We know our Nation is insolvent, with a national debt of over \$14 trillion. Our troops are already overextended, we're hearing, in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Meanwhile, the administration is talking about defense spending cuts at the very same time it's piling on this new mission, a humanitarian mission, a narrow humanitarian mission, we're told, on top of all our other commitments.

Now what gives? This Congress needs to be heard. Our President has failed to properly define what vital national security interests justify this military intervention, and with this resolution, we give him 14 days to do so. Sadly and ironically, by becoming involved in Libya, our NATO alliance, which does remain a vitally important national security interest, may well have been put at risk.

This Congress will be heard.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, regarding H. Con. Res. 51 and H. Res. 292, both resolutions have imperfections. I strongly support the sentiment behind the Kucinich resolution but do not think it would be responsible to compel action in such a short time period. Regrettably, the Boehner resolution accomplishes little. However, it makes a clear statement that I agree with, which is that American troops should not be on the ground in Libya.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Boehner resolution on Libya. As a combat veteran myself, I am extremely concerned any time that we commit to using our armed forces to support military actions, and I believe that close scrutiny of our country's involvement in the NATO-led operation is essential.

I understand the frustration being expressed by many here today about their level of consultation in the decision to commence military operations in Libya, but, as my colleague from the Armed Services Committee ADAM SMITH noted, Congressional leaders were invited to a White House briefing and substantial information has been provided to Congress since then.

Based on my personal experience as Chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, the Obama Administration's level of consultation with Congress on these sorts of issues is much more extensive and timely than during the Bush Administration.

I, myself, had additional questions which were not fully addressed by this week's briefings, and, while my colleagues were debating the rule for this resolution, I simply called the White House to request the information demanded in this resolution. Much of the information was provided immediately, with the rest due back in the next few days. And when I asked the White House about requests for information they had received on operations in Libya, they told me they had responded to all Congressional requests for briefings.

Debating the bill before us may provide a convenient opportunity for opponents of the President to make political statements, but it does so at the expense of our troops who are actively engaged in combat operations. This resolution threatens our critical NATO alliance and emboldens our enemies.

The Boehner resolution—like the Kucinich measure which we are also debating today—potentially sends the message to our NATO allies that the United States does not stand by its commitments. At a time when we are relying more and more on our NATO allies to support the joint mission in Afghanistan, now is not the time to turn our back on NATO.

Beyond straining relations with our closest allies, this resolution sends an even more dangerous message to Colonel Qaddafi. This resolution is effectively telling a despotic dictator, who has murdered and terrorized his own citizens, that he can simply wait out the military effort to protect the Libyan people because the United States will not hold true to its word.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, as a combat veteran, and as an American, I will continue to ask the hard questions of our military and civilian leaders about military operations over Libya. But I will not vote for a measure that I believe threatens the security and safety of our country and undermines our President.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, more than two months after stating that our military action in Libya would be over in “days, not weeks,” President Obama has yet to explain to the American people what our mission in Libya is, how it will be conducted, and when it will be completed. He has failed to explain how our military involvement in Libya fits with our policy interests in the Middle East and northern Africa. Most importantly, he has ignored his constitutional responsibility to uphold federal law by choosing not to acquire authorization from Congress for our involvement there.

That is why I cosponsored Mr. TURNER’s resolution disapproving of the President’s actions, and that is why I joined my House colleagues today in demanding action from the President.

The President must follow the law and seek approval for this military action from Congress. In doing so, he must explain some basic facts, such as whether the removal of Moammar Qaddafi is part of the mission, how stability will be promoted in the region if Qaddafi is removed from power, and who among the anti-Qaddafi forces in Libya should be supported in the event that he is removed.

Instead of following the clear path of seeking congressional approval as outlined in federal law, the President unilaterally escalated our military efforts in Libya after assuring us they would be scaled back. Now, some in the Obama administration are saying we should put boots on the ground in support of further NATO actions. This is the opposite of what the President promised and contrary to the will of the House.

Congress appropriately shows a certain deference to the commander-in-chief when it comes to national security decisions, as we must always have the ability to quickly respond to threats to our sovereignty and our interests around the world. Further, Congress must not direct troop movements or set timelines for our military operations, as such decisions should be left to our highly skilled

commanders on the ground. But our deference is contingent upon the President respecting the Founders’ intent for the primary role of Congress in providing for our defense and security needs. It does not change the fact that the President is obliged to seek congressional approval and to explain how our mission in Libya is vital to our national security.

The brave men and women in our armed forces, as always, are performing their duties with the greatest expertise and professionalism of any military in the world. The issue at hand is the failure of the President to seek congressional approval required by law, and the failure of the President to tell Congress and the American people the details of our mission.

The American people will always stand with those who seek freedom and self-determination. Today’s vote reaffirms that it is vital the President obey the rule of law in doing so.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, like many members of this body, I have been outraged by the President’s failure to comply with the War Powers Act and to define the U.S. mission in Libya. This Congress must not neglect its responsibility and authority regarding the use of force in Libya, and the debate we are having today is long overdue.

I think most Americans, including myself, agree that seeing Moammar Gadhafi and his regime of thugs removed from power would be a good thing. However, I think most Americans, including myself, also feel strongly that American forces should not be committed to this kind of mission without the consent of the U.S. Congress.

Our Founding Fathers envisioned a country where the executive branch and the legislative branch share the responsibility regarding the use of force. President Obama has not sought the consent of the Congress in terms of involving American forces in Libya and that is why we are having this debate today.

I rise in support of H. Res. 292. This resolution demands that the President provide answers about our involvement in the conflict in Libya, including the President’s justification for not seeking Congressional authorization for this action. The resolution gives the President 14 days to respond to this request. The President should take very seriously this resolution. And our leadership in Congress should be vigilant to demand a full and clear response from the President. This resolution also gives adequate notice to NATO and our other allies of the concerns of the House before the House takes further action. The further action must take note of the President’s failure to comply with the War Powers Act and notwithstanding that fact must also take note of our Nation’s foreign policy interests and efforts to combat terrorism.

H. Res. 292 is an important first step in restoring the balance that our Founding Fathers envisioned, that our legislative and executive branches share the responsibility regarding the use of U.S. force. However, the action taken today should not be the last step. In 14 days, the House of Representatives should reconvene to evaluate our continued involvement in Libya. We must then make hard decisions about the operation in Libya and the role of the United States in this conflict. I hope my colleagues will join me in remaining vigilant and demanding accountability from the White House.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 51, “Directing the President, Pursuant to Section (c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed forces from Libya.” I support the War Powers Resolution however I cannot support a resolution which requires the President to withdraw all United States Armed forces within 15 days of its adoption.

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. This Concurrent Resolution 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.

Presidents, Members of Congress, scholars and lawyers had 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 (Public Law 93–148) 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 the War Powers 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 believe in the Constitution and the importance of maintaining the power of Congress in asserting when international conflicts warrant U.S. military involvement. I call upon the President to issue a report detailing the current status of the United States military forces in Libya within the next 30 days.

We must not forget the bloodshed that continues to take place in Libya. The people of Libya have given their lives in their fight for democracy. This conflict began in Libya four months ago when Colonel Gaddafi 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.

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 help. 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 today.

Colonel Muammar Gaddafi has continued to refuse to acknowledge the will of the Libyan people and the reality of the dilemmas that Libya faced. Rather than act as a true leader and acknowledge the interests of Libyan citizens, Gaddafi 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. The reality of the situation is this: it was Gaddafi's refusal to contemplate the circumstances in Libya that led to the unnecessary loss of innocent lives. Let us not make the same error as we deliberate the role of the U.S. and the decision of our President to act on behalf of innocent people.

We should not forget that the people of Libya are continuing to fight for democracy and there has been a significant loss of life.

Gaddafi has a long record of bloodshed and blood continues to run in the streets of Libya. We cannot stand by and do nothing, and America cannot do this alone. 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 Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi.

I stand with the people of Libya fighting for peace and freedom. It is clear that NATO has taken the Lead in protecting the Libyan People.

#### FACTS ON NATO

For over two months NATO-led airstrikes 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). During the week of May 11th, rebel forces succeeded in capturing Misratah, which had been the scene of the heaviest fighting since the conflict began. With control of the air and sea ports, rebels have developed a means to resupply and reinforce Misratah from the east while simultaneously supporting resistance in the west. Meanwhile fuel shortages in regime-held areas are taking a toll, as demonstrated by an attack over the weekend against reporters during a state-supervised trip to the Tunisian border. Fierce fighting continues across the

Nafusa mountain range, which cuts across the desert south of Tripoli to the western border with Tunisia. At least four Grad rockets fired from Libya on May 16th landed in Tunisia near the Dahiba border crossing. Tunisian authorities have warned that it will report Libya to the Security Council if loyalist forces continue firing ammunition into Tunisia.

As rebels consolidate recent gains, NATO has proven to be the equalizing force. NATO have targeted major command centers near Tripoli and Brega and surface-to-air missile launchers in Sirte and Al Khums. On May 19th NATO destroyed at least eight naval ships after it was verified that the Libyan navy had tried to mine the rebel-controlled port of Misratah. That same day NATO blocked a Maltese-flagged ship from delivering a consignment of fuel intended for regime forces. Airstrikes against a compound in Tripoli on May 1st reportedly killed Qaddafi's youngest son Saif al-Arab and three grandchildren. Direct lines of communication have been established between NATO and opposition headquarters in Benghazi, thereby enhancing NATO's operational effectiveness. Previously, opposition forces have faced accidental strikes by NATO aircraft after failing to identify themselves and shifting to the use of armored vehicles without communicating with the coalition.

The NATO air mission has conducted nearly 8000 sorties, including 3025 strike sorties, since assuming control of the operation on March 23rd. The NATO maritime component has conducted more than 1000 sailings in the embargo area, boarded 48 ships, and turned away 7 ships.

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. 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 Qaddafi most of the world believed the bloodshed would end. Today, it is clear that Qaddafi is going to continue to fight to stay in power.

As it stands, the United States already has authorized a drawdown in nonlethal defense articles and services valued at \$25 million to assist the Transitional National Council (TNC) and an additional \$53.5 million in humanitarian assistance. It was announced on May 5th that the Administration now is seeking legislation to allow them to "vest," or confiscate, "assets and property held by the government of Libya, including the Central Bank of Libya, in the jurisdiction of the United States and invest all or part of that in any agency or individual designated by the President to provide humanitarian relief and protect civilians in Libya." The United States currently holds \$33 billion in frozen Libyan assets and property, of which \$150 million has been proposed for vesting. Senator KERRY has suggested to reporters that he will soon introduce the requested legislation.

We can not 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. Thus far, the United States has provided over \$53.5 million to meet urgent humanitarian needs in Libya while the European Commis-

sion has provided nearly \$55.4 million. On May 18, the UN launched a revised Regional Flash Appeal for the Libyan Crisis, increasing the appeal from \$310 million to \$407.8 million. To date, the UN has received \$175 million in contributions or 43% toward the appeal and an additional \$106 million for humanitarian activities not listed in the appeal. The UN evacuated its international staff from Tripoli on May 1st but maintains a presence in Benghazi. Humanitarian access inside Libya remains severely constrained. Of particular concern are the besieged western towns of Zintan, Nalut, Zawiyah and Yifran.

Over 807,000 people have fled to neighboring Chad, Egypt, Niger, Algeria and Tunisia since the start of the crisis. Additionally, up to 200,000 internally displaced persons (IDPs) from Brega, Ras Lanuf, and Ajdabiya are in eastern Libya.

We must continue to remember the context upon which we are currently operating in the world today. The Middle East is finally awakening to democracy and freedom. Advancing these objectives also advances our nation's security.

#### FACTS

The people of Libya have suffered since the overthrow of King Idriss in 1969. Under the oppressive Qaddafi regime, basic human rights have been terminated, and too many lives have been lost.

Since assuming power, Colonel Qaddafi has ignored the needs of the Libyan people, choosing to train other oppressive leaders in intelligence and weaponry. Qaddafi has 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. Foreign Policy reports 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.

Since the outbreak of civil war in February, Qaddafi has shut down Internet communication in Libya, and abused and detained foreign journalists covering the rebellion.

The International Federation for Human Rights has reported that commanders in the Libyan army executed hundreds of lower ranking soldiers for refusing to fire on protestors or defend Qaddafi.

Colonel Qaddafi 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.

Because of the severe communication restrictions and limited access of journalists, estimates are extremely varied as to how many Libyans have been killed in this conflict. Navi Pillay, the High Commissioner for Human Rights at the United Nations estimates thousands have been killed or injured. The Libyan

National Transitional Council puts the death toll around 8,000.

I am outraged at the story of Eman al-Obeidi who had the courage to report being raped by soldiers in the employ of Qaddafi. Because this young woman spoke out about the brutal crime she endured, she lives in fear of the repercussions. Ms. Al-Obeidi's story is a harsh and violent reflection of Qaddafi's regime and the somber reality that rape is a symptom of war. This violent sexual assault must be investigated, and Ms. Al-Obeidi's safety must be ensured. This brutal crime is further evidence of the cruelty of Colonel Qaddafi's regime. In addition, to killing thousands of innocent civilians, the Libyan government is also allowing violent discriminatory actions to be freely committed against the women of Libya. This is unacceptable, and is strong evidence that humanitarian efforts must be increased. I call on the Allied Nations to ensure Ms. Al-Obeidi's safe passage out of Libya. Further, I call on the United Nations to condemn these actions, and work to prevent their future occurrence.

The Red Cross reports dangerously low amounts of medical supplies and food, as well as a refugee crisis as thousands flee the violence.

There should be an increased emphasis on diplomacy. On May 20th it was reported that Shukri Ghanem, head of Libya's National Oil Company and former Prime Minister, had defected to Tunisia. On May 19th Secretary of State Clinton asserted that Qaddafi's wife Sophia and daughter Aicha had fled to Tunisia, though Tunisian authorities later denied the report. On May 9th it was reported that Egyptian authorities had placed Qaddafi's cousin Ahmed Gaddafi al-Dam under house arrest and planned to seize his assets before deporting him to Benghazi. On May 4th, the prosecutor for the International Criminal Court announced that he was seeking the arrest of three unnamed senior officials in the Libyan regime for war crimes and crimes against humanity. On May 3rd, Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan demanded that Qaddafi step down after attacks against foreign embassies in Tripoli forced Turkey to suspend diplomatic operations. Libyan diplomats subsequently were expelled from France and the UK. On May 2nd, Switzerland reported that the country had seized over \$411 million in Libyan assets. The United States, the European Union, Russia, Japan, South Korea, and other countries previously enacted targeted sanctions against Qaddafi and his key supporters.

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. Therefore I voted against the meaningless H. Res. 292 that has no basis in law in order to be consistent in my support of Congress' authority to declare war and the War Powers Resolution (driven by the Vietnam War). I voted yes on H. Con. Res. 51 to allow the President to go to

the Senate. The Resolution failed and I hope the President will approach Congress and consult so we can bring peace and an end to violence together.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Boehner resolution, H. Res. 292 and also to announce my opposition to the resolution offered by Mr. KUCINICH.

Let me be clear, I will never jeopardize support for our troops, and I will always maintain the proper level of deference and respect due the Commander in Chief in matters of war. But I do not believe the President of the United States has the authority to take America to war without congressional approval where our security and vital national interests are not directly threatened.

The President told the American people in his address to the Nation on March 28, 2011, that it would be a mistake to broaden our mission. He said, "We went down that road in Iraq." Now, more than seventy-five days since hostilities began in Libya, it has become all too clear that the road we are currently taking is quite different from that we took in Iraq.

In Iraq, we had a clear objective. We had congressional bipartisan approval in both Houses, international support, and through trial and the sacrifice of blood and treasure, we are now on the edge of victory. Here in Libya, there is no clear objective, no congressional approval, and uncertain international support. We are on a different road.

Speaker BOEHNER's resolution before the House today, H. Res. 292, will prevent the President from committing American ground forces in Libya and requires the Administration to finally justify why it committed our military resources in Libya without seeking consultation from Congress. When passed, this resolution will also force the Administration to report to the Congress the political and military objectives regarding Operation Odyssey Dawn.

Let me also speak to the resolution of the other gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KUCINICH. I have never believed it to be wise to tell the enemy when you will quit fighting. More significantly, it cites the constitutionally dubious provisions of the War Powers Resolution and I cannot support it.

In closing, let me just say that history has taught us that America has succeeded only when we have chosen to send our men and women into combat with a clear objective to win. In this instance, where the Administration has not demonstrated how American military involvement advances our national security interests and where the President has failed to provide the American people with a compelling reason to commit our Armed Forces, there is no clear objective to win.

The Boehner resolution will force the Obama Administration to bring its case to the American public before further committing our men and women in Libya and I urge its immediate passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 294, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. McKEON. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### LIBYA WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 294, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Libya, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 294, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 51

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM LIBYA.

Pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)), Congress directs the President to remove the United States Armed Forces from Libya by not later than the date that is 15 days after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

□ 1200

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, with 30 minutes controlled by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and 30 minutes controlled by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), be allowed to control 15 minutes of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 51, directing the President to remove United States Armed Forces from Libya. The President has failed to make the legal and constitutional case that he owes to the Congress and to the American people before committing American forces to a voluntary conflict. But the situation as it stands today poses an important U.S. national security consideration, and it requires this body to oppose this Kucinich resolution.

What are these considerations, Madam Speaker? These are: the sudden U.S. withdrawal from Libyan operations proposed by this resolution could do irreparable harm to the NATO alliance, and ultimately undermine support for NATO efforts in Afghanistan. Also, the longer Qadhafi is able to

cling to power and continue fighting, the more that he will destabilize the larger region. Conflict is already spilling over into neighboring countries—Tunisia, for example, which is undergoing a fragile transition of its own. Also, there are significant proliferation concerns at stake, including the need to secure Libyan chemical munitions and prevent the flow of heavy and light weaponry from leaking across the porous borders of Libya. Also, extremist organizations that pose a credible threat to American interests, including al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, already are exploiting the opportunity to arm themselves and organize.

So while I share the frustration of my colleagues, I am deeply concerned that an abrupt withdrawal of support for the NATO mission would have repercussions that extend far beyond the borders of Libya. Adoption of this resolution would send a signal to Qadhafi that if he can just hang on for 15 days more, the alliance will crumble and he can resume his destructive behavior and his destabilizing activities. In Egypt, the stability necessary to prevent extremist elements from seizing control could be compromised if the conflict in Libya remains unresolved.

Furthermore, Madam Speaker, providing Qadhafi free rein by forcing the U.S. to rapidly withdraw from the NATO operation would pose an even more virulent threat to such other allies in the region as Israel. An emboldened Qadhafi regime would be in a position to provide both destabilizing types and amounts of conventional weapons, as well as unconventional capabilities through new and existing smuggling routes to violent extremists in Lebanon, the West Bank, and Gaza, extremists who seek the destruction of Israel.

A U.S. withdrawal in a manner that is called for in this resolution, in fact mandated in this resolution, could have detrimental consequences for countries such as Jordan and the United Arab Emirates, who provide critical support to the United States and our NATO allies in Afghanistan. And, as operations experts from the Department of Defense warned yesterday, an abrupt withdrawal from Libya operations, as this resolution demands, would severely undermine support by our European allies for NATO efforts in Afghanistan.

In fact, it would have a detrimental effect on NATO's efforts in Afghanistan both in terms of weakening our mission partners and emboldening the Taliban, al Qaeda, and associated elements. It would compromise the safety and security of U.S. forces that at this very moment are engaged in the battle against heavily armed enemy forces in Afghanistan.

Madam Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, my daughter-in-law Lindsay served in Iraq and in Afghanistan. I also have two committee staffers, one in the Army Reserves and one in the Marine Reserves, who recently

returned from serving a year each in Afghanistan. They have emphasized that the potential dangers to our troops there of a NATO pullout or a decrease of forces and assets in Afghanistan due to a need to refocus them on ongoing operations in Libya is indeed dangerous for the United States. They have emphasized that operations in Libya do not exist in a vacuum.

Recall that the House just this last week adopted an amendment to the National Defense Authorization bill to prevent U.S. military or private security contractors from establishing or maintaining a ground presence in Libya. Speaker BOEHNER has offered a resolution that we discussed previously that further underscores that the Congress does not support putting U.S. boots on the ground in Libya.

Now, many have argued that Congress needs to strongly exert its prerogatives under War Powers. We must do so, Madam Speaker, but do so in a prudent and responsible manner that protects the legitimate national security interests of the United States. This resolution, Madam Speaker, does not do so. So I urge a "no" vote.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 2 minutes to the prime cosponsor of this important constitutional initiative, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

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

I want to start off by saying this is not a partisan issue. I am very happy to cosponsor this legislation because it's the only legislation we are discussing today that has teeth in it. It really deals with the problem.

Now, Qadhafi is a bad guy and he ought to be replaced. There are a lot of tyrants around the world that ought to be replaced. But should the United States go to war any place we want to get rid of a bad guy unless it's in our national interest, or unless we're at risk, or unless there's been a declaration of war? No. We could go to war anyplace we want to if we just say this guy's a bad guy and he's killing his own people. We could do it in Syria, we could do it in Ivory Coast, we could do it all over the place.

But the Congress of the United States is the body that's supposed to be consulted by the President before we go to war. The President did not do this. We are contributing about two-thirds, or at least half of the war effort. It's cost over \$700 million, and it will be over \$1 billion before it's all over. And the President has taken us into this conflict without the authority of the Congress, without the support of the Congress.

He did get the Arab League, he did get the United Nations. He did talk to the French and the English. But he didn't talk to the people's House, the Congress of the United States. And the President did not have the authority to do this.

Now, the reason I support the Kucinich resolution is it sends a clear

message to the White House they cannot do this again. They cannot unilaterally go into Syria or the Ivory Coast or anyplace else without talking to the Congress that represents the people all across this country. The President should not have done this. And the only legislation that really deals with the problem today is the Kucinich resolution, which I cosponsored. I am a co-author of it.

Now, I am going to vote for the Boehner resolution because it does send a signal. But it does not solve the problem. The only way to solve the problem is to let the President know he cannot, should not, and will not be able to do this again.

□ 1210

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just listened to my chairman—I am very fond of her—make a very compelling case for the national security interests we have in seeing through this operation that is now going on against Qadhafi and Libya.

In detail, with specifics, I completely support it. The only thing I didn't hear was, "Mr. President, while you didn't consult with us enough and you haven't provided us all the information, I want to thank you, as our President and our Commander in Chief, for pursuing America's national security interests in this current operation. Great job, keep it going, be a little better on the information, a little more on the consulting, but stick with it." That's what I didn't hear.

I want to compliment Mr. KUCINICH for offering this resolution. We disagree on the President's policy. My colleague wants to withdraw forces, while I support the ongoing operations in Libya. But unlike the majority, Mr. KUCINICH is taking seriously this body's fundamental responsibility to legislate on the use of force.

The President commenced combat operations in Libya to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe, a massacre at the hands of Qadhafi's forces. There was bipartisan support for this effort and the President prevented massive loss of life through the decisive use of force. We don't have to speculate about that. Qadhafi told the entire world about his plans for Benghazi, to go door to door, closet to closet to find and eliminate his opponents.

I continue to believe the mission in Libya is relevant and necessary, as does my chairman and as does the Speaker, and I believe it's achieving success. Qadhafi's forces have been driven out of eastern Libya and out of Misrata in the west. High-level defections are on the increase. Demonstrations are once again breaking out in Tripoli, suggesting a weakening of government control. Progress is slower than we would like, but it is steady.

Efforts to force a withdrawal of forces would reverse this process and

jeopardize the lives of hundreds of thousands of Libyans now benefiting from the NATO operation. And this resolution demands not merely withdrawal; it demands withdrawal within 15 days.

Think about what a removal in 15 days, as required by this resolution, would mean. We would be giving Qadhafi a free hand to maintain control in Libya and continue his campaign against civilians. We would be thumbing our nose at our NATO partners whose support on the ground has been and continues to be so crucial in Afghanistan.

We would likely threaten the stability for the very Arab nations where democracy has its best hope of success: Egypt and Tunisia, each of which flank Libya and are inevitably affected by its internal developments. And we would send a message to Assad of Syria and dictators everywhere that our support for freedom and humane governance is, at best, lukewarm and transitory: Hang in there for a few weeks, Mr. Dictator, and we'll go away.

And as the families of the victims of Pan Am 103 know better than any of us, a Qadhafi who is unleashed to commit acts of terrorism around the world will do so with unspeakable barbarity. He might even reconstitute his weapons of mass destruction.

We need to give the President more time to pursue this mission. To do otherwise would be to alienate our allies, to damage our regional interests, and, once again, to invite a horrible massacre of Libyan civilians.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 51, although I share my colleagues' concerns regarding our operations in Libya. In fact, I sent a letter to the President 2 weeks ago, to which I have not received a reply, making it clear that I would have serious reservations regarding a request for authorization of military force in Libya.

Moreover, I support House Resolution 292, which we have also debated here today. I do not believe the President has adequately sought congressional authorization, nor has he provided sufficient information for Congress to perform its constitutional oversight.

Nevertheless, I cannot support the resolution before us. This resolution would require the President to remove all U.S. forces within 15 days. Such a short lead time offers our allies no time to prepare for the withdrawal of U.S. forces, and, make no mistake, the hasty withdrawal of U.S. forces would cripple allied operations and embolden

Qadhafi. The United States provides adequate capabilities that our NATO allies and other partners cannot provide, either in kind or at all levels required.

We provide over 75 percent of all aerial refueling; 70 percent of all intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; nearly a quarter of all the aircraft, including fighter aircraft, for suppression of enemy air defenses; armed Predators, providing aerial surveillance and strike capability, including low-level targeted strikes in urban centers where Qadhafi's forces have entrenched themselves; and electronic warfare aircraft for jamming and support in targeting.

Reasonable people can disagree about the extent to which involvement in Libya was in our national strategic interest, but having committed our forces, a precipitous withdrawal would certainly have implications for U.S. national security and our strategic interests around the world. We should make certain allied efforts are not undermined at the last minute.

As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I will continue to ensure that the committee conducts robust oversight of ongoing military operations, and I will continue to press the President for answers, but this resolution is not the appropriate means to bring about an end to the stalemate in Libya.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Let me thank Mr. KUCINICH, and I support his efforts over the years, but especially today, in allowing this very sensitive constitutional question to be debated.

I asked him and almost pleaded that he allow me to follow my friend DAN BURTON, because nothing could better prove to our colleagues and those that know both of us how nonpartisan this issue is and should be.

This is not a question, really, of past Presidents who always thought they were doing the best for the United States of America when they put our men and women in harm's way. Not one of them ever thought that they were doing anything immoral.

This is not a Democratic problem; it's not a Republican problem; it's not a problem of the President of the United States, not Nixon, not Kennedy, not Johnson, certainly not President Obama, certainly not the Bushes. It's a problem of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. This is a congressional problem. We have not fulfilled our responsibility.

Some people I have heard say, well, this hasn't reached a level that it should be war. Well, ask the men and women that make the sacrifices and come home and leave their fallen friends there whether this was a war. Ask those mothers and fathers and children who have lost their loved ones whether this is war.

It's easy for us to say that we are not going to get involved; let the President have the authority. But in the final analysis, when we go to the funerals, these brave men and women may not come from your districts because they don't have to make the sacrifices somehow in these United States. We know who has to volunteer, who makes the sacrifices, and we sit back and wash our hands and say we didn't think that this reached a level that we had to give approval to the President of the United States. I am not saying that the President is right or wrong. I am saying we are.

And, Mr. KUCINICH, I thank you for the opportunity, because no longer should there be a debate as to whether or not it's Libya, whether it's Korea or wherever it is. We have a constitutional authority. Thank you for giving us an opportunity to talk about this as Members of the United States Congress.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

□ 1220

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman from New York, and our political philosophies may be different. I think it's a powerful and passionate speech. What frustrates me, I think, the most, and the fact that we are even having this debate in this way is because the President has not led on this particular issue. He should have come before Congress. I think that's clear.

I don't think anyone really objects to the fact that he should have come here anytime when we put our troops in harm's way, absolutely. I think he's done not a great job talking about what our national security interests are in Libya and what role we're playing in Libya. Bad marks all the way around.

But the Kucinich resolution is dangerous. I do believe we have national security interests at stake here. Even though the President has gone about it in all the wrong way, they're our national security interests. And to stand up today and say we're frustrated with the President, we're going to stomp our feet and we're going to bring them home, leaving our allies holding the bag, is unconscionable—unconscionable.

Here's what happens if the Kucinich resolution passes: the naval blockade becomes at risk, Qadhafi gets stronger, our ability to refuel aircraft—NATO aircraft who are doing strikes, not the United States who are doing strikes mind you, our British, our Italian and our French allies who are doing combat strikes—goes away.

The fact that we cannot get in and do particular efforts on making it very difficult for them to see through radar and actually target planes happens by the United States, that goes away. Who



would do that to friends and allies in the middle of a fight?

And here's our national security interests. They have thousands and thousands of pounds of chemical weapons. This isn't a guess. We're not reading some analytical sheet. Many of you have seen it. I have personally seen it. We know it's there. It's declared. What happens to those chemical weapons in a place where al Qaeda in the Magreb is growing stronger, not weaker? There's only one country in the world that has the unique capability to keep an eye on it and take care of it when the opportunity arises. That's the United States of America. That is in our national interest. There are thousands and thousands and thousands of shoulder-fired, anti-aircraft weapons that keep me awake at night.

We have the unique capability in the United States to make sure that those weapons systems don't fall into the hands of those who would do us harm—the terrorists who proliferate in northern Africa right now. Those are in our national security interests.

So, yes, let's have the debate. I think the Speaker's approach is absolutely appropriate. It's sad that we had to come to that point where we had to inform this administration, "Sir, you have not made your case. You need to come and make your case." And I argue when he does that, when he makes his case, I think the American people will be with him. But he has to make the case, and he needs Congress' consult and advice on this particular issue. And I argue he needs our approval to continue to move forward.

I hope that we don't get really small in our politics and we're so angry at this President for not making his case on something as sensitive as this that we would ruin our national interests as we move forward. They are important allies, our French and our British. Now we've been frustrated at them, and I'm sure they're frustrated at us. But they've spilled their blood and their treasure in places like Iraq and Afghanistan, and they currently help us fight terrorism where we find it in the world.

Do you poke your friend in the eye because you're mad? No. This is an important issue that has to be bigger than our political parochial beliefs. It has to be bigger than our congressional districts. This is about America, our future, our allies, and, yes, our national security.

Who better to make sure that those shoulder-fired weapons don't go somewhere than us? Who better to make sure that those chemical weapons don't fall in the hands of terrorists who seek to kill innocent men, women and children? Qadhafi has been proven to be a state sponsor of terror. The Pan Am bombing, he killed hundreds. He killed U.S. soldiers in Germany in the eighties, our U.S. soldiers, through an act of terrorism. We know he still has terrorism hit squads. We know it. We can't prove that he's engaged them yet,

but we know they exist. Why would we walk away from that threat when we know he's under siege and feeling desperate?

This is the time we should stand with our allies, Madam Speaker. This is the time that we should say, yes, our national security interests are at heart. And, yes, Mr. President, come down and meet your constitutional obligation and show this Congress why we're there, what role we're playing and what it means to our national security.

I would urge a strong rejection of cutting and running in the Kucinich amendment and a strong support of the Speaker of the House's right approach to bring the President to Congress, as he needs to be.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), who has been very closely involved in helping construct bipartisan support for H. Con. Res. 51, and I thank him.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this resolution. We need to be crystal clear on this. Without prior congressional authorization, under the War Powers Act, the President may only commit Armed Forces to hostilities for 60 days if there is a direct attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions or its Armed Forces.

There was none, so there is no 60-day clock, and the unprovoked attack on Libya—from day one—constituted an illegal and unconstitutional act of the highest significance.

And the question is, What are we going to do about that? If the President felt there was moral justification to attack Libya, he was constitutionally required to make that case to the Congress and to get its authorization. He did not.

Now, the argument we hear against this resolution comes down to this: we're already committed; it's too late for Congress to order a withdrawal without harming America's reputation or undermining its allies. Well, if we take that position, we have just changed the entire Constitution to read as follows: the President may attack any country he wants for any reason that he wants and the Congress has no choice but to follow. That's what they're saying.

The President has crossed a bright constitutional line, and this Congress has a clear moral and constitutional duty to intervene, and only the Kucinich resolution actually does so, short of sending a strong letter to the President.

If we fail to do so, we will have destroyed the work of the American Founders by fundamentally changing the legislative and executive functions on the most momentous decision that our Nation can make, and we will take our country down dark and bloody roads that the American Founders sought to avoid.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. I thank my friend for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Madam 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 trampling on the fundamental principles of separation of powers and the plain language of our United States Constitution, which is the supreme rule of law here at home.

The United States Constitution clearly states that the President's power as Commander in Chief—to introduce our Armed Forces into hostilities—may be exercised only pursuant to three circumstances: number one, a declaration of war; number two, a specific statutory authorization; and, number three, a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States. That has not happened.

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

In closing, I'd just like to say that I've been to Iraq 13 times and Afghanistan 10 times. I don't meet any of our kids on their first tour of duty anymore. They're all on their third tour of duty or fourth tour of duty.

We are stretched thin, and this was a gratuitous action. We should not be there. There's no lawful basis for the prosecution of this war. So I ask for the support of this resolution.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. KUCINICH, and thank you Members of the House.

This issue of war and peace and separation of powers transcends partisan politics. A few years ago, together with my good friend, STEVE ISRAEL, I began what's known as the Center Aisle Caucus, which has a large membership now. Our goal is bipartisan solutions to America's challenges, and this bill reflects that approach.

H. Con. Res. 51, on paper, addresses our illegal war in Libya; but, in spirit, it calls into question American presence in the Middle East, and it should command the attention of the national media, if you're listening, and every American citizen.

Today I issue a challenge to an often divided Congress. To my Democratic colleagues, I ask you to candidly acknowledge that war is war, even when a Democratic President initiates, or perpetuates, that war. To my Republican colleagues, I ask you to acknowledge that a sincere and effective attack on our crippling national debt, without defense spending squarely on the table, is indefensible and disingenuous.

To all of my colleagues, I ask you to acknowledge certain realities: one, our global warfare kills American men and women and innocent people all around the world every day.

□ 1230

Two, we cannot impose our standards of democracy, humanitarianism, and culture—as much as we want to—on nations that don't care and resent our self-proclaimed role as judge and jury.

Three, there is little, if any, connection between our actions in Libya and the safety of citizens in St. Louis, Missouri, or Mount Zion, Illinois. We spend almost \$700 billion a year on defense, a significant portion of that for three wars.

Three days ago, we voted on the issue of whether to increase our national debt limit to nearly \$17 trillion. From President Bush to President Obama, and well before, Presidents have flagrantly and arrogantly violated article I, section 8 of the Constitution, not to mention the War Powers Act.

The Speaker's resolution that we will vote on here in a few moments was strongly worded—and I believe sincerely offered—but it was just that: words. It is not and should not be a cover for any Member of this Chamber to fail to support the Kucinich bill, which puts teeth, real teeth, into congressional prerogatives.

Support the Constitution, support fiscal responsibility, and support peace. Support the Kucinich resolution.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia earlier said that the Kucinich resolution would tie the President's hands. Yes, it would. The whole point of the Constitution is to tie the President's hands. The President, not this particular President, any President, must not have the power to commit this country to war on his own authority without the concurrence of Congress. That is the point of the Constitution.

George Washington said the Constitution vests the power of declaring war in Congress. Therefore, no offensive expedition can be undertaken until they shall have deliberated upon the subject and authorized such a measure.

Abraham Lincoln said they—meaning the Framers—resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression—meaning war—upon us. And that's what this really does.

Now, over the last 60 years since World War II, during the Cold War, power has flowed to the President—again, Presidents in general. The exigencies of time when bombers were over the Pole, or we thought bombers were over the Pole, you couldn't call Congress into session. And Congress, in effect, surrendered much power to the Presidency.

Korea was an undeclared war and should not have happened that way.

Vietnam, Congress was fooled. They called the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution the “functional equivalent of a declaration of war” which Congress would

not have voted had they known what was in store or what they were voting on, or that it was going to be cited as a declaration of war.

The issue before us is not consultation with Congress; it is not a lack of information to Congress. It's the fact that Congress must act, and that is why the Boehner resolution is beside the point.

Now, in the past, there was a good reason. There was time, there were emergencies. But here, Secretary Gates said there was no threat to the national security of the United States. We had time to negotiate with the Arab League, we had time to go to the U.N., and there was time to go to Congress and ask for an authorization of military war.

The President gave us his reasons for going into Libya. Not everyone agrees with those. But the question is not the wisdom of the war in Libya; it is enforcing the Constitution. And if we pass the Kucinich resolution, the President would have 15 days to come before us and ask us to authorize the use of force, if that is necessary.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the United States is engaged in a war in the name of humanity. The President's actions did not follow the Constitution. They do not follow the War Powers Resolution. It is an unconstitutional action on the part of the United States.

I served on the bench in Texas for over 20 years trying criminal cases. In our daily business, we followed the law. And the law required that you have a trial. If convicted, the person was sentenced. I never tried a case that a person was so bad we just skipped the trial and we went ahead and sentenced them and then had the trial later to prove it was a good idea. We followed the law. And the same law that required a procedure in a trial that is in the U.S. Constitution, the Constitution also says there is a procedure for going to war. And the procedure is that Congress, not the President, instigates war.

James Madison, a person who wrote the Constitution, said the Constitution supposes what the history of all government demonstrates: that the executive is the branch of power most interested in war and most prone to it. Therefore, with studied care, we have vested the question of war with the legislature. That would be us. Congress. We have not fulfilled our obligation.

The war in Libya violates the Constitution, the War Powers Act. It is not in the national security of the United States. It is said, Well, the French, we may disrespect the French. Well, I say to the French: You respect our Constitution, and our Constitution says that the declaration and going to war is the responsibility of Congress, not any executive.

It has been said that the Constitution may be inconvenient, but it is meant

to be, Madam Speaker. War is a serious matter, and Presidents and Congresses should be inconvenienced on the road to war.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, the first airstrikes against Libya were launched in March. Now it is June. Seventy-six days after this mission began, Congress still hasn't been given an opportunity to vote for or against a declaration of war.

Every Member of this body, regardless of individual feelings, should demand—demand—that their constitutional authority be respected. The engagement in Libya is lingering without accountability or checks on Presidential power, without a vigorous debate about the consequences of our actions. What is the endgame? What is the timetable? What are the metrics or benchmarks of success?

With the United States already fighting in two theaters, with the human and financial costs of Iraq and Afghanistan mounting every day—\$10 billion a month alone in Afghanistan, our military is stretched to its breaking point. We simply cannot take on a third war.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Last week, by an overwhelming majority of 416–5, this body voted to say “no” to boots on the ground in Libya. Today, we must go one step further. We must support H. Con. Res. 51 and end the war in Libya altogether.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for introducing this resolution.

It is just so ironic that on May 26, a CNN poll found that the majority of the American people, 55 percent, believe Congress, not the President, should have final authority for deciding whether the United States should continue its military mission in Libya.

Yes, American people, you are exactly right, and that is why we need to support Mr. KUCINICH's resolution.

It has been amazing to me that I have heard so much debate today about NATO's feelings—NATO's feelings. Well, how about the feelings of the American people? How about the people that pay the taxes in this country, how about their feelings? Isn't it time their feelings come first?

That is why I sincerely believe, and I wanted to be on the floor today because—and I thank Mr. BOEHNER, the Speaker of the House, for presenting a resolution, but that does not do it. That does not do it.

The Constitution says that Mr. KUCINICH is right with this resolution. The American people say that he is right with this resolution. The American people are calling on the Congress

to meet their constitutional duties and to vote for this resolution.

Madam Speaker, before I close, I want to say again to Mr. KUCINICH, thank you for taking the lead on this. This should actually be the only resolution we are voting on, but let's show the American people that we believe in the Constitution and let's support Mr. KUCINICH's resolution.

□ 1240

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I inquire of the amount of time remaining for all of the managers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 13¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Florida has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, this resolution is not as much about Libya as it is about us. Wouldn't it be wonderful if we could control events around the world, determine the way that people see us and always accurately predict the consequences of our actions? But that's not what life is all about. The best we can do is establish the values and the principles that define us individually as citizens and collectively as a Nation.

This resolution is not about whether we should be involved. We are always going to be involved in what is taking place around the world, because we are the world's economic, military and moral superpower. To choose not to act, particularly at a time of such crisis and transformation that is occurring throughout the Arab world, is, in fact, to choose. In this case, it would be to choose to define us as a people who has decided to look the other way, to choose not to hear the cries of desperate help from the Libyan people who have chosen to put their lives on the line in the cause of democracy, of individual liberty and of freedom from oppression.

These are the values that define us as a people and as a Nation. They are the values, frankly, that give hope to a world of repression and despotism that will, in fact, continue to exist and, in fact, will gain strength if we do not stand up, speak out and "have their back" at such a time as this.

That's why we should defeat the Kucinich resolution, because it is really about who we are as a people and whether we still have the courage and the constancy to defend the moral high ground. As long as the rest of the world has to look up, not down and not sideways as this resolution would place us, we will, in fact, be advancing our own security and prosperity and the integrity of our moral force as a Nation of principled people.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. MORAN. We must always bear in mind that we live in a world that wants more than anything to shine as brightly as the beacon of freedom and hope that we represent. We should always bear in mind that we have the privilege of representing and bur-nishing ever brighter that beacon in a time of crisis when there is clear cost and consequence to our actions. This is when we show the courage and the constancy that must define us. Once again, we are called upon to be equal to our history to the legacy of those who have gone before us.

This may not seem like a terribly critical vote in the scheme of things; but to all of the Libyans who have chosen to put their lives on the line for the values that define us as Americans, it is a big deal. It is everything. It is their lives. It is their hope. It is their future. That's why this resolution should be defeated. Because this is about us and a world that looks to us for its moral leadership.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. This is a defining moment for us as a people. This is a defining moment for this body. This is a defining moment for the United States Constitution.

With the civil war in North Africa, there is no clear and present danger to the United States of America. Therefore, in acts of war, the President has a constitutional duty and obligation to come to the Congress to seek approval. For the President to suggest that he got approval from the United Nations is offensive, and it's wrong.

No, Mr. President. Authorization to go to war comes from the American people, and it comes from the United States Congress. We must stand tall and true to the Constitution. We have no choice but to vote on this action. This is a defining moment.

What is absent in all this discussion, I'd point out to my colleagues, is I see no resolution to go to war. I don't see a resolution that says this is what we should be doing.

Please vote in favor of this amendment. Stand true and tall for the Constitution. This is a defining moment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support for H. Con. Res. 51. We need to pass this resolution to send a very strong message.

We have been told by those who oppose this message that we should not have an abrupt withdrawal from the region, but I would strongly suggest that what we should be talking about is the abrupt and illegal entry into war. That's what we have to stop. Since we went in abruptly and illegally, we need to abruptly leave.

It has also been said by those who oppose this resolution that they concede that Congress should assume its prerogatives over the war powers but to do it gradually. I would strongly suggest that when we took our oath of office we assumed that radically and suddenly. We took an oath of office to obey the Constitution, not to defer to the United Nations, and that we already have assumed that responsibility.

I would also suggest, if we do nothing, if we do not pass this resolution, it is the sin of omission that we commit.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of the Kucinich resolution. I had hoped to be able to support the Boehner resolution. I share the Speaker's concern that a precipitous withdrawal called for by the Kucinich resolution sends a less than optimal signal to our NATO allies.

Yet, while we are on the subject of signals, I am far more concerned about the puzzling, confusing, mystifying signal that we send by passing a resolution that affirms that the President has not fulfilled his constitutional or statutory obligations, yet offers no remedy, only a mild rebuke, followed by a questionnaire.

Madam Speaker, I was here in 2001 when we authorized the use of force to enter Afghanistan. There was just one dissenting vote. When a genuine threat to our national security is perceived, it has been the longstanding practice of Congress to support the administration in its actions. The greater threat today, in my view, is the perpetual acquiescence of this body, in situations such as we face today in Libya, where we tolerate the use of military force when the threat to our national security is less obvious.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I think the President erred in not following the War Powers Act in the spirit of the Constitution. He should have asked us. If he had, I would have said "no" then, and I say "no" now.

Let me disagree with those of my colleagues who have talked about what a terrible man Qadhafi is as a reason for the United States to be spending our money there. Yes, he's a thug who ought to be removed, but it cannot be that America has to be the 911 for the world and that we are the ones who have to respond everywhere every time.

I heard one of my colleagues on the other side say, Well, the Europeans are there. Let's not poke them in the eye. Poke them in the eye? We have for years, since the beginning of NATO, been subsidizing them so that they have military budgets less than half of

ours as a percentage of their GDP, so that they can do better than us in health care and better in competitiveness and every other way.

□ 1250

Yes, he should be opposed. There are European nations, developed, wealthy nations just across the Mediterranean. Why do they have to have America come nearly 4,000 miles to do it?

And it's not just Libya. This is defining. Are we going to go forward with a situation in which America undertakes to defend everybody in the world everywhere, even when they are not greatly threatened, as is the case with NATO or with missile defenses against non-existent missile threats from Iran, or do we say that we will bear our fair share but not more? We have got to stop subsidizing the rest of the world, particularly now.

And when members from the Appropriations Committee come up and tell us, You've got to go do this, but let's cut police in Massachusetts, let's cut housing in Ohio, let's cut transportation in California, we cannot reduce our deficit in a way that allows us to maintain any concern for the quality of life here if we continue to spend money promiscuously all over the world.

By the way, let's go beyond that. We're not just talking about Libya. What about the paradox of Afghanistan, where we will spend \$100 billion a year to be told by the President of Afghanistan that he doesn't like what we're doing. Fine, let him have it. Stop forcing him to take our \$100 billion a year.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me a minute this morning.

Today I think we owe the American people an apology because we all as a House are here to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States and it has been way too long before this debate has been had on this floor.

There is much more at risk today than Libya. What is at risk today is the very Constitution that we have sworn to protect and to uphold. If the Constitution is at risk, then this House is at risk.

When this House is blatantly ignored by another branch, by the President of the United States, then the people are blatantly ignored by the President of the United States and this House will fall.

I applaud those that have sponsored this resolution, and I rise in support of it today.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

Mr. STARK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I support H. Con. Res. 51, a bipartisan resolution directing the President to remove the United States Armed Forces from Libya within 15 days. I'm proud to support this resolution by Representatives KUCINICH, BURTON, and CAPUANO. It gives Congress, and therefore the American people, the power to decide whether America enters into or continues a war which destroys our economy, which destroys unnecessarily human lives who do not oppose us and are not a threat.

For us to be wantonly killing people around the globe, entering into a war—there's no other question about that—without permission from the American people through this body is unconstitutional, it's wrong, and we should support the Kucinich amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman from California, our ranking member on Foreign Affairs, for the time.

Madam Speaker, this is a very tough call, a tough set of circumstances. There is much complexity here with the convergence of war and diplomacy and geopolitics and allied relations.

What is clear, however, is that the President has not communicated effectively with the United States Congress, nor has he sought this body's authorization for the undertaking in Libya.

Let's have a brief history lesson here, though: Some in this body called for unilateral action against Libya just 3 months ago. That was appropriately resisted by this administration until other nations, particularly the British and the French, were willing to put up their own assets and give structure to a NATO coalition.

However, now U.S. actions, in an important allied effort to save Libyan civilians from imminent slaughter, have clearly moved beyond the scope of humanitarian relief and stabilization efforts.

With that said, an abrupt and imminent cut-off of U.S. participation in Libya causes numerous complications and would be highly disruptive. Yet we should not creep, we must not creep toward opening up a third front in Libya, which is the root cause of this debate.

The general framework for intervention without express congressional authorization has precedent and some parallels within the last 30 years. Let's look at Lebanon in 1982, Panama in 1989, Bosnia in 1995, and Kosovo in 1999. All of these interventions had various levels of controversy, particularly the one in Lebanon; but they were undertaken by Presidents of the United States.

The Boehner resolution, considered before this one, gives the President a small window of time to better make

his case. If the President cannot, Congress can assert its authority and disapprove.

Raising principled questions about war powers is a laudable goal, and I do want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for his leadership in this important debate. It would not have happened without him.

However, I think we should move forward very carefully. Speaker BOEHNER's resolution pushes the President for answers but stops short of requesting congressional authorization or abrupt withdrawal of U.S. participation in the Libya mission. If this approach is unfruitful, we can then exercise further options.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO), who has been a driving force behind this resolution.

Mr. CAPUANO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to be one of the original cosponsors of this resolution. But I want to be honest, I take no pleasure in this. I'm an early and ardent supporter of the President on most everything. This has nothing to do, in my mind, with the President or, truthfully, even with the action in Libya. For me, this is about the Constitution, plain and simple.

The Constitution is clear. It's not even about the War Powers Act. I personally think the War Powers Act is probably unconstitutional. The Constitution is clear. On many things it's not. It is unequivocally clear that the declaration of war is the responsibility of Congress, period. No gray area there.

Now, I know you can try to fudge on what the definition of war is, but when someone is shooting at someone else, that's war. If it's one person, 10 people, or 10 million, that's war. For me, that's what this is about.

Now, don't get me wrong. I would hesitate strongly—I doubt that I would support the action in Libya. But that's not why I cosponsored this.

And I've had some people say, well, 15 days is unreasonable. Well, okay. Then if this passes, they have 15 days to come back to us and ask us for more time, which I would be inclined to do if that's necessary on a military basis.

□ 1300

What this simply says is that Congress has to stand up on our own two feet and take the actions that we took an oath to take, which is to uphold the Constitution.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CAPUANO. Now, I understand that people may see things differently and I respect people that would differ, but I cannot believe that anyone can honestly read the Constitution on this matter in an unclear way.

Congress has the authority to declare war, period. That's why I'm here today.

I'm not here to debate today whether we are right or wrong to be in Libya. That will come another day—maybe or maybe not. But I am here to say, uncomfortable as it is, unpleasant as it is, as difficult as it is, it is our responsibility to take action when it comes to declaring war. Every Member of Congress should be voting for this resolution because of that simple fact, and we can have other debates on another day.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, the author of this resolution is known for his opposition to the use of American military force, and those who agree with him on foreign policy may well vote for this resolution. In contrast, I have voted for every authorization to use military force that has come before this Congress in the last 15 years, and I would support the authorization to use force in Libya if it had the proper conditions and limits.

This resolution would not actually result in the immediate withdrawal; instead, it would force the President to come to this Congress and seek authorization pursuant to law—and would get that authorization, I believe, with the appropriate limits and conditions. That would be an improvement to our foreign policy. More importantly, it would mean we're following the Constitution. The War Powers Act is the law of the land and it requires congressional authorization for military actions that take more than 60 days.

We long for democracy and the rule of law in Libya, but not at the expense of democracy and the rule of law in the United States. If we don't require compliance with the War Powers Act, who will? And if the War Powers Act becomes a dead letter, who will constrain some future President with imperial ambitions?

If your constituents insist that you stand up for the rule of law, don't go back to them next week saying you voted for the Boehner resolution. That Boehner resolution does not mention—let alone enforce—the War Powers Act.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Boehner resolution just grudgingly acquiesces to an imperial vision of the Presidency. The Kucinich resolution enforces the War Powers Act and starts us on the War Powers Act process.

We owe it to our fighting men and women that when they risk their lives, they do so pursuant to our laws and our Constitution. And when they risk their lives for an extended period of time, they do so not because of the decision of one individual but, rather, because of the decision of the representatives of all of the American people.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Appropriations

Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. The debate in the House today concerning the extent of U.S. involvement in the military action in Libya, now led by NATO, is a necessary and important debate, and I appreciate the role that DENNIS KUCINICH has played in this.

Both resolutions being considered today recognize the essential role of Congress in authorizing and in funding the use of U.S. Armed Forces consistent with the War Powers act and the Constitution. Both resolutions require the Members of the House to reflect on the appropriateness of the use of military force in this operation, as outlined by the President. And both resolutions initiate the entirely appropriate debate over the objectives of this operation as well as its duration.

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 U.S. effort was undertaken in concert with a broad coalition of nations, some of our closest friends, 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 al Qadhafi. The Qadhafi government's response to the uprising—inspired by the Arab Spring movement—was to use force against civilians and opposition forces, and the brutal measures prompted the international outcry and the U.N. action.

At the time, the President stated clearly that our leadership of the NATO effort would last a matter of days, not weeks. While the direct U.S. leadership of this effort lasted a brief time, U.S. forces remain engaged in the NATO operation; and at this point, it is clear that Members of Congress are not comfortable with the extent of information they have been given about the direction, the duration, or the cost of the operation. Under the War Powers act, the President has an obligation to report to Congress and to seek concurrence if our military involvement extends longer than 60 days, and clearly such consultation has not been effectively accomplished.

We are encouraged by statements from the Obama administration that U.S. ground forces will not be used in Libya. And last week, 416 Members of Congress supported the Conyers amendment to the Defense authorization bill that would prohibit funds in the bill from being used to deploy ground forces in the country.

At issue now is whether Congress should act through the Kucinich resolution to effectively terminate the U.S. involvement in the NATO effort within 2 weeks or whether Congress, through the Boehner resolution, should scold the President for not providing greater detail about specific actions, contribu-

tions of other nations to the effort, and the possible involvement of Hezbollah, the Muslim Brotherhood, al Qaeda, and other organizations in and outside the region in providing support to the Libyan Government.

I believe the Kucinich resolution is premature and that it could materially harm our relationship with NATO allies from which we will undoubtedly require support in the future.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I believe the Boehner resolution is an attack on the President, something most of the Republican Caucus would vote against if its party was in control of the executive branch.

I do support a wider debate and greater oversight of the use and the cost of U.S. military forces engaged in the Libya operation, both in the Defense and Foreign Affairs-related committees here as well as in the full House. I am neither prepared to end our involvement unilaterally, as in the Kucinich amendment, nor do I believe Congress should officially declare our involvement in this effort that has not been properly explained by the President.

I think the President made a very strong statement to the American people about why we were going to use this for humanitarian reasons. I think the Qadhafi regime is a brutal regime that should be replaced, and I hope that we can accomplish that.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time remains for all?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 3 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California has 45 seconds remaining; and the gentlewoman from Florida has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself 1 minute.

Members will be asked to vote on two resolutions, H. Con. Res. 51, and a resolution offered by Speaker BOEHNER, H. Res. 292, both of which address U.S. military involvement in Libya.

I do not believe that H. Res. 292 is at odds with H. Con. Res. 51, but it's not a substitute for the resolution that Mr. BURTON and others have worked on. It's imperative that Members clearly understand this, because the consequence of voting for one—that's the Speaker of the House resolution—and not the other, H. Con. Res. 51, ends up being an endorsement of unconstitutional action that was taken by the White House.

So how does Congress deal with the failure of any President to adhere to the Constitution? If Congress does not challenge a President's dismissal of the clear meaning of article I, section 8, then we will have tacitly endorsed a President's violation of the Constitution and guaranteed the perpetuation of future constitutional transgressions. A mild rebuke alone of the usurpation

of a constitutionally mandated war power is insufficient to defend the Constitution.

Many of us want to support our President, but the President has ignored Congress' assertion of the war powers by failing to obey the War Powers Resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, just in closing our time in the debate, I would take up Mr. KUCINICH's comments.

If you think there has been an inappropriate abuse of power here, voting for the Boehner resolution does not cure that. But the Constitution doesn't say the President must come to Congress and get a declaration of war. It says Congress must declare war.

I agree very much with the thinking of my friend, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. ROGERS, that there are national security issues involved here as well as humanitarian issues, and that's why I oppose Kucinich. But the notion that the President has to come to Congress when Congress has the authority to address this issue directly through a declaration or through an authorization or a limited authorization is the right way to do it.

I urge a "no" vote on both the Boehner amendment and the Kucinich amendment.

□ 1310

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself 1 minute.

There are those who may hesitate to support my resolution because of the supposed negative impact it will have on the NATO mission and on our image in the eyes of our NATO allies.

In the weeks leading up to the war, the administration had time to consult with the Arab League, the United Nations, and the African Union, but apparently had no time to come to this Congress for approval. If our image in the eyes of NATO is a reason to stay in Libya, the administration should not have committed the U.S. to a war of choice without consulting with Congress for an action that was so far outside that which is allowed by the War Powers Resolution.

Far more damaging is a Congress that ends up being more concerned with our image in the eyes of NATO than our fulfillment of our constitutional responsibilities and the continued usurpation of the war power by the executive. Our loyalty to NATO and to our President, regardless of party affiliation, does not trump our loyalty to the United States Constitution.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. May I ask the gentlelady, will she be closing?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Yes, we will use the time to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank all Members on both sides of the aisle who

have participated in this important constitutional debate.

What does it mean to defend the Constitution? Well, if you know that Congress very clearly has the power to declare war, if you believe the President violated the Constitution in this regard, then you cannot come to any conclusion other than to say that we stand up and defend the Constitution by voting for H. Con. Res. 51.

Let us also defend the Founding Fathers and the doctrine of separation of powers. Let us defend the doctrine of checks and balances. Let us defend the institution of the Congress of the United States. And as we stand here, having taken an oath to defend the Constitution, this, my friends, is our moment to stand up for that oath, to act in defense of the Constitution.

I urge a "yes" vote on H. Con. Res. 51. I ask Members on both sides of the aisle, who I know are ready to step forward in this moment, to join me.

Thank you very much.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and a captain in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 1½ minutes.

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

Ladies and gentlemen, we are at a moment in time. The Middle East is awakening to freedom. They're seeing the opportunities that lie before them that we have experienced for hundreds of years, and they're begging for freedom.

The greatest disinfectant to terrorism is not necessarily bombs. It's not necessarily armies. It's freedom. This war, this action in Libya, I believe sells itself. I believe it is in the United States' interests and in the interests of freedom-loving people everywhere to support it. But, Mr. President, you need to come to Congress, and you need to say what our interests are there and allow Congress to vote on that, because I believe the action in Libya sells itself.

People all across are begging for this. In 50 years, when boys and girls in school read about the great awakening in the Middle East and the wars and the consternation that we used to have to fight and now you have a bastion of freedom, let us be on the right side of history. Let us be the ones that stood up with people that said, we're going to throw off the reins of terrorism and the reins of dictatorship. This sells itself.

Thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members that remarks in debate are properly addressed to the Chair and not to the President.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 292, offered by Representative BOEHNER and H. Con. Res. 51, offered by Representative KUCINICH.

I strongly oppose putting any U.S. forces on the ground in Libya and voted in support of the amendment offered to the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act by Representative CONYERS which prohibited funds from being used for that purpose.

These resolutions are both flawed. I cannot support either of them because they ignore the reasons the U.S. joined NATO operations in Libya and the president's efforts to keep Congress informed, and each fails to recognize the support role American forces now play since we transferred leadership of the mission to NATO.

I disagree with the Boehner Resolution's accusation that the president has failed to provide Congress with a compelling rationale for U.S. military activities in Libya.

On March 21, 2011, President Obama wrote to Congress notifying us of his decision to deploy U.S. forces against the Qaddafi Regime in response to a request from the Arab League. In his letter, President Obama stated that his actions were undertaken to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe and to address a growing threat to international peace and security.

Further, the president fulfilled his pledge to greatly redefine the role of American forces and they now play a non-combat, supporting role comprised of intelligence gathering, logistics, surveillance and search and rescue.

Finally, I oppose the Kucinich resolution's call for an immediate withdrawal of forces from Libya. In his speech last month on North Africa, the president said the U.S. joined the NATO operation in Libya because "we saw the prospect of imminent massacre and we heard the Libyan people's call for help."

Not acting in the face of Qaddafi's threat to show "no mercy" to his people and to go door to door hunting them like rats would have been an abdication of our moral duty as global citizens and would have sent the wrong message to the tyrants of the world.

In his speech on Libya the president said, "To brush aside America's responsibility as a leader—and more profoundly—our responsibilities to our fellow human beings under such circumstances would have been a betrayal of who we are. Some nations may be able to turn a blind eye to atrocities in other countries. The United States of America is different."

Given the conversion of special factors in Libya, I believe the president's decision has been justified.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 51, a bipartisan resolution directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed forces from Libya within 15 days after the adoption of this resolution until Congress is able to review how our Nation should move forward.

With no stated goal, no input from Congress and no end in site, a continuation of our involvement in Libya is unreasonable and unconstitutional. With Congress considering cuts to Medicare, Medicaid and other vital programs, we cannot afford yet another war.

We have now been involved in a war with Libya for over 60 days with no constitutionally required authorization for the use of military force or declaration of war. And we were not attacked. It is time for Congress to reassert its Constitutional war powers authority and end the war in Libya.

I am proud to support this resolution by Representatives KUCINICH, BURTON and

CAPUANO that gives Congress, and therefore the American people, the power to decide whether America enters into or continues a war.

I urge my colleagues to follow the will of the American people and support this resolution.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of President Obama's foray into Libya, I have been a vocal critic of his decisions. Shortly after the United States' bombing campaign began in Libya, I spoke out in opposition, expressing my belief that intervention in Libya is not in the vital national security interest of the United States. I stand behind that belief today. In writings, interviews, and Armed Services Committee hearings, I have made it clear that I believe the President is in violation of the War Powers Resolution. I am proud that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle acted to send a clear message to the President and his Administration that they must take our country to war only when they absolutely must, and then only when they have fulfilled their Constitutional obligations, as defined in the War Powers Resolution.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to both H. Res. 292 and H. Con. Res. 51 which address our ongoing allied efforts in Libya. While I strongly support Congress's continued oversight and debate of the mission in Libya and its effect on our national security, I do not believe that either of the resolutions before us represent the most appropriate approach to this issue.

I recently voted for an amendment to the FY2012 Defense Authorization Act to prohibit the use of American ground troops in Libya as the operation progresses, and I continue to believe this is the right path for America's involvement. However, it is not in the best interest of our national security today, or in the long term, to remove all forces from the effort, including U.S. Air and Naval assets, as H. Con. Res. 51 demands. The ongoing NATO operation is intended to preserve the lives of the Libyan people. By completely removing ourselves from this effort, we weaken our global standing on human rights, risk damage to our relationship with NATO allies, and threaten our national security by putting the stability of the region in jeopardy.

Similarly, while I support the ongoing discussion of our involvement in Libya and feel that the Administration's initial coordination and consultation with Congress could have been improved upon, I find H. Res. 292 unduly critical of the Administration's efforts. Furthermore, this resolution would have no actual impact on Congressional oversight of the President's authority or conduct of operations. Rather, it seems designed to serve a political purpose that does nothing to advance the genuine, substantive discussion we should be having about this issue.

Congress should continue to debate U.S. involvement in the Libyan effort, however we must do so smartly and in a manner that does not undermine our military efforts or global standing. I urge my colleagues to vote against both of these measures.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I voted against both House resolutions that are the wrong response to the United States participation in an international coalition to deal with the humanitarian crisis in Libya.

I do not, however, support an open-ended commitment. Additionally, my vote last week for the Conyers amendment to bar all funds

from being used to deploy, establish, or maintain a presence of Members of the Armed Services or private security contractors on the ground in Libya makes clear I only support a limited U.S. role.

Too often the greatest powers, including the United States, have failed to act when they could have intervened in a responsible way to stop the slaughter of innocents. In Libya, it was clear that there was a crisis developing and America, with our NATO allies, the Arab League, and the UN Security Council, appropriately provided limited support to rebel forces.

That assistance included a no-fly zone that has undoubtedly saved thousands of lives.

It would have been an unfortunate precedent and undermined key global institutions if we failed to act with such a clear, unified call for intervention.

Inaction would have endangered the recent display of democratic aspirations by so many in the region.

Our failure to act would have emboldened the despots of Syria, Iran, Yemen and others, suggesting there were no consequences for murdering peaceful protesters.

Our primary role in the NATO mission has been to provide operational and logistical support to other countries that have taken the lead on enforcing UN Security Resolution 1973.

The Kucinich resolution is ill-advised, requiring U.S. forces to cease all operational support for the NATO mission in Libya within 15 days. I believe that we must not turn our backs on our allies and more importantly, the innocent civilians in Libya who want the right to choose their own government.

Speaker BOEHNER's resolution, while not calling for an end to U.S. involvement in Libya, is factually inaccurate and attempts to rewrite history.

I will welcome thoughtful legislation acknowledging that the U.S. has chosen to answer the cries of the innocent Libyan people, but makes clear that our commitment to their aspirations of self governance is not open-ended, and which clearly defines our goals and—more importantly—limits.

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res 51 by my colleague Congressman DENNIS KUCINICH, which directs President Barack Obama to remove the United States Armed Forces from Libya by not later than 15 days after the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

Let me be perfectly blunt—the reason we are here today voting on two resolutions that deal with the President's role and responsibility under the War Powers Resolution is because of President Obama's failure to abide by the law, and our failure to address this issue before day 74.

The War Powers Resolution was enacted into law on November 7, 1973, overriding President Richard Nixon's veto. The law states that the President's powers as Commander in Chief to introduce United States forces into hostilities or imminent hostilities are exercised only pursuant to either (1) a declaration of war; (2) specific statutory authorization; or (3) a national emergency created by an attack on the United States, its territories and possessions, or its forces.

The War Powers Resolution requires the President—in every possible instance—to consult with Congress before introducing Amer-

ican armed forces into hostilities unless there has been a declaration of war or other specific congressional authorization, such as the Congressional Resolution that provided President George W. Bush authority to engage in Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2003.

The War Powers Resolution also requires the President to report to the United States Congress any introduction of forces into hostilities or imminent hostilities, into foreign territory while equipped for combat, or in numbers which substantially enlarge U.S. forces equipped for combat already in a foreign nation. Such a report is required within 48 hours. Once this report is submitted—or required to be submitted—the United States Congress must authorize the use of forces within 60 days, or the forces must be withdrawn within 30 days from the 60 day mark.

Before discussing the current situation the United States finds itself in, it is important for the American people to understand the reasoning behind the passage of the War Powers Resolution in the 1970s.

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution gives the United States Congress the power to declare War, not the President. However, Article II, Section 2 declares that "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States." Many Presidents have cited their authority under Article II, Section 2 to defend the United States against attacks, or to take actions in our nation's national security interest, through military action without a formal declaration of war.

Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon used their authority as Commanders in Chief in order to send American combat "advisors" forces into Vietnam beginning in the late 1950s. By the 1968 Tet Offensive, the United States had over half a million troops on the ground in Vietnam engaged in intense military conflict. Unclear about the American strategy in Vietnam, many Members of Congress became concerned about their eroding authority granted by the Constitution to debate, decide and declare when to involve the United States in a war.

As such, the War Powers Resolution enacted in order to ensure the checks and balances mandated by the United States Constitution would remain intact during times of armed conflict.

On March 19, 2011, U.S. military forces began operations in Libya. Two days later, on March 21, 2011, President Barack Obama informed the United States Congress that Operation Odyssey Dawn was aimed at "assisting an international effort authorized by the United Nations Security Council . . . to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe and address the threat posed to international peace and security."

To date, President Obama has not provided a clear and defined mission for the United States involvement in Libya. Since the opening hours of military action on March 19, the President has had no clear direction in Libya. President Obama has not defined the mission, defined success, nor defined the end state. Further, the President has still not identified who the so-called rebels are that are receiving millions of dollars of American support in terms of weapons, ammunition, and resources, as well as attacks against Moammar Qaddafi's forces.

As a 22-year Army combat veteran, I can tell you from experience that successful mission completion is obtained by properly defining the very things I have mentioned, which

President Obama has failed to do. As a Member of the United States House of Representatives, I swore an oath to protect and defend American citizens against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Is Moammar Qadaffi an enemy of the United States—absolutely. But because President Obama has not informed us of whom the rebel forces we are supporting are, how can we be absolutely certain that they will not be an enemy of this country? Quite simply, we cannot because the President has failed to define our strategy.

It has now been 74 days since President Obama informed the United States Congress on the introduction of American forces into Libya as required by the War Powers Resolution. Since March 21, 2011, the United States Congress has not declared war or enacted a specific authorization for the use of force, has not extended the 60-day period required by the War Powers Resolutions, nor is United States Congress physically unable to meet as a result of an attack upon the United States. In fact, United States Congress has met nearly 30 times since March 21, 2011. Therefore, President Obama is in violation of Title 50, Chapter 33 of United States Code—the War Powers Resolution.

Section 5, Paragraph C of the War Powers Resolution states that “at any time that United States Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States, its possessions and territories without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President if the Congress so directs by Concurrent Resolution.”

The Concurrent Resolution offered by Congressman KUCINICH falls right in line with Section 1544 of the War Powers Resolution, and simply states that pursuant to Section 5c of the War Powers Resolution, the United States Congress directs the President to remove armed forces from Libya within 15 days of enactment.

President Barack Obama is in violation of the law—plain and simple—and he must comply with the law. The very foundation of our Republic lies on the rule of law, and is guarded by a system of checks and balances, and as a Member of the United States Congress, I have a Constitutional obligation to ensure this system is upheld.

I support the Concurrent Resolution offered by Representative KUCINICH.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 51, which expresses the sense of Congress that we must withdraw our armed forces from Libya no later than 15 days after H. Con. Res. 51 is adopted. It is the constitutional authority of the Congress to declare war. In my view, the President committed U.S. troops to a hostile environment without Congressional consent. Therefore, I voted for H. Con. Res. 51.

Simply stated, military intervention endangers the lives of our brave men and women in uniform and that of civilians on the ground. And such a heavy responsibility necessitates concurrence by the Congress. Moreover, our Nation’s long term foreign policy cannot be driven by threats of military action in every corner of the world. In order to achieve long-lasting peace and stability, we need to lead by example and look past the sword for solutions. As lessons in Afghanistan and Iraq have taught us, military action alone is not a win-

ning strategy for long-term security and peace. Hearts and minds are not won over by tanks and bombs. Instead, they are won by engaging local populations and offering resources that uplift entire communities.

I commend Representative KUCINICH for bringing this Resolution to the Floor and I am proud to support it. I always have and always will use my vote and my voice to promote a foreign policy aimed at bringing lasting peace and prosperity to fragile, conflict-ridden regions around the globe.

All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 294, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Resolution 294;

House Concurrent Resolution 51.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second vote in the series will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

#### REGARDING DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN LIBYA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 292) declaring that the President shall not deploy, establish, or maintain the presence of units and members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Libya, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 268, nays 145, answered “present” 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

YEAS—268

Adams	Bartlett	Bonner
Aderholt	Barton (TX)	Bono Mack
Akin	Benishek	Boren
Alexander	Berg	Boswell
Altmire	Biggert	Boustany
Amash	Billbray	Brady (TX)
Austria	Billirakis	Braley (IA)
Bachmann	Bishop (GA)	Brooks
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Broun (GA)
Barletta	Black	Buchanan
Barrow	Blackburn	Bucshon

Buerkle	Herger	Pingree (ME)
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Pitts
Burton (IN)	Higgins	Platts
Calvert	Himes	Poe (TX)
Camp	Hochul	Pompeo
Canseco	Huizenga (MI)	Posey
Cantor	Hultgren	Price (GA)
Capito	Hunter	Quayle
Carter	Hurt	Reed
Cassidy	Issa	Rehberg
Castor (FL)	Jenkins	Reichert
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Renacci
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Ribble
Chandler	Jordan	Richardson
Clarke (MI)	Kelly	Rigell
Coble	King (IA)	Rivera
Coffman (CO)	King (NY)	Roby
Cole	Kingston	Roe (TN)
Conaway	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Connolly (VA)	Kline	Rogers (KY)
Costello	Kucinich	Rogers (MI)
Cravaack	Labrador	Rohrabacher
Crawford	Lamborn	Rokita
Crenshaw	Lance	Rooney
Cuellar	Landry	Ros-Lehtinen
Culberson	Lankford	Roskam
Davis (KY)	Latham	Ross (AR)
DeFazio	LaTourette	Ross (FL)
Denham	Latta	Royce
Dent	Lewis (CA)	Runyan
DesJarlais	Lipinski	Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Scalise
Doggett	Loeb sack	Schilling
Dold	Long	Schmidt
Dreier	Lucas	Schock
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Schrader
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Scott (SC)
Duncan (TN)	Lungren, Daniel	Scott, Austin
Ellmers	E.	Sensenbrenner
Emerson	Lynch	Sessions
Farenthold	Mack	Shimkus
Fincher	Manzullo	Shuster
Fitzpatrick	Marchant	Simpson
Fleischmann	Marino	Smith (NE)
Fleming	Matheson	Smith (NJ)
Flores	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)
Forbes	McCarthy (NY)	Southerland
Fortenberry	McCaul	Stark
Fox	McClintock	Stearns
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Stivers
Gallegly	McIntyre	Stutzman
Garamendi	McKeon	Sullivan
Gardner	McKinley	Terry
Garrett	McMorris	Thompson (PA)
Gerlach	Rodgers	Thornberry
Gibbs	McNerney	Tiberi
Gibson	Meehan	Tipton
Gingrey (GA)	Mica	Tonko
Goodlatte	Michaud	Tsongas
Gosar	Miller (MI)	Turner
Gowdy	Miller, Gary	Upton
Granger	Mulvaney	Visclosky
Graves (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Walberg
Graves (MO)	Neugebauer	Walden
Green, Gene	Noem	Walz (MN)
Griffin (AR)	Nugent	Webster
Griffith (VA)	Nunes	Westmoreland
Grimm	Nunnelee	Whitfield
Guinta	Olson	Wilson (SC)
Hall	Owens	Wittman
Hanabusa	Palazzo	Wolf
Hanna	Pallone	Womack
Harper	Pascrell	Woodall
Harris	Paul	Wu
Hartzler	Paulsen	Yarmuth
Hastings (WA)	Pence	Yoder
Hayworth	Peters	Young (AK)
Heck	Peterson	Young (FL)
Hensarling	Petri	Young (IN)

NAYS—145

Ackerman	Carney	DeGette
Andrews	Carson (IN)	DeLauro
Baca	Chu	Deutch
Baldwin	Cicilline	Dicks
Bass (CA)	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Becerra	Clay	Donnelly (IN)
Berkley	Cleaver	Doyle
Berman	Clyburn	Edwards
Bishop (NY)	Cohen	Ellison
Blumenauer	Conyers	Engel
Brady (PA)	Cooper	Eshoo
Brown (FL)	Costa	Farr
Butterfield	Courtney	Fattah
Campbell	Critz	Finler
Capps	Crowley	Flake
Capuano	Cummings	Frank (MA)
Cardoza	Davis (CA)	Fudge
Carnahan	Davis (IL)	Gohmert



Gonzalez	Luján	Sarbanes	Davis (KY)	Labrador	Roe (TN)	Meeks	Rivera	Smith (NE)
Green, Al	Maloney	Schakowsky	DeFazio	Landry	Rooney	Mica	Roby	Smith (NJ)
Grijalva	Markey	Schiff	Doyle	Lansry (CT)	Ross (FL)	Miller (NC)	Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)
Gutierrez	Matsui	Schweikert	Duffy	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard	Miller, Gary	Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)
Hastings (FL)	McColum	Scott (VA)	Duncan (SC)	Lewis (GA)	Royce	Moran	Rogers (MI)	Stivers
Heinrich	McDermott	Scott, David	Duncan (TN)	Luján	Schmidt	Murphy (CT)	Rohrabacher	Sullivan
Hinchev	McGovern	Serrano	Farr	Lummis	Schrader	Murphy (PA)	Rokita	Sutton
Hinojosa	Meeks	Sewell	Fincher	Lynch	Schweikert	Neugebauer	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)
Hirono	Miller (NC)	Sherman	Flake	Mack	Scott (SC)	Nunes	Roskam	Thompson (PA)
Holden	Moran	Sires	Fleming	Manzullo	Scott (VA)	Nunnelee	Ross (AR)	Thornberry
Holt	Murphy (CT)	Slaughter	Fox	Markey	Scott, Austin	Olson	Rothman (NJ)	Tiberi
Honda	Nadler	Smith (WA)	Frank (MA)	McClintock	Sensenbrenner	Olver	Runyan	Tipton
Huelskamp	Napolitano	Speier	Garrett	McGovern	Serrano	Owens	Ruppersberger	Tsongas
Inlee	Oliver	Sutton	Gibson	McHenry	Sherman	Palazzo	Ryan (OH)	Turner
Israel	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (CA)	Gohmert	McKinley	Southerland	Pallone	Ryan (WI)	Van Hollen
Jackson (IL)	Payne	Thompson (MS)	Gonzalez	Michaud	Speier	Pascrell	Sánchez, Linda	Walden
Jackson Lee	Pearce	Tierney	Gosar	Miller (MI)	Stark	Pelosi	T.	Walz (MN)
(TX)	Pelosi	Towns	Gowdy	Mulvaney	Stearns	Pence	Sanchez, Loretta	Wasserman
Johnson (IL)	Perlmutter	Van Hollen	Graves (GA)	Nadler	Stutzman	Peters	Sarbanes	Schultz
Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)	Velázquez	Grijalva	Napolitano	Terry	Peterson	Scalise	Watt
Jones	Quigley	Walsh (IL)	Guinta	Noem	Thompson (MS)	Platts	Schakowsky	Waxman
Keating	Rahall	Wasserman	Gutierrez	Nugent	Tierney	Polis	Schiff	Weiner
Kildee	Rangel	Schultz	Hall	Pastor (AZ)	Tomko	Pompeo	Schilling	Whitfield
Kind	Reyes	Watt	Hanabusa	Paul	Towns	Price (NC)	Schock	Wilson (FL)
Kissell	Richmond	Waxman	Harris	Paulsen	Upton	Quayle	Scott, David	Wilson (SC)
Langevin	Rothman (NJ)	Weiner	Hastings (FL)	Payne	Velázquez	Quigley	Sessions	Wittman
Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard	Welch	Hinchev	Pearce	Visclosky	Rahall	Sewell	Womack
Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger	Holt	Huelskamp	Perlmutter	Walberg	Rehberg	Shimkus	Wu
Lee (CA)	Ryan (OH)	Huelskamp	Huizenga (MI)	Petri	Walsh (IL)	Reichert	Shuster	Yarmuth
Levin	Sánchez, Linda	West	Jackson (IL)	Pingree (ME)	Waters	Renacci	Simpson	Yoder
Lewis (GA)	T.	Wilson (FL)	Jackson Lee	Pitts	Webster	Sires	Simpson	Young (IN)
Lowey	Sanchez, Loretta	Woolsey	(TX)	Poe (TX)	Welch	Richmond	Slaughter	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Waters

NOT VOTING—18

Bass (NH)	Kaptur	Myrick
Frelinghuysen	Lofgren, Zoe	Neal
Giffords	McCotter	Polis
Guthrie	Miller (FL)	Rush
Hoyer	Miller, George	Schwartz
Johnson (GA)	Moore	Shuler

□ 1340

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

Mr. ALTMIRE 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.

LIBYA WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Libya, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 148, nays 265, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]

YEAS—148

Adams	Brooks	Chaffetz	Cohen	Harper
Akin	Broun (GA)	Cicilline	Conaway	Hartzler
Amash	Buchanan	Clarke (MI)	Connolly (VA)	Hastings (WA)
Bachmann	Burgess	Clarke (NY)	Cooper	Hayworth
Baldwin	Burton (IN)	Clay	Costa	Heck
Bartlett	Camp	Cleaver	Courtney	Heinrich
Becerra	Campbell	Coble	Cravaack	Hensarling
Benishek	Capito	Cole	Crawford	Herger
Berg	Capuano	Conyers	Crawshaw	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (NY)	Cassidy	Costello	Critz	Higgins
Bralley (IA)	Castor (FL)	Davis (IL)	Crowley	Himes

Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Keating
Kingston
Kucinich

NAYS—265

Ackerman	Cuellar	Hirono
Aderholt	Culberson	Hochul
Alexander	Cummings	Holden
Altmire	Davis (CA)	Honda
Andrews	DeGette	Hultgren
Austria	DeLauro	Hunter
Baca	Denham	Hurt
Bachus	Dent	Inlee
Barletta	DesJarlais	Israel
Barrow	Deutch	Issa
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Jenkins
Bass (CA)	Dicks	Johnson (GA)
Berkley	Dingell	Johnson (OH)
Berman	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Biggart	Dold	Jordan
Bilbray	Donnelly (IN)	Kelly
Bilirakis	Dreier	Kildee
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Kind
Bishop (UT)	Ellison	King (IA)
Black	Ellmers	King (NY)
Blackburn	Emerson	Kinzinger (IL)
Blumenauer	Engel	Kissell
Bonner	Eshoo	Kline
Bono Mack	Farenthold	Lamborn
Boren	Fattah	Lance
Boswell	Filner	Langevin
Boustany	Fitzpatrick	Lankford
Brady (PA)	Fleischmann	Larsen (WA)
Brady (TX)	Flores	Latham
Brown (FL)	Forbes	LaTourette
Bucshon	Fortenberry	Latta
Buerkle	Franks (AZ)	Levin
Butterfield	Fudge	Lewis (CA)
Calvert	Gallegly	Lipinski
Canseco	Garamendi	LoBiondo
Cantor	Gardner	Loebsack
Capps	Gerlach	Long
Cardoza	Gibbs	Lowey
Carnahan	Gingrey (GA)	Lucas
Carney	Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer
Carson (IN)	Graves (MO)	Lungren, Daniel
Carter	Green, Al	E.
Chabot	Green, Gene	Maloney
Chandler	Griffin (AR)	Marchant
Chu	Griffith (VA)	Marino
Clyburn	Grimm	Mateson
Coffman (CO)	Hanna	Matsui
Cohen	Harper	McCarthy (CA)
Conaway	Hartzler	McCarthy (NY)
Connolly (VA)	Hastings (WA)	McCaul
Cooper	Hayworth	McColum
Costa	Heck	McDermott
Courtney	Heinrich	McIntyre
Cravaack	Hensarling	McKeon
Crawford	Herger	McMorris
Crawshaw	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers
Critz	Higgins	McNerney
Crowley	Himes	Meehan

NOT VOTING—19

Bass (NH)	Kaptur	Neal
Frelinghuysen	Lofgren, Zoe	Rush
Giffords	McCotter	Schwartz
Granger	Miller (FL)	Shuler
Guthrie	Miller, George	Young (FL)
Hinojosa	Moore	
Hoyer	Myrick	

□ 1347

So the concurrent resolution was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for the votes on June 3, 2011 due to a family obligation. Had I been present I would have voted against H. Con. Res. 51, and in favor of H. Res. 292.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to a family commitment, I missed rollcall Vote Nos. 410 and 411 on June 3, 2011. If present, I would have voted: rollcall Vote No. 410—Declaring that the President shall not deploy, establish, or maintain the presence of units and members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Libya, and for other purposes, "aye;" rollcall Vote No. 411—Directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Libya, "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I was absent today in order to attend my daughter's high school graduation. As a result, I missed three votes on Friday, June 3, 2011. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote 410 and 411, and "nay" on rollcall vote 412.

REPORT ON H.R. 2112, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012

Mr. KINGSTON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-101) on the bill (H.R. 2112) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, 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.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY,  
JUNE 7, 2011

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, June 7, 2011; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, June 9, 2011; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, June 13, 2011.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER  
AS COSPONSOR OF H. CON. RES. 58

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the gentleman from Ohio, STEVE STIVERS, from H. Con. Res. 58.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF LAW REVISION  
COUNSEL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 285c, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of Mr. Ralph V. Seep as Law Revision Counsel for the House of Representatives, effective June 2, 2011.

□ 1350

CONGRATULATING KOREAN  
CULTURAL CENTER

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

Mr. DOLD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Korean Cultural Center of Chicago on the grand opening of a new cultural center in Wheeling. Because of the hard work and determination of the Korean Cul-

tural Center, its president, Younghee Kang, and her staff, and its board of directors and supporters, we now have a focal point for the Korean-American community in the Chicago area.

The story of the Korean immigrant is an important part of Illinois' history, and we are fortunate to now have a facility that is a repository and exhibition of that story. The new cultural center will add a rich cultural tradition to the village of Wheeling, and will also benefit the neighboring communities. I hope it will also serve to strengthen the important relationship between the United States and the Republic of Korea.

The opening of this new center is the culmination of many years of effort and is a cause for great celebration. Congratulations and best wishes on many years of success.

RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, America's intervention in Libya was initially based on the international community's "Responsibility to Protect," a mandate agreed upon in the wake of the horrific Rwanda genocide. This important international doctrine calls for international intervention in a country where a government is unable or unwilling to protect its civilians, or is actively assaulting and killing inhabitants in that country.

I agree with this doctrine and America's initial response to the Qadhafi threat to wipe out a large segment of the Libyan population. For 3 months, the U.S. and U.N. have engaged in military action. At this time, it is unclear if the mission is any longer one that fulfills the Responsibility to Protect doctrine, or if it has changed into a larger and/or different role. Given the continued military action and the lack of clarity of the U.S. mission's goal, I support House Resolution 292, which requires the administration to provide information on the American military, diplomatic, and humanitarian activities in Libya and seeks clarity on America's objective and strategy to achieve that goal.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE  
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BUERKLE) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 25, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2702, I hereby appoint as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress the following person: Dr. Sharon Leon, Fairfax, Virginia.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
Clerk.

YUMA, COLORADO, CELEBRATES  
125TH YEAR

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

Mr. GARDNER. Madam Speaker, in the late 1880s, landmen circulated flyers throughout the country about a place in the Republican River Valley with fertile soil and plenty of open land—a place named Yuma, Colorado. By 1886, the town had established itself a school, churches, and a thriving ranching community.

This year Yuma celebrates its 125th year, a community defined by the cycles of Mother Nature and the Ogallala Aquifer, made vibrant by agriculture and energized by businessmen and -women who are constantly looking for new ways to be successful.

A little town on the high plains of Colorado, population just over 3,000 people, Yuma has been home to a U.S. Open PGA champion; an Emmy winner; a National Book Award finalist; a Medal of Honor recipient; professional football players; some of the Nation's leading farmers, ranchers, and business owners; and, yes, even a Member of the United States Congress.

Yuma lies in the heart of Colorado agriculture. Yuma County is often the Nation's leader in corn production. It has weathered the boom and bust of farm prices, hailstorms, drought, and wind. For a small town, it seems like no matter where you go, you find someone who is either from there, lived there, or has family there. In many ways, it is one of the biggest little towns in the Nation.

From its Old Thresher celebration in the fall and the Yuma County Fair to high school sports and academics, it is an incredible place to live, to raise a family, to grow, and to do business. I am proud to call Yuma, Colorado, home. Congratulations on 125 years, and here's to wishing the people of that great town many more years of success.

RAISING THE DEBT CEILING

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

Mr. CARNEY. Madam Speaker, this week the Democratic and Republican caucuses met with President Obama to discuss the need to increase the debt ceiling. The President said we need to raise the debt ceiling soon, and I agree. Defaulting on our debt is not an option for a great Nation like ours. No one wants to send the economy into another tailspin. Now is the time to restore fiscal discipline. That is what the American people, the global financial markets, and U.S. creditors expect, and that is why I support the attachment

of a strong deficit reduction plan to any increase in the debt ceiling.

Congress should attach a balanced and broad-based budget plan to the debt ceiling increase. The plan should include smart cuts that would total at least \$4 trillion over the next 10 years. The budget agreement should also protect important investments in a strong economic future.

We can't delay any longer. We can't pass these tough decisions on to our children and grandchildren. The people we serve sent us here to get this done, and it is time for both sides to do just that.

#### GET RUNAWAY SPENDING UNDER CONTROL

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, Americans awoke this morning to the heart-breaking news that unemployment has increased to 9.1 percent. The U.S. economy added only 55,000 jobs in the last month. The American people are understandably concerned. But the numbers don't tell the tale. Beneath those numbers are literally millions of American families who meet this morning's headlines with heartbreak and heartache because the opportunities just aren't there.

The truth is more government, more spending, more regulation, and more taxes of the recent past are stifling our recovery. But nothing is stifling our recovery more than runaway spending in Washington, D.C.

Even as we speak today, Congress and this administration are locked in a debate over increasing the Nation's credit card, increasing the debt ceiling. And let me say from my heart, some people don't see the connection between the debate over debt and red ink and the debate over jobs, but they are related.

If we will take the decisive step to put our fiscal house in order, we will restore confidence in capital markets, and businesses and individuals will invest in ways that will put Americans back to work. There should be no debt ceiling increase without real and meaningful cuts in the way we spend the people's money in the short term and the long term. Get spending under control in Washington, D.C., and we will get this economy moving again.

□ 1400

#### THE PRESIDENT: WRONG ON ALL COUNTS

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

Mr. GOHMERT. The Speaker is to be commended for bringing these two bills to the floor. Unfortunately, we have a President who cared more about what the Arab League and the U.N. thought

than he did his own elected Congress. We've been kept in the dark about the basis for his decisions, and I voted "no" on our Speaker's bill because he didn't need any more time.

The President should be aware, Madam Speaker, that there are an awful lot of people who are ready to switch their votes and to vote "yes." I would prefer that we not do it through the War Powers. We could do like the Democrats did in '74 and just cut off the spending.

It is ridiculous. He said we'd enforce a no-fly zone. That's it. We wouldn't put ground troops in Libya. He said that NATO was going to take over and that we wouldn't be that involved.

Wrong on all counts.

We know from the rules of the House the President wouldn't lie, but he sure is misrepresenting things.

#### LIBYA: THE PRESIDENT'S WAR

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, every Member of this body, every elected official in the United States, every member of our military takes an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America. We do not take an oath to the President of the United States.

The war in Libya is the President's war. The Constitution requires that Congress declare war. The War Powers declaration requires that Congress be authorized and notified if the President leads us into war. This has not occurred. The President's war in the name of humanity, although it may be a good idea in the moral sense and Qadhafi is a rotten person, violates the Constitution of the United States. It violates statutory law that we have passed.

It is incumbent upon this body to stop the war in Libya. That is the President's war and not the war of the people of the United States.

#### OUR DEFINING MOMENT: RECLAIMING THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, this House has just had a great constitutional debate about the meaning of article I, section 8, where the Founders made it very clear that the war power is placed in the hands of Congress.

This debate that occurred today is not an end. It is a beginning. It is a beginning because we have seen one resolution which derived its presence from a resolution that I put forward on a bipartisan basis. One resolution passed which put the White House on notice that Congress is beginning to take a more appropriate role with respect to the Constitution, and that's a good thing.

But make no mistake that this issue of liberty is not going to go away. With the spending soon approaching \$1 billion and with NATO openly talking about the commission of ground troops, we'll be back here another day to consider further what our appropriate constitutional role is.

I want to congratulate Members on both sides of the aisle no matter how you voted. This is our moment to begin to reclaim the Constitution.

#### PUTTING THE U.S. ECONOMY BACK ON TRACK

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, just today we got the bad news again that the jobless numbers have gone up, that our unemployment numbers have gone up and that much smaller job increases were created than were expected.

I think, as we continue to see unemployment going up over 9 percent—9.1 percent now according to the latest numbers—it is very clear that the President's spending and borrowing agenda has been a dismal failure. Yet the President continues to go down that path.

It is time for the President to start working with the House Republicans, who have sent jobs bill after jobs bill over to the Senate. For whatever reason, the President and the liberals in the Senate don't want to address the ability that we have presented to create jobs.

One real clear example is in our State of Louisiana where we have lost over 13,000 jobs because of the President's policies, where they won't let our people get back to the work of drilling safely for energy in America.

We don't want to get our energy from Brazil or from the Middle Eastern countries, many of whom don't like us and who use the billions we send to them to do us harm. We could keep that money here. We could keep those jobs here. There is a plan to do it. Plan after plan has been sent to the Senate, and for whatever reason, the Senate and the President continue to ignore them. Let's finally get our economy back on track.

#### THE MANY CHORDS OF MAKING IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

When we finish what sometimes may seem a complicated debate, where both sides can seemingly make sense when we have the time to reflect upon the week's work or the work and philosophies of the different political perspectives in this House, I believe it is very

important to communicate with your colleagues, so let me be as clear as I can be.

As I heard my friends on the other side of the aisle, one after one, claim that the Libyan war was the President's war, well, today, on June 3, 2011, the President of the United States happens to be President Obama. Yet if you look at the Constitution of the United States, which provides provisions for the separation of powers, there is a section that articulates that the Congress, irrespective of any Presidential person in place, declares war.

So I would ask my friends on the other side of the aisle: Would they have been as quick to rise to the floor on the Iraq war, which could be called the "Bush war"? or the continued 10-year plus war in Afghanistan the "Bush war"?

When we discuss these issues for the American people, we have to be true to ourselves and the Constitution. There was a reason the Founding Fathers separated out the right to declare war. That reason, of course, was to protect you, the American people. When we send men and women into battle, it should be a deliberative process, but we should also have the right to defend ourselves.

The initial attack in Afghanistan—that was the first act—was in response to the heinous and horrific attack of al Qaeda on the soil of the United States. From my perspective, the immediate response of President Bush was legitimate. The question becomes: What came afterwards? The Congress was never given the chance to declare war. Subsequently, there was a statutory discussion and vote that gave unending opportunities and authority for the war to go on and on and on.

□ 1410

Buried in the Afghanistan decision was the authority to go on and on and on. The sad part about it was that we did not go on in Afghanistan. We distracted our troops and went into a war that saw the large numbers of our soldiers lose their lives in a war that had actually never been declared by the United States of America and the United States Congress.

We have something today in 2011 called the Arab Spring. But I don't think Americans understand that, and they, frankly, believe that we cannot promote democracy everywhere in the world. Policymakers understand the crucialness of what is going on in the Arab area as it relates to the geopolitics, the political structure of the world.

But I know what Americans of goodwill do understand: the slaughter of a people. The slaughter and the misuse of power in Bahrain; the misuse of power in Egypt; the gruesome misuse of power to the extent that a mutilated body of a 13-year-old boy can be dumped in their parents' home in Syria; and, yes, the violence in Libya. Americans understand that and I understand it.

So I applaud the President of the United States for going in in Libya to stop the horrific violence. He went in in coalition with our NATO troops. That same action occurred under President Clinton, going in with NATO, taking the lead in this instance, in the slaughter of Muslims in Kosova and the horrible wars in Bosnia.

I happened to have been able to go on an initial inaugural mission into Bosnia—the former Yugoslavia—and Croatia, and I walked the streets of Sarajevo and I saw mothers who had not seen their sons for 10 or 12 years and asked us where they were. It was a violent time.

So the Libyan action by the President was an appropriate one. He happens to be a Democratic President. I applaud his action. But the Constitution is not labeled by Democratic or Republican. It has no provisions to exempt if you happen to be a Democrat with a Democratic President. So my values argue for consistency, and that is adhering to the Constitution.

I believe Resolution 292, Mr. BOEHNER's resolution that was crafted in the last 24 hours, was a nice statement about a report. But I don't vote on actions on the floor out of contempt and dislike for anyone.

Let me be very clear. I applaud President Barack Obama for the courage that he has taken in moving forward to establish America's mark as a believer in democracy and justice and encouraging the people in the Arab States to stand up for their rights and to object and reject the oppressiveness of their regimes, and I hope that NATO becomes strategic in what they're doing so that we can be successful.

But if we are going to be true to the Constitution of the United States that is, in fact, part of the document that we hold true, then we must hold any Commander in Chief to the same standard.

The War Powers Resolution asks that the President of the United States come to the Congress within 60 days. The constitutional provision in article II requires that the Congress declare war. One could argue that we have not declared war on Arab States and we've not declared war on Libya. We're at war. We're at war because al Qaeda declares that they are at war with us. So it is a dicey circumstance.

I, instead, voted for the action to occur under the War Powers Resolution that was just occurring today, a vote that we lost, a vote that I would have voted for under President Bush, under President Reagan, under President Carter, and with the opportunity, under President Clinton, as the wars proceeded to a long extent of time.

However, we are dealing now in the backdrop of a failed resolution. But I voted because it is necessary to be consistent as to whether you believe the Constitution and the authority of the Congress and the separation of three branches is a valid one to protect the rights of the American people. And I believe that.

But my message to General Qadhafi is this: If you have any sense of human dignity left, you will stop the murderous attacks on your people. I am sensitive enough to offer my sympathy to you for the loss of your family members because I believe in the value of human life. War is ugly. But every effort of peace that we have made has been one that you've ignored. Every effort that we have made, every step that we have taken toward peace you have ignored. You have arrogantly insisted on the world stage that you're in charge, while your country is in a state of confusion and disaster. You have opened the doors to the confusion and the violence of terrorist cells, al Qaeda and other ne'er-do-wells who desire no good to you or your people. You've allowed groups to, in essence, begin to spark so that the continued frustration of world leaders in trying to bring resolution continues; but, more importantly, the violence of all falls on the backs of innocent women and children, young boys and families in Libya.

I feel a kinship to the Libyan people, as a human being and as someone whose heritage started on the continent of Africa. But the one good thing about America is that we care about all people no matter what background they come from, no matter what country. I know that because I've had the privilege of representing the United States in South and Central America, in Asia, on the continent of Africa, in the Mideast and Europe and other places maybe not mentioned—because we care.

Mr. Qadhafi, I beg of you, as an African who has met with the President of South Africa, who knows that the African Union would like for you to cease and desist this violent attack on your own people, stand down. And I would ask, as I have asked before, leave the country. Let us find the kind of government that might, in fact, move Libya forward. And if your people decide that you should stay, then you should have a reformation and a change not only of mind but of heart. The violence does not get you anywhere and it is both insane and absurd.

So I would hope that as this vote was taken, that it is not in any way, as was evidenced by the discussion in the debate by the Republicans, it is not Mr. Obama's war. He is the President of the United States and the Commander in Chief, and it was a determination to go in to stop the murderous acts of those who were killing innocent people.

Read your early history. The early Founders of this Nation in the Revolutionary War against Great Britain had other countries come to the aid of this little, tiny, baby series of States that called themselves the United States of America. It has been the world order for centuries that big countries or those who are able will go to the aid of those who are not able. And this vote today should not in any way deny the respect that is owed to the President of

the United States. This is a vote premised on the Constitution and reflecting the desires of the American people, that we do not live in a dictatorship and that if you're a Member of the United States Congress, come here and do your job.

□ 1420

And our job is defined by the Constitution.

I believe that our duty was partly handled today, and I would encourage our President, as he has done over the stages of the Afghan war and now the continued redeploying in Iraq of our soldiers, and I would add that we are in an engagement of discussion that gives us the roadmap for redeploying or moving toward a resolution in Libya.

I would also join in the debate that I've just made on the question of Libya with the need for the immediate review and designation of time for redeployment of our troops out of Afghanistan, and the President has indicated that he expects that that redeployment will begin in July 2011.

My plea to the President is, as we look at these economic times, when America is crying out for jobs, when the middle class feels splashed and unattended to, when others believe our jobs are not creeping offshore and overseas, but fleeting and flying and literally by way of speed that is faster than sound, it is time now to find the mutual courage to say to the people of Afghanistan that we have provided a duly elected government, a parliament. We have laid down our lives. We have built up the Afghan national security forces, which I was introduced to in the many times that I've been into Afghanistan, all parts, including Kabul and Kandahar and places beyond. I know there are good people there.

So I'd ask the President of the United States to ramp up the redeployment, bring home 50,000, 100,000 troops and begin to let those troops rebuild their lives. Invest in military readiness and preparedness and find a closure to the presence of United States boots on the ground in Afghanistan.

To President Karzai, I ask you to stand up and be counted, to initiate policies that would end the poppy growing and heroin production, to allow girls and boys to go to school, to produce your teachers and lawyers, doctors and scientists, generals, captains and leaders of government. I would ask President Karzai to provide the funding and resources for your Afghan national security forces. I would ask him to weed out the Taliban that is destroying his own people in the mountains of Afghanistan. And, yes, I would ask whether or not it is even possible that all of us could claim the value of peace, and by doing that, it would not be non-courageous to stand up and accept the fact that we have won in Afghanistan and we've won in Iraq, and we thank our soldiers.

And so I'm on the floor today thanking my colleagues because last week

we voted 419 votes to declare a National Day of Honor for our returning troops from combat areas, more than we've ever done in any other war, and to celebrate them all over America. So I am not asking for America to leave any battle place with her head held down. Our Vietnam vets, during a very tumultuous time and a war that we disagreed with, should have been welcomed home for their service, for their duty, for the reason that they took up arms—not of their own accord, but because a President called them.

I believe America learned her lesson as she focuses on trying to help our returning combat veterans with jobs and education and health care. We know that we should honor them. So with the amendment that I passed on the floor, 419 votes, I hope the American people will call their Congressperson and thank them, but also ask that that proclamation be declared and that we have a National Day of Honor to welcome our soldiers home from all around the world in combat places.

As we welcome them home, I think it is extremely important to recognize that America has a number of concerns. Those concerns are the tragedies that we face, the horrific loss of life in Joplin, Birmingham, Tuscaloosa, all the flooding that has gone on. People in the United States are suffering.

So what does it mean to raise the debt ceiling? What it means to raise the debt ceiling is not what Americans believe—there they go again, spending, spending, spending. What it actually means is that we're saying to working Americans and middle class Americans, we feel deeply about your inability to pay your mortgage, to pay tuition costs. If you have one or two credit cards with those old interest rates of 19, 20, 21 percent that we've been able to bring down somewhat because of legislation we've passed, we understand that. If you don't have a job, if someone in your life doesn't have a job, we understand that. We understand folks that don't have a job, but they don't have a job, a home, a car, a place to live.

The debt ceiling actually is the ability to pay our bills. It is not the ability to spend and find ways to spend money unnecessarily; it is the ability to create the jobs that America is crying out for. The 9 percent is not a reflection so much of the President of the United States not desiring and working hard to create jobs. Let me remind my colleagues that it was Democrats and the President that helped to, in essence, provide a safety net for the automobile industry. A lot of people complained about that. But we were in the middle of the fight not to pay special interests off; we were in the fight to save the auto industry of the United States of America.

It was the right thing to do. Two big reasons: one, the infrastructure of automobile building was car dealerships across America that had thousands, millions of workers selling

American cars. You let that industry collapse, and you would let, in essence, some small town in America literally have no economy. It might have been that the car dealership was the largest business in that small area.

I'll add three. The second is we obligated the industry to pay us back, and we have been paid back. We, the United States taxpayers, have been paid back. And you know what else? They have actually brought jobs back to the United States of America. If I wasn't in this very august place, I would say hal-lelujah, celebrate, applaud: jobs have been brought back to the United States. Ford, of course, did not take those resources. We applaud them. Some of you are buying some new smart cars by GM. Some of you are buying new smart cars by Chrysler—better gas mileage, got a new attitude.

We gave the American innovative genius the opportunity to survive. We allowed inventiveness to thrive. We built on Henry Ford's genius, and we let it spread around. And as well, as we developed jobs for monies that the taxpayers invested, and we put the right kind of restraint for you to be reinvested.

The debt ceiling means that it allows us, the government, to create jobs for you. You turn the economy and invest back. We then provide the protection for you through jobs or maybe unemployment insurance or maybe Social Security or maybe Medicare, or maybe when you're at your lowest end. When you have lost loved ones in a natural disaster that you cannot comprehend, it is the cause of the Federal Government to be able to pay the bills, to be able to come to a place where there is no fire station, no houses of worship, no hospital, no schools, no homes, for us to come and to be of help.

□ 1430

I don't know how we can abdicate our responsibilities. I don't know how we can frivolously play with raising the debt ceiling. I don't know how Republicans can put on the floor of the House a bill under suspension, which requires a two-thirds vote, to make a joke of helping the people in Joplin, in Alabama, up and down the Mississippi and whatever other disaster may come. How do you make a joke with that? How in essence do you in the face of the frustration of those who have suffered? I have not experienced a tornado, but I have experienced and walked the streets during hurricanes. I have seen in my own town the pain. I have come up to doors and knocked on persons' doors where someone has laid dying because they have just gone through a process where all the lights are out and they're on oxygen. I've seen seniors in homes that cannot be repaired. I've seen people lose items that can never be replaced. And so that is what your Federal Government does. And do you mean to tell me we would make a mockery of raising the debt ceiling so that America can simply pay her bills?

There is a value to reducing the deficit. And might I just say something with all good intention. It is always the person who has got money in their pocket, who's got a wallet full of credit cards that they can pay for, that can smile when you're talking about Social Security and Medicare and has an uncaring spirit. Because it doesn't matter to them. It is the philosophy that has not made this country great, the philosophy of "I've got mine, you get yours."

Young people, I have gotten my college education. I don't care whether you can go to college or not. I don't even care if you get a job. "I've got mine." That's not what this Nation is all about. I will not tell the people of Missouri, Alabama and places around, "I'm okay in Houston. My house is still functioning, the hurricane season hasn't hit me yet, so I'm not going to worry about your tragedy." Is that America? Is that how we built the greatness of this country? Did we ignore our returning troops coming home from World War II? Or did we say to them, "We're giving you the GI Bill"?

The Democrats gave the second GI Bill. President Truman gave the first. We gave with President Obama the greatest GI Bill in the history of America except the one that was passed by President Truman. We said that we care. We built on the values of a country that always rises to the occasion. And because of that, those people who desire goodness and greatness, they look to the United States of America. I am glad, regardless of whatever faith we believe in, whatever our background is or whoever's our neighbor, that we're a country that cares. And I will tell you just if you follow what your grandmother says, being a good Samaritan will always come back to you. Being kind to someone will always come back to you.

Therefore, I believe that it is imperative that we lift the debt ceiling for America to pay her bills. I am tired of smashing the middle class. I am tired of leaving them on their own. I am tired of them watching jobs go overseas when we have such a brilliant population of innovative, creative, loving people. We overcame some of the hills and valleys in America. We went through the civil rights movement and the era where those who were of a different color suffered under the devastating indignity of segregation. America rose to the occasion. It is not perfect, but we recognize the value of equality of all. You're not relegated to the back of the bus. You're not dismissed from hotels and restaurants. You are open and allowed to travel on America's transportation modes. You even can be accepted into colleges on your own merit and not on quotas. And yes, if you apply for a job, the laws at least protect you, that no matter what your background, that you're given an equal opportunity.

America has traversed some of those difficult valleys. We respect women

and a woman's equality. We are able to say that women can be pilots and Presidents and Senators and doctors and heads of organizations and engineers and train conductors and anything a little girl can admire and aspire to be. That's the kind of America that is understanding of the crisis that these people face.

And I'm sorry that the debate on the debt ceiling has been characterized as Democratic and Republican and these are the deficit-cutters and these are the wild-eyed spending-spreers going into the shopping malls of America and grabbing things off shelves. It is important to note that one of the greatest Presidents that we have admired—my little girl used to call him Grandpa—Ronald Reagan asked Congress to lift the debt ceiling in 1983, not because he was a spendthrift but because he understood the responsibility of paying America's bills. And, my friends, I remind you, can we not pay America's bills?

I want to discuss how we do that, how we lift the condition of Americans. We do it like we've done it before. We make it in America. Now I like one part of it that says, We make it in America. Everybody needs to have a chance to make it in America. The young people that are graduating in 2011 should have the right to make it in America. By the way, might I just say, congratulations to all of the graduates across America. From the preschooler that's going to kindergarten, to the elementary child that puts on the robe and is inspired, to the middle school and to the high school graduates of whom I will go home to this weekend and greet any number of high school graduates in my constituency who are making that first leap of faith, to the college graduates who are feeling so empowered to graduate in such a great Nation, to those who are getting graduate degrees, our new lawyers and doctors and business persons, our physicists and chemists and biologists, the geniuses that will go into the laboratories of America.

Congratulations to all of you.

That is why I believe it is important to make it in America. The Democrats have launched a major initiative. I wish we could get our friends to join us in a real jobs bill, of which the President of the United States has committed to introducing a real jobs bill, to make it in America. Many of us in our hearings will ask the witnesses that represent the United States Government, we want you to buy America and make it in America. And I'm not an isolationist. I believe America has been enormously generous in buying goods from other countries, proud of them. We're glad to help developing nations. We're glad to support micro-credits and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation that allows investments overseas, but we don't want our jobs to be taken overseas. I don't want to see teenagers with double-digit unemployment, particularly in the Af-

rican American community. I don't want rural communities to suffer because of the lack of employment. I dread this coming summer when there's no money for summer jobs for young people who are trying to save for going into school in the fall. Sometimes the only resources a family has may be the summer job of a teenager. But we have always encouraged teenagers to learn how to work in the decorum of the workplace. Just look what we're doing now.

For that very reason, can I give a challenge to this Nation, can I give a challenge to the businesses, can I give a challenge to corporate America: Bring some young people, maybe unpaid, to be able to be interns.

□ 1440

City governments, maybe unpaid, bring some young people into your offices. Teach them something else but hanging out on the streets. Let them see an adult role model working. But we might not have to have that kind of plea if we could make it in America again.

In the 18th Congressional District in Texas and all around America, we're going to be honoring the individuals who have manufacturing businesses. I would ask you, colleagues, to go and shake the hand of a manufacturer who's making something, who's struggling to keep the doors open, who's making a widget or a gadget. That's what we're talking about.

Solar panels. Wouldn't it be a shock if we went across America and began to make our own solar panels, our windmills of course, that create wind energy. Unfortunately, I hate to tell you that that equipment, that kind of technology we get from overseas. If I wasn't on the floor of the House, I would hold my head down.

When has America needed to depend on someone else, something that was their idea or that they could make better? Again, as I said, I don't mind being part of the world family, where we share and we buy items and we help develop economies, but not to the point where all our jobs, like I said, are taking wings and flying away. What kind of America is that for our young people that are graduating in 2011?

So I want us to focus on building buses, building submarines, and major aircraft carriers, building bridges, freeways, improving dams, building the rails, or the trains for high-speed rail, of which I am an avid supporter, and requires an investment in this country to be able to be fiscally conservative as well as to ensure that we use our energy resources right.

To have an energy policy as well that speaks about all of the energy resources, to do them effectively, as the President has articulated; and to make sure that if we are using fossil fuels, whether it's oil or gas, that we are doing it here in the United States and that we are in fact doing it safely and securely.

That we appreciate wind and we make the equipment or the kind of technology right here in the United States. Solar, that we make all of our panels. Natural gas, that we do it safely and securely, and that we create jobs that way. That we bring down the cost of energy. That we stop calling upon the American people to take \$5 out of their pocket and put a few ounces, if you will, of gas in their car.

That we begin to recognize the pain of America, and the way that we recognize the pain of America is that we begin to go aggressively toward the American people with solutions. And the demagoguery of raising the debt ceiling, and I'm not going to vote on it unless you burden it down with draconian cuts that will end Medicare as we know it on all seniors, eliminate Social Security, destroy Medicaid and throw it to the winds so that disabled children suffering from autism or those who have other diseases cannot be taken care of, that's not the America that has made us so great.

It is one that pulls up our pants and puts on our shoes, pulls up our skirts and gets empowered by the joy of work and helping others. And when we did that, we were able to invest in this Nation.

I will not vote on a debt ceiling increase that destroys Medicare as we know it. And I will not vote on a debt ceiling increase that destroys Social Security, or Medicaid, or violates the premise that this country owes a debt of gratitude to veterans and returning soldiers. That's what my friends on the other side of the aisle are trying to sell the American people, a bill of goods. A bill of goods that the philosophy that is anti to President Reagan, who asked for the increase in the debt ceiling himself, that we cannot count and speak at the same time. I believe America is greater than that.

We can bring down the debt with a very meticulous plan over a period of time, the same way you save for college or plan to bring down your debt, or stop using credit cards. We can do that. But at the same time, we can pay America's bills. And we cannot leave one American alongside of the road, languishing and reaching out for help, and we say there is no room at the inn.

Where is the America that is a Good Samaritan? Where is America that sent young men to war, World War II, and if you talk to any of that generation they say, I didn't know all the facts, but I was glad to be part of what America was standing for, helping those who were languishing alongside the road.

We have had any number of conflicts, and some that I have agreed or disagreed with; but the premise was, whether we had the agreement of the American people on the premise of that conflict, it was to help someone along the road.

I am now calling in a clarion cry for Americans to help America. I am calling on this Congress for this Congress to help America. I am calling on the

President, as a friend of the American people, to help America. And to do that, whatever is heard that will now come behind me, and disjangled chords will sound attractive, and it will be about who is going to burden our grandchildren and the long-term debt, but it will not be infused with values by many of our faiths.

Those of us of a Christian faith and many other faiths have an element of the document under which they worship that talks about the Good Samaritan and charity and love. And albeit that you are asking why on the floor of the House, it is because the infusion of those tenets were part of the design of this Nation when we organized around the concept of forming a more perfect Union. And when the Declaration of Independence said that we seek to pursue happiness, we hold these truths self-evident that all of us are created equal, we don't abandon that just because it happens to be June 3, 2011. We are able to keep those values, and those values have kept this country on a straight and productive path.

All the noise that comes sometimes in a confused sound to the ears of the American people, if as Members of Congress we can declare our commitment to helping the American people and keeping the values of the American people in place, and that of our faith, that is to help, to love, and to present charity to those who are in need, there is no limit to the greatness of America. And there is no limit to the restoration of making it in America, both in terms of our success and survival, and then in terms of making things that we need and putting America back to work.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful for being yielded this time by the Speaker of the House, and I am grateful for the opportunity to live in a Nation where disagreement does not result, in this century and even in the past century, of taking up arms against each other. I am grateful that maybe in the debate that we have on the floor of the House at some point my colleagues can hear not disjangled sounds of discord and disrespect and dislike, but they can actually hear the chords of reason, my friends, that to pay for our bills as you pay for yours, we must do the right thing: raise the debt ceiling, and to be able to preserve Medicare as we know it, and not to destroy it as it is being destroyed by the budget proposals of the Republican Party.

It is necessary, if you will, to be able to come together and to listen in one voice, finally, that we act to help America.

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

□ 1450

#### HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 min-

utes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BURGESS. This afternoon, the Congressional Health Care Caucus wants to talk a little bit about the future of the government's role in health care in this country.

I recognize, for those of you studying your Constitution as of this very moment, you don't find the government's role for controlling health care in this country, but we will do our best to help you understand why we are where we are and perhaps where we are going with some of the Federal programs that are run by the Federal Government. Again, the Congressional Health Care Caucus, the Web site [healthcaucus.org](http://healthcaucus.org).

This hour, I am grateful to the leadership of the Republican Party for the use of this hour. I and my cochair, Mr. G.T. THOMPSON from Pennsylvania, will be leading the discussion.

We have had a lot of talk over the past 4 weeks about the future of Medicare in this country. Certainly, if you look at the three plans that are on the table right now—and I understand you may be scratching your head and saying, Wait a minute. I thought there was only one plan out there. I thought there was only the Republican plan. But the Medicare Trustees Report that was issued some 2, 2½ weeks ago, came forward and articulated how the Medicare trust fund would be exhausted in the year 2023 or 2024. This is a significant fact that right now this Congress and the White House are trying to ignore, but it can't be ignored, and that's why the responsible Republican budget passed in April would deal with this fact.

One plan would be to continue on the current course and make no change at all, and that is what the trustees' report articulated. The trust fund is exhausted by 2023 or 2024. That means, then, all funds to pay for part A, part B, and part D of Medicare, hospitalizations, physician payments, and pharmaceutical payments would all come from the Federal Treasury. The trust fund would be depleted at that point.

What are the implications for that? As we sit here even now and talk about things like expansion of the debt limit, the implications are that all of the funding for Medicare for the hospitalizations, for the physicians part, for the pharmaceutical part, all of the funding would come strictly out of the general revenues, that part that is paid by the taxpayers every year.

Are there things that could be done under the trustees' report to prevent this from happening? There are. And one of those things would be to raise the tax on the payroll tax that is paid by individuals for their Medicare. All of us pay a 1.2 percent tax. The employer matches with a similar amount, so that comes out of our paychecks every 2 weeks or every month. However we are paid, there would be a way to increase that tax to perhaps sustain Medicare farther into the future.

But I must remind the Speaker that this law, which was signed by the President in March of 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, already had a Medicare tax increase included therein. So there is a .9 percent Medicare payroll tax that is included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which leaves us very little room to maneuver unless the payroll tax goes up even further.

Many people argue that the payroll taxes are some of the least progressive and most regressive taxes in this country because they are administered across the board without regard to income, so this is a potential problem. It is one that perhaps could have been solved with a payroll tax increase, but that payroll tax increase has already occurred. You say, well, but okay, if there is a payroll tax increase in the Medicare trust fund, that's good news, because that means that Medicare goes on farther.

Unfortunately, under this law, the money that is taxed on the payroll, collected by the Medicare trust fund, makes a very short stop in the Medicare trust fund and then goes to fund a very different program, a program that, in fact, does not exist today but will start in 2014, a program of subsidies for entitlement for people to purchase private health insurance in the non-Medicare years in what are called the State exchanges.

So the money goes from the Medicare trust fund to fund a new entitlement. That money will have to be paid back to the Medicare trust fund, make no mistake about it. It is money that we are borrowing from ourselves, but it is not money that is there to save Medicare today.

But as the administration argues that, hey, within the Affordable Care Act we have already done some things to sustain Medicare into the future, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, they have probably poured gasoline on the fire that was already in existence.

One of the other things the trustees' report suggested was that benefits could be cut in the future. And I dare say that if nothing else happens and we get to the point where the trust fund is exhausted, those benefit cuts will be enacted not by this Congress, not by the next Congress, but by some Congress in the future, because of the intergenerational strife that will occur because of the inability to keep pace with the problems that were made by generations before, with generations yet to come. The unfunded liabilities in the Medicare trust fund will soon begin to outstrip every other activity of the Federal Government. That is, there will be no money left for defense, no money left for transportation, no money left for education. All of it will go into health care in some way, shape, or form.

Well, did the President have a plan for sustaining Medicare? Well, yes. You heard about the tax that he already en-

acted in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, but that may not have been so helpful. In fact, that may have been more detrimental.

What other things has the President put out there on the table as a plan for saving Medicare?

Now, bear in mind, there is no Presidential plan to save Medicare. We have encouraged the White House to provide us with such a framework. We would like to see such a framework. They could send it over to the Congressional Budget Office and have it scored, have it compared to Republican proposals that are out there, but this ask has not yet been honored. So, as a consequence, what we are left with are the bits and pieces that the White House has articulated, the administration has articulated: Here is our plan for Medicare.

One of the big plans they have for Medicare is contained within the pages of the compilation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, on page 423, where it talks about a new board that is created that is going to administer Medicare costs. This is the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

Who will these individuals be? Well, they will be 15 in number. They will be nominated by the President. They will be confirmed by the Senate. They are to be made up of academics, of people who have worked in government, people who have expertise in health finance and economics and actuarial science, health facility management, health plans, and integrated delivery systems. And way, way down at the bottom of the page, yes, you might get a doctor or nurse on that board as well. Fifteen people that are paid by the government to do nothing but identify cuts in the Medicare system. Well, perhaps that's a good thing. Perhaps that's something that's necessary.

Now, look, I am a Member of the United States Congress. The Speaker is a Member of the United States Congress. We are the people's House. It is our job to deal with the people's money, to tax the people, to raise the money, to spend the money and be good stewards of the people's money. It is not our job to hand off that obligation to the executive branch or, worse yet, to a board that is appointed by the executive branch and is accountable to no one. It is not our job to do that. It is our job to have the oversight over the Federal agencies and boards so that we can ensure that things are done properly with the people's money.

In this case, the Independent Payment Advisory Board will be just that. It will be absolutely independent of the legislative branch. Once an action is taken by the Independent Payment Advisory Board, it becomes very, very difficult for Congress to impact the decisions that are thereby made.

Now, true enough, their job is to deliver back to the House and the Senate their recommendations for cuts in the Medicare system, and it's very detailed in here on those pages as to just how much they are required to cut. It's

very detailed as to the procedure for bringing those cuts to the House and the Senate and which committees they go to for evaluation.

But here's the deal. At the end of the day, Congress either votes up or down on this menu of cuts that's provided by the Independent Payment Advisory Board. And, yes, we can vote "no." Yes, we can turn down the recommendation of the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

What happens then? According to statute, we are not finished. Congress then is required to produce the same level of cuts that was recommended by the board, maybe taking it from different places. But still the same amount of money has to come out of the same Federal program, that is, the Medicare program.

□ 1500

Well, what if Congress gets together and says, "We don't like what the board has delivered to us. We're going to produce a different menu of cuts"? But then, wouldn't you know it; Congress can't agree on what those cuts should be.

I know, I know, Madam Speaker, you'll find that hard to believe that Congress could ever get to a point where it didn't agree with itself on very much, but it could happen at some point in the future that things could be so contentious in Washington and so contentious in the House and the Senate that we couldn't agree with each other on what those cuts would be. Well, what happens then?

What happens then is the cuts recommended by the Independent Payment Advisory Board are, in fact, delivered to the Secretary of Health and Human Services; and that person, whoever he or she may be, the following April, will enact those cuts. There is no getting away once those cuts are recommended. Again, they are dictated in statute. Once they are recommended, they are going to be enacted. There is almost no way around that.

We've got kind of a similar situation today with a different formula that deals with only part B. That's only the part that reimburses physicians. It's called the sustainable growth rate formula. It is a very complex set of figures and numbers that deals with some Federal targets, that deals with conversion factors, and that deals with update adjustment factors. But suffice it to say that it requires a reduction in reimbursement for patients' visits to doctors, and it does this every year.

Now, Congress, historically, has come in at the last minute and rolled those cuts back and said that we won't enact those cuts. The problem is, with the formula as written, every year that we come in and say, "okay, doctors and patients, we're not going to actually cut reimbursement rates this year," that aggregate number that should have been cut is added to the sum that ultimately must be cut.

So, right now, we are existing on a gift, if you will, done in the lame-duck



session of the last Congress where the cuts in Medicare were given a 13-month reprieve. But, if Congress doesn't act by December or January, December of this year or January of 2012, an almost 30 percent cut goes to physicians who practice in the part B part of Medicare.

Now, I know you can say, well, doctors probably make too much money anyway and the government needs to save money, so what could that hurt? Where that hurts is that doctors are having a tough enough time keeping up with their expenses. When we cut them 30 percent, the nurse that works in the front office or the company that delivers the electricity that keeps the lights on in their practice doesn't say, "Gee, Doc. We know you're having a tough time and the government cut your reimbursement, so we're going to give you a break on your electricity bill." That does not happen. The good people in the municipality that allow the doctor to practice don't come up and say, "Doctor, we know this is tough on you. We're going to give you a 30 percent reduction in your school taxes this year on your business property." That does not happen. Those fixed overhead expenses occur, and the Federal reimbursement rate for Medicare in the part B program reduces year over year. That is why you have doctors leaving the Medicare program.

As a consequence, that is why you have people who are entering the Medicare program, turning 65 or older, who move to a new location, call up a doctor's office and say, "I need to be seen for my whatever," and the answer is, "We are not taking new Medicare patients."

That unfortunate reality is hitting people today. The Independent Payment Advisory Board is theoretical. That's in the future. The SGR is the "here and now" that Congress is dealing with even this year.

Now, I'm very fortunate to have been joined by my counterpart on the Congressional Health Care Caucus. Again, [healthcare.org](http://healthcare.org) is the Web site.

GLENN THOMPSON from Pennsylvania, thank you for being with us this afternoon. Let me yield to you such time as you might consume.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my good friend, Dr. BURGESS from Texas, for yielding and also for being able to work with him in terms of our Congressional Health Care Caucus. We cover the health care industry from both important aspects—you as a physician and all of your experience specifically in the medical field.

My background came up through therapy. Most of my almost 30 years of working in nonprofit community health care was really on the administration side; some as a therapist, but largely in administering programs in hospitals, in comprehensive rehab centers, and nursing homes. I was licensed as a nursing home administrator towards the end of my career there. And, frankly, I dealt very, very closely with Medicare out of necessity because

Medicare is, on the in-patient side, at least 60 percent in terms of market share, in terms of payment. So Medicare is very important.

I have to say to my good friend, I was pretty naive when I came to Washington in January 2009. That's when I was sworn in. I won election in 2008. I thought everybody knew that one of the impending crises had to do with the insolvency and the eventual bankruptcy of the Medicare program, only to get here and find out that that was not on the agenda under the previous leadership. And, frankly, it has emerged because it is a truth.

When you look at the situation today with the Medicare system, Medicare is in jeopardy. And what we're trying to do, what the Republicans are trying to do, is to save Medicare. The thing that would hurt Medicare the most is to do nothing, to further kick that can down the road.

Just by coincidence, I was off the Hill and stopped by, and I picked up a prescription earlier today. The only prescription to save Medicare is a Republican prescription. I have to tell you, on the Democratic side, they're just willing to pull the plug and let it die, because if you don't make changes to the Medicare program, that's exactly what happens. And that's not political rhetoric. That's coming from some pretty credible sources that you talked about.

Last Friday, the Medicare trustees' report confirmed that the Medicare program is already contributing to the Federal deficit and will continue to do so for the next decade and that, since 2008, the program has run a cash flow deficit. That's a fact that has been largely ignored in Washington. Still there are those of our colleagues who choose to pretend it's not true, but it is the truth. In fact, in 2011, it exceeds \$32 billion. That's a program that, if we don't make the necessary reforms to save, will go bankrupt.

And what an injustice that will be for all of us, all the people across this Nation who have paid into that program, who are looking forward to hitting those retirement years to be able to access and utilize that benefit. If we allow it to go insolvent, if we don't reform it, if we don't save it, it goes bankrupt.

The only thing keeping the program afloat financially, really, is the sale of Treasury bonds in the Medicare trust fund. And when those bonds are cashed, that increases the deficit.

The President's plan, I guess, is to let it go insolvent, because I read today he's restated he doesn't want to do anything about Medicare, leave Medicare alone, which essentially says let's let it go bankrupt, and let's let it go away.

In fact, the measures—and you did a great job of, I think, talking about one in particular, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, which essentially takes the decision-making out of the hands of those of us who are ac-

countable, of those of us who are elected every 2 years to make decisions about Medicare. Those decisions will not be about what benefits to expand in this financial situation. This will be about where to make cuts, where to ration care.

The Federal Government already does that. Under part B, if you are in a nursing home and you need to receive rehabilitation therapy, the Federal Government has already put a cap on how much therapy that you're able to receive. It has nothing to do with what your need is. It has to do with how many dollars have been spent. So if Americans think the Federal Government would not do rationing, it already happens. It already happens.

You talked about the board. What the President has done, I think, in his plan, which really is going to pull the plug on Medicare, a program that is already financially insolvent and challenged, is cut \$575 billion from the Medicare program to fund his health care initiative. He cuts over \$200 billion for Medicare Advantage and forces over 7 million seniors out of their current Medicare plans. The projection from the CMS actuary—this is the person who is responsible for really crunching the numbers for the Medicare agency—Richard Foster, in April 22, 2010, said that 15 percent of hospitals, nursing homes and home health will close because Medicare pays less under ObamaCare.

We have an opportunity here to do the right thing and to reform Medicare and to save Medicare. The President has an obligation to do that. Under the Medicare trust fund—and what a lot of folks don't know—is there is a requirement, a statutory requirement, that at whatever point the Medicare trust fund reaches a 45 percent level for more than 2 years, the President is required—is required—to put forth a plan essentially to save Medicare, to be able to address Medicare.

We are way past that trigger, and President Obama knows that. I assume he knows it. It's part of his job. So he has chosen to ignore his responsibilities to really put a plan forward. In fact, when we were at the White House just earlier this week, the President said that he was not going to put a plan forward for dealing with Medicare.

□ 1510

He was going to just not take the leadership on that issue. We have, and I am very pleased with the plan we have put forward. It has to do with putting premium supports. Our plan would direct Medicare to go out and to bid out for many different vendors health care plans that seniors could then shop through. Medicare sets the standards, and these companies that would put these products forward would have to meet Medicare requirements. It is not a new concept. It is what we do under Medicare part D today, and Medicare part D is probably one of the few government programs which has actually

come in under budget. Most government programs come in way over budget, but Medicare part D has come in under budget. It also will put an emphasis on prevention and wellness. We are keeping people well. That is what we need to do. Obviously, that is the best thing for individuals, for folks to remain as healthy as possible.

We are not talking about voucher programs. We are not talking about privatizing Medicare. Those are concepts. That is just not true when people claim that we are. We are talking about providing people the choice of quality products that meet minimum standards and that the Medicare agency will ensure are there, because they are the ones who will bid this out and manage the process.

Then we're going to provide premium supports that allow our seniors—and we're talking about just impacting people that are younger than 55 years of age. If you are 55 years or older, there won't be any change. Although, I have bumped into a few who wonder why they can't have this opportunity. They think that it sounds like a really good thing. We are holding those harmless aged 55 and older. I think it is important that we have this debate, and it is a debate that brings forward all of the facts and the realities of what we are talking about.

We are talking about doing something that will improve Medicare, just like Medicare part C, which is Medicare Advantage. It has been shown that seniors on that, because of the emphasis on prevention and wellness, have been hospitalized for fewer days and smaller length of stays, which has saved money in the long run. So we are talking about a positive investment in the health care of our seniors, in saving the country money and, frankly, in saving Medicare.

So I appreciate the opportunity to join my good friend from Texas. This is a conversation that I think is going to be very important that we continue throughout the rest of the spring and well into the summer.

Mr. BURGESS. Well said, because that is exactly the point of this exercise this afternoon. These are difficult concepts. They are very easy to demagogue; they are very easy to demagogue against the Republican plan. The President himself may choose to do this. Certainly the Democratic leadership in this House has chosen to do that. They do that in the absence of putting forward their own plan.

But let's be realistic. We talk about things like premium support. Now, in the 1990s, I'm just a regular guy practicing OB-GYN in Texas, and President Clinton recognizes that Medicare is going to be headed for difficulty in a few years. He convenes a big commission, the bipartisan Medicare commission that is going to save Medicare.

Senator Frist, who at the time was relatively new in the Senate, was a heart surgeon from Tennessee. At that time, he was recognized as one of the

thought leaders and forward thinking in health care reform. So Senator Frist was on that commission. Senator Breaux from Louisiana, a well-respected conservative Democrat, was on the commission; Bill Thomas, who subsequently became chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in the House, was on the commission. The Breaux-Frist Commission came up with a series of recommendations to the Clinton administration on how to sustain Medicare into the future.

The Breaux-Frist Commission had a number of recommendations, but the centerpiece of what they recommended to President Clinton was this concept of premium support. It was not necessarily new with them. It had previously been described by the Brookings Institute, certainly not a conservative think tank, probably regarded more as a moderate to somewhat left of center think tank, but the Brookings Institute had come up with the concept of premium support. People liked to try to describe what the Republican budget produced as a voucher system. That is, in fact, incorrect.

I will tell you, I was a little bit surprised that members of the administration, when the Republican conference was called down to the White House earlier this week and had a discussion with the administration, required some instruction as to what premium support actually was and what the history of premium support actually represented: that it was in fact developed by a moderate think tank, that it was embraced by a centrist to center left Democratic administration in the Clinton administration, and that the Clinton administration essentially took this idea, evaluated it and put it on the shelf and said we are not going to consider it because there were too many special interest groups on the left who did not like the concept of Medicare moving away from central Federal control.

But what premium support represents is, in this case a purchaser, in this case the United States Government, going out and negotiating with insurers, saying we have a bank of patients that is going to require care, i.e., our seniors on Medicare, and this is the type of claims history they have had for the last several years, and we would like to see if you would be interested in developing a proposal for what you can do for our patients.

So it is essentially a request for proposals that goes out from the Federal Government—yes, to private health insurance companies, some for-profit, some not-for-profit. The only requirement is that they be able to show that they can take care of the patients where the government needs help with its seniors and produce a product that is going to be cost effective and is going to deliver quality care to the patients.

A voucher system—and, again, I was somewhat startled that members of the administration required instruction in

this regard. A voucher system would be essentially giving a check to someone and saying: Go out and negotiate and cut your best deal with an insurance company. A premium support system is the government going out, negotiating with the insurance companies and then saying: Come to us with your best proposals for taking care of Medicare patients.

Some people would say: That is preposterous. That would never work. Congressman THOMPSON, you were not here when Medicare part D was passed. I was. Part D was built on that premise. It was let's see if there is an interest out there in providing a prescription drug benefit for seniors. Since we were criticized that no one in their right mind would provide such insurance for seniors, we had a fallback position.

It was a Medicare prescription drug program exclusively, not one run through a private intermediary. The fear was there would be parts of the country that no insurance company would show up to make a proposal. What we got was, indeed, a surprise. After being criticized for several months that no one was going to show up to participate, we were criticized by the other side because people said there are too many plans out there from which seniors have to choose. In the State of Texas, there were 45 plans available subscribing at different rates. You could pick the one that most consistently met your needs for a prescription drug program. But it really was a pleasant surprise.

Because of the competition between so many plans, the prices were vastly under what had been projected by both the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget, and one of those few programs that came in on time and under budget where the satisfaction rate is in excess of 94 percent. Very few seniors today would be willing to give up their part D coverage under the Medicare prescription drug program.

Yes, it has had some bumps and bruises along the way, but a lot has been learned in the process. Now the concept of premium support is much more developed in 2011 than it was in 2003 when the Medicare Modernization Act passed.

So premium support—and again, I was surprised that members of the administration required sort of remedial learning on this. But at the end of the morning, I hope they understood better that it is not necessary to demagogue against the Republican plan because, after all, it is a reasonable plan that has been tested with Medicare part D satisfaction rates high and the cost of delivering the care under what was projected. Why in the world wouldn't we draw on that worthwhile experience?

Now, what do you do about someone who is between the ages of 55 and the end of their life? What do you do with someone who has reached that point where they have basically made all of

their assumptions and plans based around what the government promised they were going to do? For that individual aged 55 or older, nothing changes. I happen to fall into that age group. As Mr. THOMPSON alluded to, I would happily opt into the group that is going to have choices because I would rather have choices than a prescribed benefit.

□ 1520

Nevertheless, those individuals who are 55 and older will see no change, the thought being that they have already structured their lives and their retirements based on the fact that this promise had been made. For individuals who are younger than that, when there is still time to make some adjustments in your post-work years, your retirement years, there will be a different program.

Now you ask: For people who are 54 years of age and younger, is that fair to do this?

Well, I think both Mr. THOMPSON and I have articulated what "fair" will look like if you don't do something. What "fair" will look like if you don't do something is either vastly restricted benefits, as has been recommended by the Medicare trustees, vastly restricted benefits as dictated by the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or perhaps no Medicare program at all. After all, the makeup of the voting public in 10- to 15-years' time is going to be different than what it is today, and the makeup of the voting population in 10- to 15-years' time may feel significantly different about paying 60, 65, 70, 75 percent of their paychecks in order to continue benefits that were promised by a Congress 60 years before.

This type of intergenerational anxiety is just around the corner, and if we don't deal with it head on, if we don't take it as a serious responsibility, then it, indeed, could set the stage for some significant strife down the road between today's children and tomorrow's grandparents. That is why it is so important that we address this situation today.

G.T., I have said what I had intended to say today. If you have any additional comments or closing thoughts, we'll wind down this hour a little early.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I appreciate that. Thanks again for hosting this hour.

Whether we're talking about addressing the deficit or whether we're talking about saving Medicare—frankly, both of those issues are intertwined—we've got to save the country, and we've got to save the Medicare program. What we cannot do is allow the politics of 2012 to affect the problem-solving of critical problems in 2011. That's what we have seen so far. Where the facts are evident and clear that this country is facing a critical deficit that could bankrupt it and where the numbers for Medicare are such that its insolvency is impending and bankruptcy occurs and it goes

away, these are critical problems, and they shouldn't be demagogued as we bring solutions to the floor to debate. That's what has been happening. So there is no way we should allow the politics of 2012 to affect the critical problem-solving of 2011.

After the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, I had the privilege as a health care professional to be recruited to serve on a technical expert panel for Medicare. At the time, it was the Health Care Finance Administration. Today, it's the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Based on that experience, this is necessary. This is a necessary debate. This is necessary in order to save Medicare, and it's an opportunity for us.

We have had previous reforms. The most recent one I saw was under President Bush where he created the waiver program. That was a reform to an entitlement program that actually increased the quality of life and decreased the costs of many people who were institutionalized, living in nursing homes. Frankly, I like nursing homes. I think they can be very quality facilities, and I was an administrator at one time. Yet people should have the choice of where they live if they're living with a significant disability. It was President Bush's waiver program, a reform actually, that allowed that to occur.

So "reform," I think, can be a word used to scare people, but we need to talk about the specifics of why it is necessary and the opportunities that we have, I believe, to increase the quality of care, to decrease costs, to even increase access—all those—and certainly choice since the health care consumers are making decisions. Those are four principles that we share as a caucus as to whatever we do in health care. In looking at Medicare reform, I think that our plan, which is really the only viable plan, honors all four of those qualities.

So I look forward to continuing this debate. We need to have a good, transparent debate, but it needs to be a debate that is not based on demagoguery. It's a debate that needs to be based on the facts. I thank my colleague for hosting this Special Order time.

Mr. BURGESS. I think we'll look forward to having similar discussions in the future, probably frequently, because it's important that we not just have the debate with both sides of the Chamber. It's also important that we have the conversation with the American people.

I would remind people that the Republican budget that was passed in April was an aspirational document. It wasn't terribly long. If you look at something that becomes an actual law, it can get fairly long and intricate, but the budget was an aspirational document that set the goals. In 10-years' time, we want to see Medicare on a sustainable path. We want to preserve, protect and defend it for the future, and this aspirational document sets the pathway for achieving that goal.

All of the work that will be done to actually develop the legislative product will be done in the committees that Mr. THOMPSON and I are on in the House and that Members of the other body are on in the Senate. The actual work will be done on those committees, and there will be ample opportunity for people to comment, for people to contact their legislators. There will be periods of open comment at the Federal agencies as those laws are written. They won't be written in the next couple of months. They will be written over the next several years.

The point I would end with is that we are entering a phase of a long conversation with the American people about what the future of this program is, which arguably has been a good program in the past but, left untouched, is headed for some significant problems in the future.

So what is the forward-looking path for our Medicare system and for our seniors of both today and tomorrow? It will be a long conversation, but we are both up to it, and we can talk for a long time without pausing. I look forward to working with you on many afternoons on this very subject.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending the funeral of former Congressman Peter Frelinghuysen.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 7, 2011, at 10 a.m.

#### OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Gary L. Ackerman, Sandy Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Jason Altmire, Justin Amash, Robert E. Andrews, Steve Austria, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Tammy Baldwin, Lou Barletta, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Karen Bass, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Rick Berg, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Judy Biggett, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono Mack, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Mo Brooks, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Vern Buchanan, Larry Bucshon, Ann Marie

Buerkle, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G. K. Butterfield, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Francisco "Quico" Canseco, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, John C. Carney, Jr., Andre Carson, John R. Carter, Bill Cassidy, Kathy Castor, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Ben Chandler, Donna M. Christensen, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Hansen Clarke, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. "Gerry" Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Joe Courtney, Chip Cravaack, Eric A. "Rick" Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Mark S. Critz, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Danny K. Davis, Geoff Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, Rosa L. DeLauro, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Joe Donnelly, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Bob Filner, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Jeff Flake, Charles J. "Chuck" Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Elton Gallegly, John Garamendi, Cory Gardner, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Gabrielle Giffords, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Charles A. Gonzalez, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Al Green, Gene Green, Tim Griffin, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Michael G. Grimm, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutierrez, Ralph M. Hall, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Richard L. Hanna, Jane Harman\*, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Nan A. S. Hayworth, Joseph J. Heck, Martin Heinrich, Dean Heller\*, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Brian Higgins, James A. Himes, Maurice D. Hinchey, Rubin Hinojosa, Mazie Hirono, Kathleen C. Hochul, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Tim Huelskamp, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Robert Hurt, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson Lee, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, Marcy Kaptur, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Dale E. Kildee, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Adam Kinzinger, Larry Kissell, John Kline, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, Jeffrey M. Landry, James R. Langevin, James Lankford, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Christopher J. Lee\*, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Cynthia M. Lummis, Daniel E. Lujan, Stephen F. Lynch, Connie Mack, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Edward J. Markey, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Carolyn McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Jim McDermott, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry,

Mike McIntyre, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNeerney, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Mick Mulvaney, Christopher S. Murphy, Tim Murphy, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Kristi L. Noem, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, John W. Olver, William L. Owens, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Ed Perlmutter, Gary C. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Benjamin Quayle, Mike Quigley, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Tom Reed, Denny Rehberg, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Silvestre Reyes, Reid J. Ribble, Laura Richardson, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, David Rivera, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Peter J. Roskam, Dennis Ross, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Jon Runyan, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Robert T. Schilling, Jean Schmidt, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, Tim Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Heath Shuler, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Steve Southerland, Jackie Speier, Cliff Stearns, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, John Sullivan, Betty Sutton, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Scott Tipton, Paul Tonko, Edolphus Towns, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Joe Walsh, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Daniel Webster, Anthony D. Weiner, Peter Welch, Allen B. West, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Frederica Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, C.W. Bill Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1812. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Triflusaluron-methyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0102; FRL-8871-4] received April 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1813. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Data Requirements for Antimicrobial Pesticides; notification to the Secretaries of Agriculture and Health and Human Services [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0110; FRL-8861-7] (RIN: 2010-AD30) received April 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1814. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluopicolide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0481; FRL-8859-9] received April 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1815. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of the Department of Defense (DoD) Chemical and Biological Defense Program (CBDP) Annual Report to Congress for 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1816. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement; Business Systems-Definition and Administration (DFARS Case 2009-D038) (RIN: 0750-AG58) received May 10, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1817. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Implementation of the Whistleblower Provisions of Section 21F of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [Release No.: 34-64545; File No. S7-33-10] (RIN: 3235-AK78) received May 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1818. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting annual report on Operations of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs for Fiscal year 2009; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1819. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Florida; Jefferson County, Kentucky; Forsyth, Mecklenburg, and Buncombe Counties, North Carolina; and South Carolina [EPA-R04-OAR-2010-0840(a); FRL-9298-9] received April 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1820. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Adoption of the Revised Lead Standards and Related Reference Conditions and Update of Appendices [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0882; FRL-9298-1] received April 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1821. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; South Carolina; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [SC-200906; FRL-9286-2] received April 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1822. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report required by the Omnibus Appropriation, Public Law 105-277, Section 2215 on "Overseas Surplus Property"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1823. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department

of State, transmitting a report concerning methods employed by the Government of Cuba to comply with the United States-Cuba September 1994 "Joint Communiqué" and the treatment by the Government of Cuba of persons returned to Cuba in accordance with the United States-Cuba May 1995 "Joint Statement", together known as the Migration Accords; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1824. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's determination that six countries are not cooperating fully with U.S. antiterrorism efforts: Cuba, Eritrea, Iran, North Korea (DPRK), Syria, and Venezuela; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1825. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergency Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1826. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting an authorization of a noncompetitive extension of up to five years; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1827. A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a copy of the Institution's audited financial statement for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1828. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting copy of the Annual Report to Congress on the Refugee Resettlement Program for the period October 1, 2007 through September 30, 2008 as required by section 413(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1829. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the "21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act", related to certain settlements and injunctive relief for the first quarter of 2011, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530D Public Law 107-273, section 202; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1830. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers from the Wah Chang facility in Albany, Oregon to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1831. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers from the Vitro Manufacturing site in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1832. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers from the Norton Co. (or a subsequent owner) in Worcester, Massachusetts to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1833. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, trans-

mitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers from the Grand Junction Operations Office, Grand Junction, Colorado to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1834. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's quarterly report from the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties for the first quarter of fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1835. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A340-541 and -642 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0310; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-133-AD; Amendment 39-16663; AD 2011-09-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1836. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Model 750XL Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0379; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-007-AD; Amendment 39-16670; AD 2011-09-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1837. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company (Cessna) Model 172 Airplanes Modified by Supplemental type Certificate (STC) SA01303WI [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1243; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-058-AD; Amendment 39-16626; AD 2011-06-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1838. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200 and -300 Series Airplanes, and Model A340-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0311; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-232-AD; Amendment 39-16668; AD 2011-09-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1839. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems Model 340 (SAAB/SF340A) and SAAB 340B Airplanes Modified in Accordance with Supplemental Type Certificate (STC) ST00224WI-D, ST00146WI-D, or SA984GL-D [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0042; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-010-AD; Amendment 39-16664; AD 2011-09-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1840. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Model 212 Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0323; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-005-AD; Amendment 39-16651; AD 2011-08-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1841. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CPAC, Inc. (Type Certificate Formerly Held by Commander Aircraft Corporation, Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation, and

Rockwell International) Models 112, 112B, 112TC, 112CA, 114, 114A, 114B, and 114TC Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0302; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-008-AD; Amendment 39-16650; AD 2011-07-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1842. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Thielert Aircraft Engines GmbH Models TAE 125-01, TAE 125-02-99, and TAE 125-02-114 Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0820; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-31-AD; Amendment 39-16646; AD 2011-07-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1843. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; the Boeing Company Model MD-90-30 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1202; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-167-AD; Amendment 39-16637; AD 2011-06-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1844. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oil Pollution Prevention; Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) Rule — Amendments for Milk and Milk Product Containers [EPA-HQ-OPA-2008-0821; FRL-9297-3] (RIN: 2050-AG50) received April 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1845. A letter from the Chair, United States Section, International Commission United States and Canada, transmitting the 15th Biennial Report, pursuant to (100 Stat. 4249); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1846. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Amendment to List of CBP Preclearance Offices in Foreign Countries: Addition of Dublin, Ireland (CBP Dec. 11-08) received April 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1847. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Undue Hardship Waivers and Taxpayers Choice Statement (Rev. Proc. 2011-25) received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1848. A letter from the Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's first quarterly report for fiscal year 2011 from the Office of Security and Privacy; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

1849. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification to Congress regarding the Incidental Capture of Sea Turtles in Commercial Shrimping Operations, pursuant to Public Law 101-162, section 609(b); jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Appropriations.

1850. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department requests to be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform, Education and the Workforce, House Administration, and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

1851. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department requests to be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), Armed Services, Education and the Workforce, Science, Space, and Technology, Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, Foreign Affairs, and the Judiciary.

#### 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. KINGSTON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2112. A bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

*[Omitted from the Record of May 20, 2011]*

H.R. 358. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than September 9, 2011.

#### 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 Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 2105. A bill to provide for the application of measures to foreign persons who transfer to Iran, North Korea, and Syria certain goods, services, or technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Science, Space, and Technology, Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 2106. A bill to strengthen sanctions against the Government of Syria, to enhance multilateral commitment to address the Government of Syria's threatening policies, to establish a program to support a transition to a democratically-elected government in Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Financial Services, 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. MICHAUD (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 2107. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to improve the safety of high risk rural roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. CASSIDY):

H.R. 2108. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modernize payments for ambulatory surgical centers under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. SESSIONS (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. HENSARLING):

H.R. 2109. A bill to provide for each American the opportunity to provide for his or her retirement through a S.A.F.E. account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2110. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize and improve activities for the protection of the Long Island Sound watershed, and for other purposes; 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. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CAPP):

H.R. 2111. A bill to ensure that proper information gathering and planning are undertaken to secure the preservation and recovery of the salmon and steelhead of the Columbia River Basin in a manner that protects and enhances local communities, ensures effective expenditure of Federal resources, and maintains reasonably priced, reliable power, to direct the Secretary of Commerce to seek scientific analysis of Federal efforts to restore salmon and steelhead listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and 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 Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 2113. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to improve the effectiveness of transportation programs on Federal lands and to provide funding for park roads and parkways and the Paul S. Sarbanes Transit in Parks Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 2114. A bill to reduce the size of the Federal workforce through attrition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. AUSTRIA, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. CHU, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. FALCOMA):

H.R. 2115. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 2116. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 2117. A bill to prohibit the Department of Education from overreaching into academic affairs and program eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 2118. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act relating to the authority to enjoin State laws that are preempted by or conflict with such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BONO MACK (for herself, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 2119. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to require practitioners to obtain particular training or special certification, approved by the Attorney General, on addiction to and abuse of controlled substances and appropriate and safe use of controlled substances in schedule II, III, IV, or V, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 2120. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include individuals who have exhausted all rights to emergency unemployment compensation under title IV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 as a targeted group for purposes of the work opportunity tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 2121. A bill to deny the entry into the United States of certain members of the senior leadership of the Government of the People's Republic of China and individuals who have committed human rights abuses in the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 2122. A bill to renew the Export Administration Act of 1979, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. WU, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 2123. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the diagnosis and treatment of hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. CANSECO (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H.R. 2124. A bill to improve the safety, security, and operational control of the international border by providing the Department of Homeland Security with an accurate definition of the term "cross-border violence", to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop measures to quantify cross-

border violence data for reporting to Congress and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. BACA:

H.R. 2125. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to require certain disclosures by employers who use electronic payroll cards to pay their employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2126. A bill to modernize the Liability Risk Retention Act of 1986 and expand coverage to include commercial property insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 2127. A bill to authorize funding for the creation and implementation of infant mortality pilot programs in standard metropolitan statistical areas with high rates of infant mortality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. ELLMERS (for herself and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 2128. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prevent the application of payment adjustments for eligible professionals who are not successful electronic prescribers, to remove any electronic prescribing requirement as an element for demonstrating meaningful use of certified EHR technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. ENGEL:

H.R. 2129. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, to condition the receipt of certain highway funding by States on the enactment and enforcement by States of certain laws to prevent repeat intoxicated driving; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2130. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a corporate responsibility investment option under the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2131. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to reform the HUBZone program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 2132. A bill to require the Food and Drug Administration to finalize a standard for broad-spectrum protection in sunscreen products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 2133. A bill to increase domestic energy production, reduce dependence on foreign oil, and diversify the energy portfolio of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Science, Space, and Technology, and Agriculture, 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. OLVER (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr.

KILDEE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 2134. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve access to advanced practice nurses and physician assistants under the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. FALCOMA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 2135. A bill to amend titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act to improve the availability of Medicaid assistance for certain breast and cervical cancer patients in the territories; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 2136. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify and expand Federal criminal jurisdiction over Federal contractors and employees outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself and Mr. CLARKE of Michigan):

H.R. 2137. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to authorize an unemployment assistance voucher program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2138. A bill to establish a health registry to ensure that certain individuals who may have been exposed to formaldehyde in a travel trailer have an opportunity to register for such registry and receive medical treatment for such exposure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOLD, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 2139. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the establishment of Lions Clubs International; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROSS of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BARROW, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CHANDLER):

H.R. 2140. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiaries coordinated care and greater choice with regard to accessing hearing health services and benefits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2141. A bill to promote optimal maternity outcomes by making evidence-based

maternity care a national priority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. BACA):

H.R. 2142. A bill to establish a program that enables college-bound residents of the Northern Mariana Islands to have greater choices among institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. LABRADOR):

H.R. 2143. A bill to permit commercial vehicles at weights up to 129,000 pounds to use certain highways on the Interstate System in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SIREN (for himself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. DICKS):

H.R. 2144. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to codify the cooperative agreement, known as the Health Technologies program, under which the United States Agency for International Development supports the development of technologies for global health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. YODER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DOLD, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. HAYWORTH, and Mr. TIPTON):

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution declaring that it is the policy of the United States to support and facilitate Israel in maintaining defensible borders and that it is contrary to United States policy and national security to have the borders of Israel return to the armistice lines than existed on June 4, 1967; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LANCE, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. TERRY):

H. Res. 296. A resolution expressing support for peaceful demonstrations and universal freedoms in Syria and condemning the human rights violations by the Assad Regime; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H. Res. 297. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of State should withhold United States contributions to the regularly assessed biennial budget of the United Nations for purposes of the General Assembly of the United Nations if the General Assembly adopts a resolution in favor of recognizing a state of Palestine outside of or prior to a final status agreement negotiated between, and acceptable to, the State of Israel and the Palestinians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. EMERSON (for herself, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H. Res. 298. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that

there is need for specified agencies to coordinate and capitalize on existing programs for epilepsy awareness; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 299. A resolution permitting official photographs of the House of Representatives to be taken while the House is in actual session on a date designated by the Speaker; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### 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 Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 2105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 2106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 2108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 to allow Congress to regulate the business of Ambulatory Surgical Centers.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 2109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 to allow Congress to regulate the individuals and business contributions to the Social Security Trust Fund.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 3

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 2112.

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 Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 2113.

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 grant Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 2115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, which grants Congress the power "[t]o establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization . . . throughout the United States."

By Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 2116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, which grants Congress the power "[t]o establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization . . . throughout the United States."

By Ms. FOX:

H.R. 2117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 2118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This law is enacted pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, and the 10th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. BONO MACK:

H.R. 2119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority for enactment of this Bill flows from Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution. The Congress has the right to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 2120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of Constitution section 8.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 2122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, sections 8 (clauses 3 and 18).

By Mr. GALLEGLEY:

H.R. 2123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8, Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CANSECO:

H.R. 2124.

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, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 2125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 2126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 2128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article I, Section 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 2130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution, "the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States." As described in Article 1, Section 1 "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress." I was elected in 2010 to serve in the 112th Congress as certified by the Secretary of State of Washington state.

Article III, Section 2 states that the Supreme Court has "the judicial power" that "shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States." Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land when stating "The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court."

The power of judicial review of the Supreme Court was upheld in *Marbury v Madison* in 1803, giving the Supreme Court the authority to strike down any law it deems unconstitutional. Members of Congress, having been elected and taken the oath of office, are given the authority to introduce legislation and only the Supreme Court, as established by the Constitution and precedent, can determine the Constitutionality of this authority.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I



By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 2133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. OLVER:

H.R. 2134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, and

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 2135.

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; 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; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 2136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation under Article I, Section 8, clauses 1 (“[t]o provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States”) and 10 (“[t]o define and punish . . . Offenses against the Law of Nations”).

However, the Supreme Court has held that Congress’s authority to legislate with respect to matters outside U.S. boundaries is based on national sovereignty in foreign affairs and, consequently, is not limited by the enumerated powers delegated to Congress. For example, in *United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* (1936), the Supreme Court ruled that the “broad statement that the federal government can exercise no powers except those specifically enumerated in the Constitution, and such implied powers as are necessary and proper to carry into effect the enumerated powers, is categorically true only in respect of our internal affairs.”

On March 30, 2011, in *United States v. Brehm*, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia upheld the constitutionality of the Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act (MEJA, on which the current legislation is modeled), on this basis.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 2137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, whereby Congress shall have the power “[t]o 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.”

As affirmed by Justice Benjamin Cardozo in *Steward Machine Company v. Davis*, 301 U.S. 548 (1937), upholding the constitutionality of unemployment benefits.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of

compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 2139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 states “The Congress shall have Power . . . To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.”

By Mr. ROSS of Arkansas:

H.R. 2140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 1 (General Welfare Clause); Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause).

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 2142.

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. SIMPSON:

H.R. 2143.

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, specifically clause 3 (relating to the authority to regulate commerce among the several states).”

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 2144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 21: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 23: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 24: Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BONNER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. OLSON, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. WU, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MICA, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BARROW, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 85: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 308: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 328: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 329: Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 451: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 502: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 575: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 601: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 639: Mr. BACA, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. BOREN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. SIREs.

H.R. 640: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 645: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 654: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 674: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 675: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 694: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 718: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CARTER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 719: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 721: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 733: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 745: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 806: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 809: Ms. MOORE and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 812: Mr. WU.

H.R. 860: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WEST, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 891: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 894: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 915: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.

H.R. 938: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 941: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 964: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 965: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 991: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1005: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1029: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1030: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1041: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 1048: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1057: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1081: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1093: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HURT, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DENT, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 1111: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 1122: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1124: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1132: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1134: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1161: Mr. POSEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1167: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1181: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.

H.R. 1195: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1200: Mr. OLVER and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1221: Mr. CANSECO.

H.R. 1236: Mr. MARINO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1244: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1259: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 1327: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1342: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1350: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1351: Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1370: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1375: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1380: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1426: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1427: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1475: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1476: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1477: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1479: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1489: Fr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1498: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1505: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1509: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr.

- WALBERG, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. COLE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. DEUTCH.  
 H.R. 1513: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mrs. MALONEY.  
 H.R. 1515: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.R. 1545: Mr. CARTER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.  
 H.R. 1546: Mr. LANGEVIN.  
 H.R. 1578: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. QUIGLEY.  
 H.R. 1579: Mr. HEINRICH.  
 H.R. 1591: Mr. KISSELL.  
 H.R. 1633: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. FLAKE, and Mrs. BACHMANN.  
 H.R. 1639: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. TERRY.  
 H.R. 1645: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 1648: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SIREN, and Mr. ANDREWS.  
 H.R. 1668: Mr. COURTNEY.  
 H.R. 1687: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
 H.R. 1697: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. BOREN.  
 H.R. 1704: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. STARK.  
 H.R. 1723: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. REHBERG.  
 H.R. 1724: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. CAPP, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
 H.R. 1735: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 1739: Mr. LANCE and Mr. FLAKE.  
 H.R. 1744: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.  
 H.R. 1747: Mr. REHBERG.  
 H.R. 1749: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.  
 H.R. 1756: Mr. DENT.  
 H.R. 1771: Mr. FILNER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.  
 H.R. 1776: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. BONNER.  
 H.R. 1781: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. GARAMENDI.  
 H.R. 1799: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
 H.R. 1803: Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 1827: Mr. OWENS.  
 H.R. 1834: Mr. MORAN and Mr. POMPEO.  
 H.R. 1845: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. RANGEL.  
 H.R. 1861: Mr. AUSTRIA.  
 H.R. 1865: Mr. COBLE, Mr. YODER, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. HANNA, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. SHULER.  
 H.R. 1872: Mr. BACHUS.  
 H.R. 1878: Mr. MORAN.  
 H.R. 1904: Mrs. LUMMIS.  
 H.R. 1916: Mr. POLIS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. LUJÁN.  
 H.R. 1932: Mr. BACHUS.  
 H.R. 1936: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. LATHAM.  
 H.R. 1943: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
 H.R. 1946: Mr. BARLETTA.  
 H.R. 1955: Mr. COBLE.  
 H.R. 1957: Mr. CARTER and Mr. SENSEN-BRENNER.  
 H.R. 1959: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
 H.R. 1964: Mr. REED.  
 H.R. 1980: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 1985: Ms. WOOLSEY.  
 H.R. 2003: Mr. TIERNEY.  
 H.R. 2011: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. HECK.  
 H.R. 2018: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.  
 H.R. 2019: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
 H.R. 2021: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. COLE, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
 H.R. 2028: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
 H.R. 2061: Ms. EDWARDS.  
 H.R. 2068: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. WOMACK.  
 H.R. 2071: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. POLIS.  
 H.R. 2104: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
 H.J. Res. 56: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.  
 H.J. Res. 64: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
 H. Con. Res. 51: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.  
 H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. CHAFFETZ.  
 H. Res. 60: Mr. GARAMENDI.  
 H. Res. 137: Ms. EDWARDS.  
 H. Res. 246: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. MORAN.  
 H. Res. 268: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOLD, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. YODER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. SUTTON.

---

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. Con. Res. 58: Mr. STIVERS.