

She talks about children. Many of them, these individuals, were having child soldiers. They were putting children's lives at risk in war. I don't understand the rationality.

We should sanction ISIS. We should sanction Viktor Bout.

Mr. Speaker, I can't believe that any Member of this august body will vote for this resolution. Every Member should vote against this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate, again, that I appreciate the engagement from my colleagues on these matters, and I would be happy to work with them on ways to modernize IEEPA or increase oversight of the President's authorities, but this is not the way to do it.

Passing this joint resolution would seriously hinder our ability to fight terrorism in Africa and allow criminals like Mr. Bout to operate more efficiently. That absolutely should not be the message that Congress sends.

I hear often from my colleagues about the need for regular order. We had a whole discussion on it as a conference in our rules: regular order. This should be going through the Foreign Affairs Committee to have regular order. By introducing a privileged resolution, this is bypassing regular order. It is bypassing the work that all of us collectively as 435 Members of Congress have to do.

Now, I would remind my colleagues that these declarations are renewed every year by the President, including President Trump, who did it four times. Annual reports come to Congress every year. They come to the Foreign Affairs Committee of which I am a member.

There are no additional spending authorities tied to these national emergency declarations. They cost about \$300,000 a year to administer.

I would remind my colleagues that we cannot sanction American citizens. It is unconstitutional. We are sanctioning foreigners. We can only freeze assets within our jurisdiction. That is the intent of this.

So while I do agree that we need to modernize IEEPA and we need to evaluate any of these declarations, Congress already has the tools to do it through regular order. So let's actually follow the rules that many of my colleagues who are introducing these resolutions demanded, and let's do it the proper way.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania).

All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of July 13, 2023, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mrs. BOEBERT. 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.

RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 25, 2011

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of July 13, 2023, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 70) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 25, 2011, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of July 13, 2023, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 70

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, pursuant to section 202 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622), the national emergency declared by the finding of the President on February 25, 2011, in Executive Order 13566 is hereby terminated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided among and controlled by Representative McCaul of Texas, Representative MEEKS of New York, and Representative GOSAR of Arizona, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER), the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER).

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

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

H.J. Res. 70 would terminate Executive Order No. 13566, which established a state of emergency in Libya due to Qadhafi's attacks on his own people, a deterioration of security in Libya, and prolonged violence that caused serious destabilization.

This executive order was enacted during the first Libyan civil war, was kept in place throughout the second Libyan civil war, and remains critical now as Libya has yet to make a transition to stable governing.

On each annual renewal of the emergency, President Obama, President Trump, and now President Biden have carefully reviewed the circumstances

in Libya and each time determined that we need to maintain associated sanctions. It is simple to see the issues in Libya are ongoing, and it is not partisan to know sanctions are a key element.

One of the most critical sanctions that would be removed if Congress passed this joint resolution is against Saif Qadhafi, one of Qadhafi's sons, who has well-known links to the Wagner Group and is wanted for murdering Libyan civilians. Sanctions related to Libya are still, to this day, critical to our national security.

In the last 2 years alone, our Libya sanctions have blocked approximately \$18 million from reaching hostile foreign actors. The forced termination of the national emergency regarding Libya would lead to the immediate release of millions of dollars for wanted war criminals backed by the Kremlin, like Saif Al Islam Qadhafi. Again, this money would empower Putin's regime and secure Russia's interests in Libya, a strategically important country along NATO's southern flank.

I also, again, want to mention the importance of the U.S. state-sponsored terrorism fund. There is no question that this money is better served by helping 9/11 families than quite literally financing terrorists. Like most Americans, I remember exactly where I was when I heard the news. I was in my first week of classes as a freshman at Suffern High School.

September 11 had a profound impact on our Nation, but particularly impacted the residents of New York. Thousands of families have faced the repercussions of that day, especially the families of those who worked tirelessly on the pile, trying to find survivors and helping others find closure.

Every September 11, I attend numerous 9/11 ceremonies with the families and our first responders who sacrificed so much, and still today we are adding names to the various monuments of 9/11 first responders who are losing their lives to 9/11-related illnesses. These sanctioned moneys are used to help them and their families.

We will never forget that tragedy, and it is abhorrent that any of these resolutions are coming before us today in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 70.

For decades, Muammar Qadhafi ruled Libya with an iron fist and with a corrupt, self-serving economic policy that stunted Libya's development and, through a security state, engaged in international terrorism, including the Lockerbie airline bombing that remains the deadliest event in aviation history.

□ 1430

For the past 12 years, Libya has seen its share of continuous turmoil and

chaos. To the extent this resolution is a symptom of frustration about ongoing problems in Libya, that would be understandable. Any notion that this resolution will be at all useful for Libya policy is deeply misguided.

The United States actively supports the U.N.'s efforts to unify the country and its institutions under a democratically elected government.

These talks are ongoing, and violence has decreased over the last several years. The economy is doing better in part because U.S. sanctions have helped decrease oil banditry.

Lifting sanctions on the worst actors in Libya, the individuals who have perpetuated violence and instability, would send the exact wrong message to those pursuing economic reform.

Whereas economic pressure and tough diplomacy have brought parties to the table, a free pass on sanctions would have the exact opposite impact.

In general, there have been two large batches of sanctions under the Libya executive order. The Obama administration issued the first tranche against the Qadhafi family and its fiefdom of business and fake charities.

The Trump administration issued the second set that sanctioned individuals who committed grave human rights abuses and prevented the theft of Libyan oil by pirates and illegal merchants.

It is unclear to me how letting any of these people access American finance would be beneficial to the United States or to Libya or to the MENA region.

One of the most notable people currently sanctioned under the program is Qadhafi's son, Saif al-Islam Qadhafi. When the protests began, Saif al-Islam went on television and threatened "rivers of blood" if the protestors did not cease.

He has never condemned his father. He has never condemned his father's despotic rule and is actively seeking to regain power in Libya as we speak.

The Qadhafi family controlled billions of dollars in assets. If sanctions are lifted on the remaining members of the Qadhafi family, the Qadhafis would have access to a windfall of wealth, which they plundered from the Libyan people. Instead of the frozen funds going to the Libyan people, they would go to the family that imprisoned and impoverished them.

I cannot support anything like that outcome, Mr. Speaker. I must strongly oppose and hope all of the Members of this House opposes H.J. Res. 70.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, let's review the facts. There are currently 41 national emergencies that are subject to periodic congressional review, including the emergency declaration related to Libya, which is more than a decade old.

The National Emergencies Act mandates Congress consider joint resolutions terminating national emergencies at least every 6 months. Think

about it; every 6 months. That is our job—not the President's; our job.

Yet, Congress has never, not even once, reviewed the legitimacy of the national emergency related to Libya since its declaration by President Obama in 2011, nor has Congress reviewed any of the national emergencies debated today as required by law.

Almost comically, the extended national emergency related to Libya still cites Muammar Qadhafi as a reason for declaration. Mr. Speaker, Muammar Qadhafi has been dead for almost 12 years. You can't make this stuff up.

The situation in Libya poses no extraordinary threat to the national security or foreign policy of the United States. Once again, temporary measures, short-term, punch, terminate.

No group or person in Libya currently poses a threat to our national security. Furthermore, even if there was some hostility, none rises to the level of an unusual and extraordinary threat to national security.

To the extent that there is a desire for certain sanctions, they can be applied without these national emergency declarations in compliance with the Constitution, Federal laws, and national security needs.

Now, that is an important point here. We can adjust these. We can put these in in different places that adhere to our Constitution, our legal aspect, because once again, this is us.

Despite unfounded concerns, sanctioned individuals and entities can be redesignated pursuant to other authorities available to the President, including but not limited to existing national emergencies related to terrorism, Russia, and Iran.

National emergencies are supposed to be rare and brief. In passing the National Emergencies Act in 1976, Congress did not intend for the executive to utilize declarations for decades in order to apply sanctions. That is something Congress can do separately from a national emergency declaration.

In fact, let's look at the history of the National Emergencies Act. It was written to respond to FDR and to Truman in keeping the country in a state of emergency as part of their daily governance. That is what they used the national emergencies for.

Congress allowing these tyrannical authorities to remain in place is recklessly endangering our Republic, checks and balances, and the civil liberties of our constituents.

Under all these extended national emergency declarations, the U.S. Code provides the President with an additional 135 special statutory powers, including: Testing chemical and biological weapons on human beings, including American citizens. Can you say COVID?

Take over or shut down radio stations and U.S.-based internet traffic. Wow. Censorship.

Detail members of our Armed Forces. Waive sanctions on confidentiality provisions related to public health serv-

ices. Impose crippling and unconstitutional sanctions on American citizens that could freeze their financial assets or restrict anyone from selling them groceries, renting them an apartment, representing them as an attorney, providing dental and medical treatment, and much more—all without any due process supposedly afforded by the Constitution.

Clearly the President thinks he has authority to invoke these special statutory powers absent an executive order explicitly detailing them, which is why he announced his intention to forgive student loans via a press release instead of an executive order.

Oh, but voila. The U.S. Supreme Court said: You can't do that. What does this President do again? He turns around and does it again, shoving it in the Court's face.

Under the extended national emergency declarations, Congress abdicates control over policy and spending and instead transfers unfettered power to the executive branch.

For example, despite repeated bicameral requests, Biden has never provided a single expenditure report related to the COVID-19 national emergency declaration as required periodically by law. Not one.

Now, how can we, Congress, with the explicit power of the purse, allow any President to spend money without requiring a report?

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution says: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

Further, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) clearly states: "... the President shall transmit to Congress, within 90 days after the end of each 6-month period after such declaration, a report on the total expenditures incurred by the United States Government during such 6-month period..."

Despite repeated—and I said repeated requests—there have been no expenditure reports to this date allocated in the COVID-19 national emergency, nor was there a final report that was due on July 9.

In fact, what we heard is this President realized that he was behind the gun, and he actually rushed it through on July 7, had the Secretary of Health and Human Services actually try to do it for him. What a shame.

The Constitution clearly provides Congress with the power of the purse, not the President, regardless of supposed emergencies. These emergencies are supposed to be limited, not forever bearing.

We have to come up with a different solution. This is not working. This doesn't work at all. For us particularly, we as Congress, haven't done our job.

Every 6 months—if you hear what I am saying here, every 6 months we

should be bringing these up, whether their application is great or fettered or very, very faint, and we should discuss this: What about Libya? What about Yemen? What about these other ones, Iraq and others? By the way, this is regular order. Anything we are detailing here is regular order.

This is almost comical to me. I hate to say it in that light, but when Senator Church put this detail together, he spent a lot of time trying to address this publicly. He tried to get as many people involved in it as he could, and yet, we turn around and do this to him.

We have got to come up with something better, something different, something short-lived, something that actually can keep our eye on the prize.

I don't know whether it is something that we put together in a clearinghouse for known terrorists and whether we utilize that in some way, shape, or form so that we can make sure that we are keeping up to date on all of that, but something has to happen, and it is not in the national emergencies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this joint resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, I will be brief because, unfortunately, when we are in this august body, the world is looking at us. As I was scratching my head on the first resolution, I continue to do that.

Judgments I use in making determinations is: Is this good for America?

The question is, does this resolution promote America's national security? The answer to that is no.

Does this resolution support America's economic interests? The answer to that is no.

Would this resolution undermine America's standing in Libya? The answer to that is absolutely yes.

Would this resolution undermine our standing in the region? The answer to that would be absolutely yes.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need for me to continue to stand to debate this. I strongly oppose, and I believe overwhelmingly the Members of this Congress oppose this resolution, and we should vote it down.

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

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Unfortunately, the alarm bells being raised by some proponents of these

measures are demonstrably wrong and misleading.

The national emergencies at issue today rely on IEEPA, the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, which does not provide the President with any domestic statutory powers like testing chemical weapons or seizing radio stations unless the President issues another executive order specifically invoking those emergency powers.

If the President were to do so, which no President has ever done, the National Emergencies Act gives Congress the expedited privileged right to disapprove that power, which we undoubtedly would do.

Furthermore, there is no power to draft Americans into Active Duty. That was terminated in 1978. In contrast, let me remind this body, the legal certainty we are facing is that terminating these emergencies would immediately hand many millions of dollars to terrorists and war criminals and would eliminate an important source of compensation to American victims of terrorism.

Now, I remind my colleagues, with respect to Muammar Qadhafi's continued inclusion, if Muammar Qadhafi was delisted, all of his assets would be bequeathed to his children. While he has been dead for over a decade, as everyone knows, you can't take your money with you when you go, so we are preventing that money from going toward funding terrorism.

□ 1445

While I appreciate this dialogue, it is abundantly clear that the consequences of passing this resolution as well as the others are extensive. Amidst Russia's invasion of Ukraine, the Wagner Group's continued war crimes across the globe, and the ongoing instability in Libya, we must keep this state of emergency and associated sanctions in place.

I again reiterate the point that with regular order, this should be going through the Foreign Affairs Committee.

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

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

Pursuant to the order of the House of July 13, 2023, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GOSAR. 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 pro-

ceedings on this question will be postponed.

RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON MAY 16, 2012

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of July 13, 2023, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 74) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on May 16, 2012, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of July 13, 2023, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 74

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, pursuant to section 202 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622), the national emergency declared by the finding of the President on May 16, 2012, in Executive Order 13611 is hereby terminated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided among and controlled by Representative MCCAUL of Texas, Representative MEEKS of New York, and Representative GOSAR of Arizona, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS), and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution. This Yemen national emergency is the basis for sanctions against Iran-backed Houthis leaders, who have spent the past decade waging a deadly, murderous, and destructive civil war in Yemen.

The extremists sanctioned under this emergency have destabilized the Middle East and threaten the security of tens of thousands of Americans who reside or work in or near Yemen, throughout the Persian Gulf, and our great ally Saudi Arabia. If we overturn this national emergency, those sanctions will automatically and immediately disappear.