Mr. Speaker, the

Speaker of the House has made some

very legitimate points, but then his

conclusion is so contrary to the points

he made. The proposition before us

today, Mr. MCCLINTOCK is right, it is an

authorization of a series of acts of belligerence,

acts of war, that by their

own definition cannot possibly help us

either achieve the humanitarian goal

of this mission or achieve the goal, the

true humanitarian goal of removing

Qadhafi from power.

We are authorizing intelligence-sharing,

aerial refueling, operational planning,

intelligence-gathering; but we are

denying the only aspects of this operation

that can allow us to achieve that

goal—the suppression of air defense

systems and the utilization of drones

with missiles to stop Qadhafi from resuming

his effort to massacre his own

people.

I understand the argument. You

don’t buy my notions of our national

security interests. You don’t see the

context of bringing this operation to a

halt in terms of what it does to the stability

of the democracy movements in

Egypt and Tunisia. You don’t see any

consequences in terms of Syria or the

larger Middle East or the damage to alliance.

I understand and accept that argument.

But Mr. ROONEY tries to have it both

ways and in fact comes up with a proposal

that ensures that the mission is

allowed to continue, but by definition

cannot achieve its goals.

It is the worst. It is not the reasonable

proposal. It is the worst of all solutions.

If you’re going to authorize an

operation through airpower and other

methods, you don’t exclude the only

parts that can possibly achieve success.

If you’re against this operation, you

stop the funding of the operation.

Mr. ROONEY and apparently a number

of members of the majority want to

have it both ways. We don’t like Qadhafi

so we want to do something. We

don’t want to do anything that could

work, but we don’t want to come out

against the operation. But the fact is

you’re ending the operation if this were

to become law, because our European

friends have said very clearly that,

Those parts of this operation that this

amendment prohibits, those parts of

the operation we cannot undertake if

you are not doing it.

So why not be straightforward? Why

not do what a number of colleagues on

the other side have called for: stop

funding the operation. Don’t try to

have it both ways, ensure the operation’s

defeat and end the operation,

while pretending to still be interested

in seeing Qadhafi go and the operation

succeed.

I urge a ‘‘no’’ vote from anyone who

cares about the consequences of what

they vote on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield

myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are 90 days into this

operation, and the majority is bringing

up this resolution in order to embarrass

the White House. Let’s just call it

for what it is. They know it will fail.

They want to continue to play games

with U.S. national security.

Let’s be honest about what’s happening

here. The Republican leadership

allowed this resolution to come to the

floor for one reason and one reason

only: They know it will fail, and they

think its defeat will be a political defeat

for the White House. If that type

of trifling and toying with national security

appeals to them, so be it.

Mr. Speaker, I think our commitments

to NATO and the humanitarian

crisis that created the NATO operation

in Libya are too important to be exploited

for cynical political purposes.

In my view, the perfect authorization

would have been a 6-month authorization

for a limited purpose with a limitation

on that authorization with respect

to a position the House has stood

for the entire time, as has the President,

and that is no boots on the

ground.

But the Republicans didn’t give this

side the choice of the resolution for authorization.

They told us what the resolution

for authorization would be, and

that’s a very unfortunate kind of a situation.

So we will go through this

process. And perhaps, at the end of the

day, after this resolution fails, we will

get another letter to the House of Representatives

sent to the Speaker

thanking us from Colonel Qadhafi for

once again demonstrating that we

want to send a message that he is

going to prevail in this conflict.

And when that happens, what do we

think the dictator of Syria is going to

think? Faced with the choice of change

or quitting, he will hear the message:

the way to survive, the way to hold

onto power is for a despot to continue

to kill his own people without the rest

of the world doing anything.

There are critical alliances at stake.

There are critical interests at stake.

The national security question is far

beyond simply what is going to happen

in Libya, but in its neighbors, Egypt

and Tunisia, throughout the Middle

East and through the entire world, the

message of trying to say that we’re

going to pull the plug on this particular

operation.

And heaven knows, we could spend

time talking about the way the administration

has handled it; but right now

we have one choice, to pull the plug on

this baby, or to let it play out in a limited

and responsible fashion, to achieve

our goals and send a message that the

civilized world is not going to stand for

this kind of barbarity and brutality.

I urge an ‘‘aye’’ vote on the joint resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.