

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 someplace 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 burnishing 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
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow

Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggart
Billbray
Billirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn

Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon

Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Clarke (MI)
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eilmlers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling

Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hochul
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri

Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schradner
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Webster
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—145

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan

Carney
Carson (IN)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)

DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gohmert