I thank the chair.

Mr. Secretary, I thank you very much for your service. We are

really going to miss you. You have done an excellent job and always

very cooperative with the members of our committee.

I would like to use my 1 minute just to be introspective on what

has been happening across the Capitol from both political parties.

Because I have been a bit troubled on the reactor to the President’s

announcements that have occurred from Congress in both Houses.
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Regardless of party, I do not think that the predisposition to liking

the President or disliking the President is a substitute for questioning

and evaluating foreign policy. We should be doing that on

a nonpartisan basis.

I was particularly troubled by so many people who just rubber

stamped what the President was doing without thinking about it,

and I was at least equally troubled by those who were critical of

the President for doing what they suggested to do in the first place,

and then were critical of him for doing it after he did it.

We have to be a lot more careful because we are at a juncture

in world history right now where the big things are happening and

we really have to analyze and appreciate what we should be doing

about that.

I particularly want to thank the chair for having

this hearing so early. I remember during the war in Iraq, it was

1 year before we had a hearing on Iraq. So this is has been very

important.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

I find it interesting that we are in favor of killing Ghadafi, but

we do not want to be there when we kill him.

I continue to be troubled as I listen to some of our colleagues

both in this room and outside of the room. And I welcome some of

our friends to the newly found and newly discovered by them question

of the War Powers Act. It is an interesting piece of work. But

I wonder where those questions were, and to be clear I supported

my President when we went to war in Iraq. But where were those

questions from some of our friends who newly discovered the Constitution

about that war? Where were the statements about the

clarity of the mission when we engaged in that? Where are the demands

for the end game?

We are 8 years into that war, over 8 days, and nobody then and

for 8 years demanded to know what the end game was. And it is

interesting 8 days, 8 days into the action in Libya they are making

the demands about where the end game.

More people died in Iraq in the past couple of weeks then in

Libya and yet the questions are asked under this President’s action

then they were during any previous President that I can remember.

The War Powers Act is vague. It does not answer all the questions.

War does not answer all the questions when you start it. You

do not know the answer to any of the questions until it is over, and

sometimes you do not know when it is over.

Nobody has tested the War Powers Act, the constitutionality of

it is being argued but not in the courts, and deliberately so. And

sometimes we have to understand that laws are sometimes written

with deliberate ambiguity so that we have some flexibility to act

in situations that we cannot fully understand when things begin.

Maybe we need a different definition of war; I do not know. Is

it war when you are fighting on behalf of the people of a country

and against its leader when you are not against the country, when

you do not want to defeat a country, when you do not want to de-
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feat its people but you want to help them liberate themselves from

a corrupt, brutal and dictatorial leadership? Is that a war?

Was France at war with England when so many there decided

that their government’s policy and its citizens would be supportive

of the American revolutionaries instead of the oppressive king? I

think not.

But if you think further about it, you know if a bomb dropped

by a foreign government falls on your house, is it a war or just an

intervention?

And maybe we do not want to define war, and maybe we are not

in one. But we have to give these things some thought as we think

about the policy.

And why Libya? A lot of my friends thoughtfully ask the question

why of all the countries involved in the region, are we going to get

involved in every single one of them?

If you are approached on the street by somebody asking you for

a few cents and has their hand out, and tells you their story and

they are in need and you are trying to figure out whether or not

to reach in your pocket and help or not because there are so many

beggars out there to help. But if suddenly all of the street people

say to you, ‘‘Help that one,’’ maybe you have to take a look at that.

And this is the first time that I can think of when not just one

Arab nation, but the entire Arab League, which seems to be in a

little bit of difficulty on every individual basis, says to you ‘‘Help

that one,’’ maybe there is cause for the exceptionalism that the

President has indicated here.

So, I want to thank him, and you, and the administration for

taking the actions that they are taking. I mean, this is dictator in

that country who has threatened no pity and only brutality to those

who oppose him, we have heard that before. Had only Roosevelt at

the outset and during World War II stepped up to the plate with

the moral clarity and intervened when another dictator was annihilating

people by the thousands and millions, maybe 1 million or

millions of innocent people would not have been slaughtered.

Thank you, Madam Chair.