I thank the gentleman for

yielding.

I rarely speak on the House floor, and

almost never have I ever come to the

floor two times in one day to speak on

this one issue. But this is my fourth

trip to the floor today on this issue because

I consider it so important and so

serious.

If I could rename this bill, I would

call it ‘‘a bill to authorize the use of

force in Libya.’’ That is what we’re

doing. We should not kid ourselves—we

are authorizing the use of force. We are

endorsing the Obama war in Libya.

Some see this as weakening our presence

over there, but there is no doubt,

if you read it carefully, we are expanding

and giving authority because of the

exceptions. The exceptions include

search and re-search, intelligence, surveillance,

reconnaissance, refueling,

planning—contract labor probably can

still go in, the CIA is in there already,

special forces. And paying for it: How

can you do all that without paying for

it? So we are there.

This will be the first time the President

will have received any information

from the Congress that it’s okay

to pursue what we’re doing. We’re supposed

to be sending the message that

we’re in charge of when we go to war

and when we pay for this war. We’re

not just supposed to lie over and capitulate

to what the President wants—as

we have been for too many years.

So there is no doubt that I think the

proper vote here, the proper constitutional

vote, the proper vote for the best

of our national interests, the best vote

for peace is to vote this resolution

down just as we voted the previous resolution

down. We should prohibit the

use of funds.

A lot of us complain on this House

floor because of the way the President

went to war—he didn’t come here, he

went to NATO. But this supports

NATO. One of the arguments in favor

of this bill is we have the exceptions,

so we don’t want to break ties and our

allegiance to NATO. Well, that’s what

we’re supposed to be doing, we’re supposed

to be reclaiming the sovereignty

and the responsibilities here in the

House. We are not supposed to roll over

for NATO and the United Nations.

We’re supposed to stand up for this

country.

We are not supposed to go into war

under these conditions. And under

those circumstances, I strongly urge a

‘‘no’’ vote on this resolution.

I thank the gentlewoman

for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution that

endorses the policies that have been

going on for 4 months. Not only has the

Congress basically been strong in opposition

to what has been going on, the

American people are even more so. So

what this resolution does is endorses

exactly what has been going on—another

unconstitutional war, involvement

and justification under NATO

and the United Nations, doing it secretly.

There’s an attempt to restrain

the funding of this effort over in Libya.

How can we restrain it, because we’ve

never authorized it. Restrain unauthorized

funds? The funds weren’t authorized.

The President just goes and does

it.

What we’re talking about here is the

challenge for the Congress on looking

at the unitary President. The unitary

President has been around for quite a

few years. That means that Presidents

do what they want, and the Congress

just acknowledges it. So that is what

we’re doing. This is what this resolution

does. It acknowledges and gives

authority to the President to pursue

this war, which is actually what he has

been doing. Obviously, H.J. Res. 68, for

me, is a very, very strong ‘‘no’’ because

the last thing we need to do is to be

giving explicit support and explicit authorization

for the very policies that so

many people now think are ill-advised.

This resolution also says you don’t

send in ground troops. Well, that’s fine,

no ground troops. But in this day and

age, war can go on for a long time

without the ground troops. It happened

to a degree in Bosnia. But it didn’t exempt

such things as special forces, the

CIA. The CIA has been in Libya, and

I’m sure they will be, as they are in

many, many other hundreds of countries.

Contractors. When we can’t send

in troops, we send in contractors. We

have as many contractors in Afghanistan

as we do the military. So a couple

thousand troops come out of Afghanistan

and nothing changes as we add

more contractors. Nothing ever

changes.

But this whole idea of this effort to

legalize the bombing, at least give the

authority to the President to continue

this, is foolhardy. How many more

wars can we withstand? What number

is this? This is I think number five.

Today, in the papers, number six is

coming. How long before we’re in

Syria? Go into Syria tomorrow and in

90 days we’ll start talking about Syria

and proper authority.

Instead, we in Congress have given up

our responsibility for war. Because the

responsibility of going to war should

have been and still remains constitutionally

mandated that the Congress

makes these decisions. The President is

not supposed to get us engaged in war

without Congress’ authority. Too often

we say, Whatever you need, we’ll endorse

it.

We have another resolution coming

up shortly.

Unfortunately, I think

the next resolution, H.R. 2278, isn’t

much different because it has too many

exceptions. It says: Deny funding. But

there are too many exceptions, and the

exceptions are to allow the very things

the President is currently doing.

So both resolutions have serious

shortcomings. Both resolutions should

be defeated if you’re opposed to this

war in Libya.