

McNulty	Pickett	Talent
Meek (FL)	Ramstad	Thompson (CA)
Miller, George	Rothman	Thompson (MS)
Moran (KS)	Sabo	Visclosky
Oberstar	Schaffer	Waters
Olver	Stenholm	Weller
Pallone	Stupak	
Peterson (MN)	Sweeney	

NOT VOTING—39

Aderholt	English	Norwood
Archer	Fattah	Owens
Barton	Ganske	Rangel
Burton	Gordon	Salmon
Chenoweth	Hoyer	Sandlin
Coburn	Hyde	Slaughter
Cox	Kingston	Tauzin
Crane	Klink	Taylor (MS)
DeGette	Markey	Velazquez
Deutch	Martinez	Whitfield
Dixon	McKinney	Wynn
Edwards	Meeks (NY)	Young (AK)
Engel	Moran (VA)	Young (FL)

□ 1024

Mr. DINGELL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."
So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Today, April 28, I missed the vote on the Journal, the initial vote of the House. Although my pager was charged and turned on, it failed to function and I did not receive the announcement of the vote. My pager has been turned in for repair.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). Will the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THUNE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the tragic shooting at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 105 (adopted April 13, 1989), as amended by Senate Resolution 149 (adopted October 5, 1993), as amended by Public Law 105-275, and further amended by Senate Resolution 75 (adopted March 25, 1999), the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the appointment of the following Senators to serve as members of the Senate National Security Working Group—

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), Majority Administrative Co-chairman;

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), Majority Co-chairman;

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), Majority Co-chairman;

The Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS);

The Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR);

The Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER);

The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE); and

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 101-509, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of Elizabeth Scott of South Dakota to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that he will entertain 1-minute speeches at the end of legislative business.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1569, H. CON. RES. 82, H. J. RES. 44, AND S. CON. RES. 21, MEASURES REGARDING U.S. MILITARY ACTION AGAINST YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 151 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 151

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to debate the deployment of United States Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for one hour equally divided and controlled among the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committees on International Relations and Armed Services.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, it shall be in order without intervention of the question of consideration to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1569) to prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense from being used for the deployment of ground elements of the United States Armed Forces in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia unless that deployment is specifically authorized by law. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. After disposition of H.R. 1569, it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or the question of consideration to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 82) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces from their positions in connection with the present operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for one hour

equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 4. After disposition of H. Con. Res. 82, it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or the question of consideration to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 44) declaring a state of war between the United States and the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. After disposition of H.J. Res. 44, it shall be in order on the same legislative day without intervention of the question of consideration to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) authorizing the President of the United States to conduct military air operations and missile strikes against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), if called up by Representative Gejdenson of Connecticut or his designee. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 6. The provisions of sections 6 and 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1545-46) shall not apply during the remainder of the One Hundred Sixth Congress to a measure introduced pursuant to section 5 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544) with respect to Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Dayton, Ohio (Mr. HALL) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded will be for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 151 provides for the consideration of four separate measures relating to the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces in the Republic of Yugoslavia, each under a closed amendment process with 1 hour of debate. The first measure made in order by the rule is H.R. 1569 which prohibits the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense from being used for the deployment of ground elements of the U.S. Armed Forces in Yugoslavia unless that deployment is authorized by law. Debate time on H.R. 1569 will be controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The next two resolutions made in order by the rule were introduced by my friend from Campbell, California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and reported unfavorably yesterday by the Committee on International Relations. Both resolutions, H. Con. Res. 82 and H.J. Res. 44, have a unique procedural status under the War Powers Resolution of 1973. Without this rule, both Campbell resolutions will become the pending business of the House today as a result of having been reported by the Committee on International Relations. Motions to proceed to consideration of the resolutions would be privileged, and the resolutions would not be subject to general debate but would be subject to an open but clearly unfocused amendment process.

As a result, this rule structures the consideration of these measures in accordance with the War Powers Resolution while providing for a full, fair and focused debate on the broader issues surrounding the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces in Yugoslavia.

Debate time on both of these resolutions will be controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

The fourth resolution, Mr. Speaker, that we make in order with this rule is S.Con.Res. 21, authorizing the President to conduct military air operations and missile strikes against Yugoslavia. This resolution may only be called up by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) or his designee. Debate time on S.Con.Res. 21 will be controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

Prior to consideration of these four measures, the rule provides for 1 hour of debate on measures relating to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, equally divided and controlled among the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Armed Services.

Finally, the rule provides that provisions of sections 6 and 7 of the War Powers Resolution shall not apply during the remainder of the 106th Congress to a measure introduced pursuant to section 5 of the War Powers Resolution with respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when Americans are engaged in armed conflict, the House of Representatives is invariably faced with important and very difficult questions. That is the responsibility handed to us by our Nation's forefathers when they crafted democracy's most enduring and enlightened document, our Constitution. Today is such a day. President Clinton has directed our Armed Forces to join our NATO allies in a battle against the forces of Yugoslavian dictator Slobodan Milosevic. It is a fight to preserve civilized society in a corner of Europe that has been wracked by atrocities, violence and Civil War on a scale un-

seen in Europe since the Second World War.

The United States is not the world's policeman. The American people know too well that we cannot intervene in every civil war. We cannot stop every act of brutality. We cannot keep the peace and protect democracy all on our own. But that is not what is going on today in the Balkans.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a cornerstone of the world's civilized and democratic nations, is engaged in military action in Yugoslavia. When the President, the Commander in Chief, made the decision a month ago that it was in our national interest to lead NATO in this effort, America became a full participant in that undertaking. Our pilots are risking their lives every single day.

Whether or not in hindsight that was the right decision is a question for presidential historians. This really is not about whether we agreed with the President at the time either. Today the overriding question is: What policy best protects and advances our national interests?

Article 2, Section 2 of the Constitution clearly and unequivocally establishes that the President is the Commander in Chief. The deployment and direction of the armed forces is his job. In fact, since my first day of service in this legislative body, it has been my view that the direction of our foreign policy and national security is the President's first and foremost responsibility. Everything else comes after that.

Although I have had some doubts about the President's original policy in Kosovo, I believe that the facts on the ground have overtaken those concerns. Now we must win. We must achieve the goals that the President set out to achieve when he committed our forces to battle. The price of failure is simply too great. American prestige and power, two of the most positive forces of good in the world today, must not be abandoned on the field of battle.

Mr. Speaker, vacillation and hesitancy in the face of this challenge to the leadership of the United States and NATO, a challenge undertaken by a gang of thugs in Belgrade and their brutal underlings in Kosovo will severely undermine our Nation's ability to stand up and defend clear American interests across the globe. If that happens, we lose. The American people lose. Freedom loses.

Mr. Speaker, as the House undertakes this important debate, I will focus on doing what is best for our national interests and for the American service men and women doing their jobs with bravery and commitment. First and foremost I believe that means opposing micromanagement of our foreign and military policy. We know we cannot engage in combat by committee. One of the most serious objections to the conduct of the Kosovo campaign thus far has been the fact that too many people, in particular too

many political leaders, have been involved in this effort. I do not support adding to that problem. The President is constitutionally charged with leading and winning this campaign. He must do it, and we must stand behind him so that he can.

I urge support of this rule which provides for, as I said, a full, fair and very focused debate on the broader issues surrounding the introduction of U.S. armed forces in Yugoslavia.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me the time. As my colleague from California has explained, this rule provides for the consideration of four different measures dealing with U.S. troops in Yugoslavia. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on International Relations and Armed Services. For each measure, this rule provides an additional hour of debate.

Under the rule, none of the measures may be amended on the House floor. Furthermore, the rule prohibits consideration of any other measure with respect to Yugoslavia brought up under the War Powers Act for the remainder of the 106th Congress.

The purpose of considering these four resolutions is to give Congress a role in the decisions affecting U.S. military actions against Yugoslavian President Milosevic and his reign of terror directed against the Albanians in the Yugoslavian province of Kosovo.

The rule was approved by the Committee on Rules late last night on a straight partisan vote with Democrats against it, and I strongly oppose the rule, and I ask for its defeat.

The first measure called up under the rule H.R. 1569 prohibits the use of funds for deploying ground troops in Yugoslavia without additional congressional authorization. This measure raises numerous legal and military questions. In a worst case scenario, this resolution would result in the Federal courts defining what operations are legal in Yugoslavia. The measure was only introduced yesterday, and it had no hearings and no committee consideration. If passed by the Congress, it would certainly face a presidential veto.

The second measure, House Concurrent Resolution 82, calls for the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops in Yugoslavia. On a bipartisan vote of 30 to 19 the Committee on International Relations recommended against passing the bill. The committee report said that this resolution would have severe consequences for U.S. national security and severe repercussions with the North Atlantic Alliance. It stands little chance of passage on the House

floor. Enactment of this measure would undermine the President, our military forces and destroy any hope that our air campaign against the Serbs would have a positive outcome.

The third measure, H.J. Resolution 44, declares war against Yugoslavia. The Committee on International Relations unanimously recommended against this resolution. The legislation is intended to clear up the legal question of whether or not the U.S. is at war. Unfortunately, this resolution does more harm than good at this point. In fact, the report of the Committee on International Relations warned it could actually strengthen Milosevic politically. This measure also does not stand any chance of surviving a presidential veto.

Lastly, the rule makes in order S. Con. Resolution 21 authorizing the President to conduct military air operations and missile strikes against Yugoslavia. This bill passed the Senate with bipartisan backing.

Considering a declaration of war is one of the most solemn duties of Congress under this Constitution. Only 11 times before in our Nation's history has Congress ever formally declared war. This rule mocks the dignity of that responsibility. What we have here is a grab bag of conflicting, contradicting and confusing resolutions about the war in Yugoslavia which stand little chance of enactment, and proceeding in this fashion is an embarrassment to the United States, to our President, to the men and women in our Armed Forces and to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, what would it say if none of these resolutions pass, or some of them pass, or if they all pass but are vetoed? The only signal that can possibly result from this rule is that our Nation is confused and hesitant. That certainly is not the message we want to send to our NATO allies, nor is it the signal we want to send to our troops.

□ 1045

It is not the signal we want to send to the American people. Indeed, Congress does have a role in going to war, but finding that role at the end of the 10th century in an era of modern warfare is difficult, and this rule does not find it.

Under the War Powers Act, both H. Con. Resolution 82 and H.J. Resolution 44 would be amendable on the House floor, but this rule prohibits amendments to all four resolutions.

Furthermore, the rule prohibits any further resolutions about Yugoslavia to be brought up in the 106th Congress under the expedited procedures of the War Powers Act. This is a terribly restrictive clause, that nullifies a key part of the War Powers Act. It reduces the ability of each House Member to participate in the decisions about this war.

At a hearing before the Committee on Rules yesterday, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the

author of two of these resolutions before us today, urged the committee to remove this provision. The expedited procedures are everything, the gentleman said.

I appreciate the Republican Committee on Rules majority granting a full five hours of debate time to these measures. Still, the cause of democracy is not served by this restrictive rule. Under the War Powers Act, the House is required to consider H. Con. Resolution 82 and H.J. Resolution 44, so I have no issue with their consideration under the House rules. However, bundling these four measures together makes the House look weak and indecisive.

I agree with the backers of these bills that Congress should not, cannot, be left out of the loop on vital decisions of war, but this rule is a clumsy, ineffective way to participate. The only way to get our voice heard is through careful, deliberate and bipartisan measures.

The American people are hurting for leadership from Congress. They want us to work together. Painful experience with controversial issues in the recent past should have taught the House that bipartisanship is the only way to reach the American people.

This rule will not increase the role of Congress in the decision to make war. It will only further undermine our ability to be taken seriously. I urge the defeat of this rule.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from Newport News, Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN), one of the great champions of our Nation's national security.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this is certainly I suspect the most sorrowful day in my now 17 years in this body. It is a solemn day.

We are here because of the circumstances of what I think has been a very, very poor implementation of a national security policy, founded on good intentions, but run amuck in the execution and the failure to appreciate all of the consequences that would ensue from the way we sought the objectives, all of which we would endorse, but we are indeed here.

I am speaking in debate time on the rule; not so much in objection to its technical terms, but for the fact that it does not leave an alternative that I feel is logical and supportable given the incredible mess in which we find ourselves. But the one thing we cannot deny is the fact that we are in the mess.

I have urged for weeks that the president, our Commander in Chief, come to the Congress and lay out in whatever terms he chose in support of a resolution framed by the White House, to ask for the authorization of the actions and of the objectives that he was pursuing, with great intention and expectation

on my part that I would have voted for them.

He has not chosen to do that. Yet I think very clearly it is incumbent upon the Congress as part of its obligation to the people who wear our uniform in the military that we let them know that the Congress has authorized what they are doing or what they may be asked to do and that we state the objectives pursuant to which they do it. None of the resolutions before us today do that.

I cannot possibly vote for either of the Campbell resolutions. I cannot vote for an alternative that says it is all right to continue, bomb, bomb, bomb, without restriction or reservation, but, my goodness gracious, we cannot possibly contemplate the use of ground forces, even though I think that is a bad idea. But it is an even worse idea, when no one is proposing to do it anyway, to announce to your potential enemy, your real enemy, you are not going to do it.

The reverse of that is what we do basically in the Senate joint resolution passed, you may recall, the day before the bombing began. It did not seem to me to be a good idea then. I do not think it has improved since.

There are things we need to say and we need to do. I think this rule ought to make in order something that, when in effect, enunciates on behalf of the Congress the kind of policies incorporated in the statement of the gentleman who chairs the Committee on Rules, which was a very eloquent statement of why we are involved, what the stakes are, and what we as a Nation ought to be doing together to see that our objectives prevail. I wish the rule and debate was going to make that possible.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), a very important member of the Committee on Rules and Chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, this is a fatally flawed rule which should be defeated for a variety of reasons, and I want to touch on those as briefly as possible.

First, it denies the opportunity for any Member of this House during the next 18 months to bring up anything else under the War Powers Act, no matter what happens. We tried to eliminate that in the Committee on Rules, but the majority insisted on that provision.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I simply would like to say to my friend that it does not prevent a Member from having an opportunity to offer a resolution. It simply moves under standard

procedures without going through the expedited process.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, as the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) said yesterday, giving the preferred position, the status of a privileged resolution to go to the floor, is everything, so you have denied everything by precluding this to come as privileged resolution for the next 18 months.

Secondly, only 5 hours of debate time were permitted. When we did the Persian Gulf resolution, we debated that virtually all night, as you remember.

Third, and most importantly, this rule puts in a preferred position the Goodling resolution, which is enormously and dangerously flawed.

I want to read from the Goodling resolution: "None of the funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the deployment of ground elements of the United States Armed Forces in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia unless such deployment is specifically authorized by law enacted after the enactment of this act." Then it talks about a limited exception to rescue our personnel.

I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) in the committee a series of questions. I first asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), does this preclude the use of Apache helicopters to go in and destroy tanks, with the Apaches being operated by our Army? The gentleman first said yes, it precludes it, and then he changed his mind and said no, it does not preclude it.

Then I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) another question. I said, for sake of argument, let us say we have Special Forces in Kosovo right now acting as forward observers to direct our bombing attacks and who are also working with the refugees trying to rescue refugees. Would this require the immediate removal of our Special Forces in Kosovo if they are there for those purposes? The gentleman's answer was yes.

Then I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), how could this be? How could we have these conflicting provisions? He then said in the Committee on Rules, well, he did not draft this. I said, this has your name on it. He said yes, but I did not draft it, and I cannot fully explain it.

I find this to be a very unfortunate situation. We have a resolution that was drafted by some members of the other party, handed to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), which he cannot fully defend, which will create a situation where our commander on the ground, General Clark, will have to think, do I have to go to a Federal Court, do I have to seek a ruling from a Federal judge, before I make any decision in the next few days?

This will hamstring our troops in the field and hamstring our President. This rule sets up in a preferred position a resolution that should not be passed by

this House, and this rule should be rejected.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Surfside Beach, Texas (Mr. PAUL).

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly to oppose the rule, and I do this hesitantly, because it is difficult to write fair rules and I generally support the rules. But today I have to oppose this rule, mainly because we are going to be debating war, a declaration of war, and a full hour is not adequate to debate an issue of that magnitude. I know there was an attempt to provide for a lot of debate today, but, for instance, on the one issue of declaration of war, only one hour was given; that is just not enough.

The other reason is that it does preclude a House Resolution coming up again under an expedited procedure. This is not right. This is undermining the whole purpose of the War Power Resolution of 1973, and we should not be doing this.

This is taking more authority away from the Congress and giving more authority to the President and to the administration and for us not to have a say. The whole issue of war should be decided here in this Congress, and we are here today because we have been negligent on assuming our responsibilities.

I saw this coming, and on February 9 of this year, I introduced a bill that would have prevented this whole problem by making certain that our President could not spend one penny on waging war in Kosovo. That is what we should have done. We have not, and now we are in this mess.

But we do not need to be once again taking more responsibility from the Congress and giving it to the President. We have a policy problem, we do not have a resolution problem. We have a foreign policy that endorses intervention any time, anyplace, assuming that our Presidents know when to insert troops around the world. That is our basic problem. Until we in the Congress take it upon ourselves to assume our responsibility with the issue of war, this problem will continue.

So I applaud the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for bringing these resolutions to the floor, but, unfortunately, I cannot support this rule today as written.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), a very distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, some of us stood in this chamber 8 years ago when President Bush called on the Congress to support his military plans in the Persian Gulf. I was one of those Democrats who strongly supported the President at that time. But I recall,

Mr. Speaker, that we were given 16 hours of debate, 16 hours of debate, on one single resolution. Every Member of this body had full opportunity to speak his mind. We now have four conflicting, contradictory, mutually exclusive resolutions, with each of them given one hour of debate.

With all due respect, I think this is an outrage. This will be one of the most significant issues this Congress will debate in this session or for many sessions to come, and I strongly call on my colleagues to defeat this rule. This is a rule which is giving us 30 minutes on each side to decide on war or peace, which is an absurdity, and it is not worthy of this body.

This past weekend, Mr. Speaker, my distinguished Republican colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BE-REUTER) and I represented this body at the NATO summit.

□ 1100

Nineteen countries devoted 2 full days to discussing the plans for the future. It is unconscionable that the Congress of the United States should be denied the opportunity to seriously discuss issues of war and peace. The President has just asked for the call-up of some 33,000 reservists. We have a major military engagement, and this body and the country are entitled to a full airing of all of the issues involved in this.

I trust that my colleagues will see fit to turn down this rule. It is poorly crafted. It is a gag rule. It allows not a single amendment, and it gives over 200 Republicans and over 200 Democrats 30 minutes to discuss each of these issues. This is simply unacceptable, and I earnestly call on the majority to rethink this restrictive, un-American rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Knoxville, Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule because it is a fair rule and it allows all views to be heard and will allow far more than 30 minutes that the previous speaker mentioned. We will be debating this for many hours to come today, and on into tonight.

However, I rise in strong opposition to this war in the Balkans. First of all, as our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has pointed out, it is an unconstitutional war because Congress has not and, I assume, will not declare war against Yugoslavia. Secondly, we have made the situation in Kosovo many times worse by our bombings and we cannot hide behind NATO because NATO would never have gone in there if the U.S. had not wanted it done. Ninety percent of the bombings have been paid for and done by the U.S. In fact, if the President is going to send in ground troops, as many people think, let the European members of NATO send them in. We have carried almost the entire financial and air war burden thus far and we

should not have to carry the ground war burden too.

If we get further into this mess by sending in ground troops, there are estimates that ultimately we will spend \$40 billion to \$50 billion in air and ground war costs and resettlement and reconstruction costs, money that will have to come from Social Security and many other valuable programs.

Pat Holt, a foreign affairs expert writing in the *Christian Science Monitor* wrote a few days ago, "The first few days of bombing have led to more atrocities and to more refugees. It will be increasing the instability which the bombing was supposed to prevent."

Richard Cohen, the very liberal columnist for *The Washington Post* wrote, "I believe, though, that the NATO bombings have escalated and accelerated the process. For some Kosovars, NATO has made things worse."

Philip Gourevitch, writing in the April 12 *New Yorker Magazine* said, "Yet so far the air war against Yugoslavia has accomplished exactly what the American-led alliance flew into combat to prevent: Our bombs unified the Serbs in Yugoslavia, as never before, behind the defiance of Milosevic; they spurred to a frenzy the 'cleansing' of Kosovo's ethnic Albanians by Milosevic's forces", and on and on.

A.M. Rosenthal writing in *The New York Times* a few days ago asked this question: "Would we again bomb, bomb, bomb the capital of the Serbs, who thought of themselves as far more our friends than his," meaning Milosevic. "So far this has produced three major results: humiliating Serbs forever, turning friendship into enmity, and persuading many to rally around a man they detest and fear."

All we have done, Mr. Speaker, is turn friends into enemies and waste billions and billions of dollars. We have gone into an area where there is absolutely no threat to our national security and no vital U.S. interest, and we should negotiate a settlement and get out of there as soon as we possibly can.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the former chairman and now ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to object to the part of the rule that turns off the action-forcing elements of the War Powers Act.

Today, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) is using the War Powers Act to force the House to debate and vote on two resolutions. The first is the concurrent resolution to withdraw the troops from Yugoslavia, and the second is a joint resolution to declare war on Yugoslavia.

But after today, Mr. Speaker, no other Member will have that right. If this rule is adopted, no matter whatever else may happen in Yugoslavia, no matter how much the situation there may change, no other Member will be able to bring this issue for a vote.

In the Committee on Rules last night, the gentleman from California

(Mr. CAMPBELL) himself complained about this rule and he said, and I agreed, that "the War Powers Act is there so that any Member of the House can request the House to take action against the war."

Mr. Speaker, this resolution prevents the average Member from exercising their war powers rights for the remainder of this Congress. This Congress has just started. The war has just started. A great deal may happen over the next 20 months, and nothing, nothing should be taken off the table.

My colleagues might compare this to the rule in 1991 on Somalia. On that rule, the House turned off the War Powers Act only with respect to concurrent resolutions of withdrawal and only for a period of 2 weeks. We turned it off for only a period of 2 weeks. That rule retained Members' ability to introduce privileged resolutions declaring war, and it also reinstated the war powers for the second session of that Congress which was scheduled to start in 2 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, there is no comparison. We did it for 2 weeks, for a limited number of resolutions. My Republican colleagues today are doing it for 20 months, 20 months, for all resolutions. This is a very dangerous situation, to tie Congress's hands in the matter of war, and I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Dallas (Mr. SESSIONS), a very able member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule today, and I want to extend my appreciation to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for his forthright and honest War Powers Resolution Act that he is bringing up.

The purpose of the War Powers Resolution is to ensure that the collective judgment of both the Congress and the President will apply to the introduction of United States armed forces into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in the hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, and to the continued use of such forces and hostilities or in such circumstances.

What we are talking about today is a rule that would allow us the opportunity to bring forth the debate and the discussion about foreign policy and the use of troops in a foreign country. Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about is the use of ground forces that would be engaged in war, the debate about the probability and possibility that U.S. lives would be lost overseas. We intend to utilize this time to discuss not only our foreign policy, but what we intend to engage in and be involved in overseas.

I am opposed to us being in Kosovo. I am opposed to the war being escalated and us not seeking a peaceful resolution. This is why a debate is so important. Obviously, the other side does not

want to have this debate. Obviously, the President feels like that he does not even need to fall within the confines of this law. The bottom line is that what we are discussing is that which democracy brings about, which the laws of this country have brought about, and I believe that it is important for us to do this.

Previous Presidents have submitted 72 prior reports on the War Powers Resolution. President Ford, 4; President Carter, 1; President Reagan, 14; President Bush, 7; and President Clinton, 46 times has asked for these types of powers. It is time that we openly engage in the debate.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, among the duties of a Member of Congress, there is nothing more serious than the issues of war and peace; committing the wealth and the might of our Nation, putting the members of our armed forces in harm's way. Before we went to war with Iraq, we debated around the clock. Every Member of this body who so wished was allowed to come to the floor and debate and discuss the issues of conscience and war and peace.

Today promises a pathetic, pale and perverted version of that grand debate. Four contradictory resolutions, 1 hour each. Vote on a declaration of war, 13 seconds per Member of Congress, if it is equally apportioned. Vote on immediate withdrawal, 13 seconds per Member.

Is the press of business on this body so heavy that we cannot allocate more time, or are the leaders on the other side afraid of a full and fair debate? Yesterday, the House adjourned at 4:30 in the afternoon. Tonight, after exhausting ourselves in this debate, we will leave at 7 p.m. What is more important to the other side, fund-raisers, or issues of war and peace fully and fairly debated?

Fair debate? No amendments will be allowed from the floor of the House of Representatives. And, we are only having this debate today because of the War Powers Act and its expedited procedures. They have to have a debate, although they are trying to pervert it in different ways, but after today, no further votes will be allowed.

This is an outrageous abdication of our duties as Members of Congress. Vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Atlanta, Georgia (Mr. LINDER), my very good friend and a very able and hard-working member of the Committee on Rules and chairman of the Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, this is the right time to have this debate. I too wish it would be longer, but this body needs to be heard on this issue.

I served in the Air Force during the Vietnam War. At that point we had one

nation trying to overtake another nation, and this country thought it was worth the effort to stop it. After 10 years and 58,000 American lives, this body stopped the Vietnam War on a rider on an appropriation bill.

We now have a dispute in the Balkans, and it is not one nation against another. There are two bad actors in this. Last year, 2,000 people died in this area. Not nearly as many deaths as those that died in Sierra Leone in January of this year alone, but of the 2,000 that died, nearly a third were Serbs and two-thirds were Kosovars.

There are two bad actors in this war. I do not know why we are there. If we are there, why are we not in the Sierra Leone or the Sudan where in 10 years, 2 million people were exterminated in ethnic cleansing? I do not understand our end game, if there is one, and I do not know what victory is. But this body ought to say no. This body ought to say enough of the adventurism. We are the only institution that can declare war, and this administration has admitted that it is at war. This body ought to be heard.

I think the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) is doing exactly the right thing to raise precisely the right issue, and I hope that this body will pass this rule. I too hope that we will strike section 6; I supported the gentleman from Massachusetts last night in his effort to do so. I think that is a mistake. But after we strike that, I hope we will pass this rule and be heard on this issue. It is exactly the right thing to do.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY).

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I only have a minute, so let me get right to the point. I oppose this closed rule, I oppose the declaration of war and the use of U.S. ground forces, and I oppose the motion to withdraw from our efforts to liberate Kosovo.

Mr. Speaker, when one says what one is against, one ought to stand up and say what one is for. I support the current air campaign, which is already weakening Milosevic's military capability, and I support arming the KLA so that we have a ground operation composed of individuals who actually know the terrain.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this closed rule, oppose both Campbell resolutions, and support the continuation of the air campaign, coupled with the creation of a more effective KLA ground force.

□ 1115

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed by the tragedy taking place in Yugoslavia. I urgently call on all parties to this conflict, including the United Nations and the Russians,

to seek a negotiated settlement to this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I do not relish breaking with my President, particularly when matters of war and peace are being debated. But in my opinion on this issue, this administration is headed in the wrong direction.

The Clinton administration would have us believe that there are only two alternatives in this crisis, either do nothing or bomb. That premise is false. In following it, President Clinton has taken us on the slippery slope towards war.

Our bombing started in Kosovo and has now thoroughly saturated Serbia and Kosovo. It triggered a dramatic increase in the refugee crisis and violence against the Kosovar Albanians. We have killed many innocent civilians, both Serb and Albanian. In addition, the Yugoslav democracy movement has been a casualty, as has been the peaceful Albanian Kosovar resistance to Milosevic's tribal fanaticism.

Another unfortunate casualty in this episode has been U.S. respect for international law. The administration sidestepped the United Nations and flouted international law.

Mr. Speaker, my gut check on this issue is personal. I am a mother. The question I have asked myself is am I willing to sacrifice the life of my son to follow this administration's policies in Kosovo. It is very clear that the administration has backed itself into a corner, and now wants to take all of us there with it.

As for the Rambouillet agreement, I do not hear the administration even mentioning it anymore. For a peace agreement worth bombing for, it has had an amazingly short shelf life. So from Rambouillet implementation to Milosevic's removal to the return of the Kosovars to Kosovo, the goalposts keep shifting. How can we know if we have won if we do not know what we are fighting for?

The objective first touted was autonomy for the Kosovars, and now we find ourselves allied with the KLA. So while our rhetoric remains the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia, our actions promote a secessionist movement along ethnic lines in the heart of Europe.

Smart bombs are only smart when they back up smart policy. This is the wrong policy for too many reasons.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, limiting debate and blocking all amendments on this question of life and death is all too typical of this House Republican leadership. They would convert the War Powers Act to the "In War, Powerless Act." Through its previous inaction, this House has largely abrogated its responsibility to approve this Nation's involvement in foreign conflicts. Today's action will only prolong that irresponsibility.

As a few of us indicated in letters to the President in August and in October

of last year, and again on February 19 of this year, authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), there should have been no military action in the Balkans, not bombing, not troops, not any military action until this Congress had given it approval.

The Constitution prescribes that no president should commit the lives of our youth and the billions of our taxpayers' dollars in nonemergency situations like this without involvement of the American people, through their representatives in this House.

While NATO raids Belgrade, the same Republican leadership proposes to raid the United States' Treasury. They are determined to divert billions of dollars to purposes that have little or nothing to do with Kosovo. They are using Kosovo as an excuse to subvert the budget limits or caps that helped bring us a balanced budget, and which only months ago they swore to uphold.

Yet now that this conflict is underway, it would be folly not to consider the facts on the ground. Milosevic is a war criminal, who is committing genocide. No doubt he and his thugs are watching these proceedings as they unfold today in Washington. We ought not to send the wrong message to him or to the other petty tyrants from Iraq to North Korea who may be watching these proceedings.

What is wrong, further, with this rule, however, is that it denies us the opportunity to invoke the War Powers Act in the future, as we may well need to do. This rule is outrageous. It ought to be rejected firmly.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the war powers resolution. It provides for congressional action in committing and maintaining our men and women in harm's way. I oppose this rule because it compromises the ability of Congress to exercise its responsibility under the war powers resolution.

I believe it is appropriate for this body to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 21. It supports the President's decision to join NATO in air strikes. I will support that resolution, considering the atrocities being committed by Mr. Milosevic.

For many reasons, I have serious concerns about ground troops. If the President believes it is necessary to use ground troops, I believe he must come to Congress in compliance with the war powers resolution. H.R. 1569 by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) goes well beyond the war powers resolution. It compromises the safety of our military operation. I will oppose H.R. 1569.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, if this rule passes and permits the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, then Congress will have, in effect, declared war and permitted both bombing and ground troops, all in one.

Let me explain how. The Senate passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, which authorizes bombing. In Delums versus Bush, the court case against the Iraq war, Judge Green wrote in his opinion that Congress has the sole power to authorize the use of U.S. forces overseas, where the lives of our men and women would be put in danger.

The President, at the very least, in order to be in accordance with the Constitution, needs a resolution passed by both Houses that authorizes him to use force. He does not need a declaration of war to proceed with the war.

Therefore, if the House joins the Senate in Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, it meets the constitutional test of both Houses, and the President is authorized to send ground troops and to prosecute the war.

Some say we must win the war. I believe we must win the peace. Some people believe that only military action can bring about peace. I believe that only diplomatic initiatives and constant negotiations can bring about peace. Some believe we need to teach the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia a lesson by bombing their Nation to rubble. I believe that violence is not redemptive but it breeds more violence, and places the hope of resolution far beyond the horizon of peace.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule for four reasons.

First of all, it limits the debate to 30 minutes on each side on something as momentous as this. Contrast that with the Persian Gulf debate. We debated all day, late into the night, all of the next day before we finally came to a vote.

Secondly, it makes in order four measures. One, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) is a flawed product. It needs to be amended and changed considerably. It has already been amended since it was reported. It will be unamendable when it comes to the floor.

What is missing among these four is something truly bipartisan. When we had the Persian Gulf debate we had a bipartisan resolution, Michels-Solarz-McCurdy. I joined and voted for it. But we do not have an option like this, or even the opportunity for crafting one here.

Finally, it crowns these four choices, four bad choices, three bad choices, with an exceptional, unprecedented declaration overriding statutory law and saying if there are any more measures like this to come up this year, they will not be entitled to the expe-

ditioned procedure that the War Powers Act, a black letter law, provides them.

This is no way to deal with something as important as war. This rule should be voted down.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want us to debate in this House the nuances of this campaign in a very serious manner. I also want to be able to say, in response to the question that is put often by the mothers and fathers of American forces, that we in Congress gave our best and most deliberative consideration.

The proposed rule has removed the right of all Members to introduce resolutions pursuant to the war powers resolution and thus gain expedited procedures to ensure a floor vote on such an authorization.

Without resort to the war powers expedited procedures denied for the remainder of the 106th Congress by this rule, the decision on whether to move forward with an authorization vote will lay entirely and solely with the Republican leadership. That is unwarranted and unfair.

This rule and the underlying bill send an overwhelmingly negative message to our troops and to our allies. I think we deserve better.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a very distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I note with regret that the President, who once pledged to the world that no American ground troops would be deployed, now refuses to pledge to seek congressional approval before such a massive deployment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule because the last paragraph of it nullifies the War Powers Act until the end of this century, and the War Powers Act is a tool we may need to influence policy.

There are those who argue against any congressional involvement in the grave decision that lies ahead. They say that our enemies will tremble in fear if one man, without congressional approval, can deploy 100,000 American soldiers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I tremble in fear and the Founders of this Republic would tremble in fear if they thought that one man, without congressional approval, could send 100,000 of our men and women into battle.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, in 1968 to 1970 I was a physician in the Vietnam War and dealt with the casualties from that war. That war was started on this floor by a voice vote.

If we think about the fact that we committed 500,000 people, 50,000 of whom are dead and on a memorial not very far from this building, on the basis of a voice vote, it seems to me that the United States Congress can spend more than 1 hour deciding whether or not we are going to go into this issue.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had a debate for a few minutes and got out of here at 4 o'clock. Last week we came back here. One day we gave a gold medal to Rosa Parks. That is all we did that day. What have we got on our calendar that prevents us from spending the time to give the Members of this House the opportunity to speak about something, where we are potentially sending our young men and women to die?

I think this rule should be defeated.

□ 1130

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the acting chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding this time to me. I was asked to speak on the strategy of why these issues have come forward. I have told the acting chairman of the Committee on Rules that if I spoke I would speak on the rule as well, so it is with his permission that I say I object strongly to section 6. I went to the Committee on Rules last night and said that we should not cut off the opportunity of other Members to make use of the War Powers Resolution.

I am an average Member of the Congress. I am not a senior Member, I am not in any leadership position, I am not a chairman, yet I have the rights simply granted me under the War Powers Resolution, which are remarkably important. I do not know of any other statute that provides that right. It is a right that a Member of Congress can come to the floor and require other Members of Congress to vote on the record, up or down, when the question is war. That is what we will be doing today, whether under this rule or otherwise.

The purpose is to fulfill the constitutional obligation. Are we at war? Yes, we are at war. There are only the worst possible arguments to say that we are not at war. We have a President who has designated combat pay for our soldiers. We have the Secretary of Defense who has said we are in hostilities. We have the Secretary of State who has said we are in conflict and her designee who said we are in armed conflict. We have the Deputy Secretary of State who has said that Serbia would be within its rights to consider a bombing of Kosovo to be an act of war. We have all the reasons common sense gives to suggest that this is indeed war.

Secondly, we are on the verge of ground troops. I do not think anybody today should be mistaken about that.

In our Committee on International Relations I asked the Secretary of State whether she thought that the approval of Congress was needed to prosecute the war, and she said no, she did not think so. And the ranking member of the Democrats in the Committee on International Relations yesterday stated that that even included ground troops.

Let me emphasize that. It was the position of the ranking member of the Democratic Party in the Committee on International Relations that even for ground troops there was no need for Congress to give authority.

Well, I am sorry, that is contrary to the Constitution. The Framers were quite clear that war was too important to be commenced by the action of one single individual. Those are the words of Alexander Hamilton and also of representatives at the Constitutional Convention.

Are ground troops imminent? All one can do is look at the newspapers from this weekend and see the headlines that were prepared. In particular I refer to the Washington Post: "Clinton Joins Allies on Ground Troops", and the Wall Street Journal: "Clinton Edges Closer to Backing the Use of Ground Troops". The quotations from the articles under those headlines, which I will be distributing to my colleagues on the floor or make available, are quite clear that ground troops are very seriously being considered.

If ground troops are introduced and Congress has not acted, we all know what will happen. The argument will be, how can we do anything that might possibly undercut American troops while they are on the ground in operation? So the moment is now. The moment was earlier, actually, before the bombing started, but no one can be surprised if the ground war starts.

So those are the two premises. Number one, we are at war; and, number two, it is distinctly possible that the bombing will move into ground war. And, therefore, we must vote. My own view is that we should vote to withdraw the troops. My own view could be in error. I understand people of good will feel differently, but my view is that this is a civil war, and that if our purpose is to help the Albanian Kosovars, we have not succeeded. Milosevic has done the harm. He is the tyrant, he is the one at fault, but it is a fact that the Albanian Kosovars are worse off after our bombing has commenced than they were before. That is simply a fact. I wish it were not so.

And if ground troops go in, and they must, even if Milosevic signs the Rambouillet Agreement this afternoon, what Albanian Kosovar will go back into Kosovo without the protection of ground troops? Thus, ground troops are the option, slugging their way through Kosovo, either because the Serbian army is resisting or taking up positions in Kosovo because the Rambouillet Agreement still requires that placement of ground troops.

And as to those options, I put to all of my colleagues that we have the question of lives and the question of money. Lives will be saved if we do not commence a ground war. I am speaking of NATO lives, American lives, Serbian lives and Kosovar lives.

And, lastly, regarding money, we are bombing bridges that we will be asked to rebuild tomorrow. Please mark my words. My colleagues know that. We all know we are going to be asked to appropriate taxpayers' money to rebuild the very buildings that today we destroy. We can, for the same amount of money or less, help the Albanian refugees right now immensely better where they are, in Albania and Macedonia.

As for Milosevic, he should be denounced to the International War Crimes Tribunal. If he leaves his country, he will be subject to arrest, as has happened to Augusto Pinochet as he has tried to go around the world. And the time will come when there will be a change in government in Yugoslavia. But by putting in ground troops to force that change, it will cost innocent lives, and it will cost more economically than helping the Albanian refugees where they are now.

So the options today are to declare war, which is what it is, to be honest under our Constitution, and thereby empower the President to carry on war, which is our constitutional right. After we declare war, then the President can conduct it. That is his constitutional right.

I am very wary of the Congress telling the President, well, it is war, but now we want to overview every step of the war. No—if it is war, we declare it and then the President conducts it. But if it is something the American people do not wish to become engaged in, this is the moment to say no, this is the moment to remove the troops, and this is the moment to help the Albanian Kosovars where they are. Mr. Speaker, the choices are obvious.

I want to conclude by offering my thanks to the Speaker of the House particularly for his graciousness and consideration, and to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), for the same and allowing these two resolutions to come forward.

Shall we be at war? Then vote to declare war. That is what the Constitution says. If we say no, then vote to withdraw troops, bring them home, and start the humanitarian assistance for those refugees where they are. I suggest the second is the better option.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just advise my colleagues that I am

going to close on this myself, and I will do so informing the House that I intend to offer an amendment to the rule which will strike section 6 in the rule itself.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FROST. Since we are amending the rule on the floor, would the gentleman also consider amending the rule to extend general debate time?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that I do not intend to offer an amendment to do that. With this hour we have a total of 6 hours that have been included for the debate.

We all know this is a very important, a very serious, a very grave issue, and I think 6 hours of debate is an appropriate amount of time for this. So it is my intention, following the concern that was raised by my friend from Dallas and many others, to offer an amendment to the rule which will strike section 6.

Mr. FROST. If the gentleman will continue to yield just briefly, those of us on this side raised several concerns, not just about section 6 but also about the debate time. I think it is unfortunate that the gentleman would not agree to amend the rule to also extend the debate time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for accepting the fact that I am going to offer an amendment to strike section 6.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, let me state at the outset that I appreciate the chairman of the committee for announcing his amendment to strike section 6. I thought that was among the worst things about this rule. After the eloquent statement by the other gentleman from California, which I do not agree with at this point in time, to say to the House and to the country that the House will have one opportunity and one opportunity only to address the War Powers Act and only one Member will get that opportunity, I think would have set a very bad precedent.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify again that that is not what section 6 said. What would happen, if section 6 were to have been included, it would have meant that it would have gone through the leadership structure and the only change that would have been made is we would not have proceeded with the expedited process. So it would have not have been a one-time-only thing.

Mr. BENTSEN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, again, I commend the gentleman for agreeing to make that change. Perhaps that sets a precedent for more fair rules going forward in the remainder of the 106th Congress.

I think it is also a mistake that we are spending such little time to debate this issue. This is a very critical issue for the Nation, and I am afraid that this underscores the way this House is going to operate on issues that should be addressed in a bipartisan manner. I would encourage my colleagues to oppose this rule even as amended.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to this rule, which will govern our debate over the situation in Kosovo today.

Under the terms of this rule, we will be debating four measures, each for only one hour. This means that each side will only receive but 30 minutes to make known their concerns, just slightly more than is allowed for a bill on the suspension calendar. These measures are of precious importance to our troops, and to our national security, and we should have ample time to debate them.

Furthermore, the timing for the debate on these bills is poor. Like many other conflicts, the factual circumstances are fluid, and require our flexibility if we are to be effective. We should not be pigeonholing our position and threatening the safety of our troops.

Neither NATO nor the United States believes that a state of war exists in the current conflict in the Balkan region. The President has not requested that Congress issue a declaration of war. I believe that a declaration of war would be entirely counterproductive as a matter of policy and is unnecessary as a matter of law. Yet we stand to debate this measure today.

On only five occasions in the United States history and never since the end of World War II has the Congress declared war, reflecting the extraordinary nature of, and implications attendant on, such a declaration. Yet it seems Congress is willing to do that today. While we are not at war with either the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or its people, Slobodan Milosevic should not doubt the determination of NATO to see the stability of Europe reasserted. Yet, with this debate today, we show Milosevic weakness. With resolve NATO can attain a durable peace that prevents further repression and provides for democratic self-government for the Kosovar people. Yet, with our votes today, we send mixed signals to our trusted allies.

As it stands, I must question the genuineness of at least three of the measures we will be debating today. That is especially true because we will see Committee leadership bringing a resolution to the floor that they will be voting against. Those at home watching this debate on television will undoubtedly see through this charade, and know that what transpires here today will be less about the importance of our mission in Kosovo, less about ending human suffering, and more about partisan politics and taking shots at the White House.

What we should be debating here today, and acknowledging, is the suffering that is taking place in the Balkans. We should be doing something to help the refugees who have been cast out of their homes, and their home-

land, by a tyrant. We should be debating how we can bring stability to this region, and appropriating funds to help thousands of innocent children eat. We should be passing resolutions of support for our brave troops.

Instead we stand here today, using the floor of the House of Representatives, to play tired, partisan politics. I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule, and to bring to the floor meaningful debate that can help save lives in Kosovo.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and would simply say that there is nothing more powerful than when this body speaks with one voice, and the only way to get our voice heard is, I think, through careful, deliberate and bipartisan measures.

I believe that the American people want us to work together. They believe, I think, that we are hurting for leadership here in the Congress, particularly on issues like this. It is not that the issues that we are debating are not important. They are important, each and every one of them, and the vote we will take on them, but the way we are packaging this makes it look like we are frivolous.

This rule will not increase the role of Congress in the decisions to make war, it will only further undermine our ability to be taken seriously. The rule, in my opinion, is not the way to go.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I rise in strong support of this rule.

I am going to move that we strike section 6, but before I do that, let me make a couple of comments about this rule and the procedure around which it was considered.

For starters, we had a request that came from the minority that we extend by an hour the debate. We agreed to that. We are allowing the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), under this rule, to call up or not call up a freestanding bill, which I believe, if it is not unprecedented, it certainly is unusual. We have also agreed to the requests that have been made by Members on both sides of the aisle to address this section 6 question.

I should say that the section 6 which was included in the bill was not an idea of Republicans. As has been pointed out by some, in 1993 when the resolution on Somalia was considered, it was a proposal that the majority, the Democratic majority at that time, offered. We were simply following along the line with that. But from discussions that have been held, we are going to move to strike section 6.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DREIER: Strike Section 6.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I know we are rapidly approaching a vote. I think we have very clearly explained it.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment I just offered and the resolution itself.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 210, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—213

Armey	Fowler	McCrery
Bachus	Franks (NJ)	McHugh
Baker	Frelinghuysen	McInnis
Ballenger	Galleghy	McIntosh
Barrett (NE)	Ganske	McKeon
Bartlett	Gekas	Metcalfe
Barton	Gibbons	Mica
Bass	Gilchrest	Miller (FL)
Bateman	Gillmor	Miller, Gary
Bereuter	Gilman	Moran (KS)
Biggert	Goodlatte	Morella
Bilbray	Goodling	Myrick
Billirakis	Goss	Nethercutt
Bliley	Graham	Ney
Blunt	Granger	Northup
Boehler	Green (WI)	Nussle
Boehner	Greenwood	Ose
Bonilla	Gutknecht	Oxley
Bono	Hansen	Packard
Brady (TX)	Hastert	Paul
Bryant	Hastings (WA)	Pease
Burr	Hayes	Peterson (PA)
Burton	Hayworth	Petri
Buyer	Hefley	Pickering
Calvert	Herger	Pitts
Camp	Hill (MT)	Pombo
Campbell	Hilleary	Porter
Canady	Hobson	Portman
Cannon	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)
Castle	Horn	Quinn
Chabot	Hostettler	Radanovich
Chambliss	Houghton	Ramstad
Chenoweth	Hulshof	Regula
Coble	Hunter	Reynolds
Collins	Hutchinson	Riley
Combust	Hyde	Rogan
Cook	Isakson	Rogers
Cox	Istook	Rohrabacher
Crane	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Cubin	Johnson (CT)	Roukema
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Davis (VA)	Jones (NC)	Ryan (WI)
Deal	Kasich	Ryun (KS)
DeLay	Kelly	Salmon
DeMint	King (NY)	Sanford
Diaz-Balart	Kingston	Saxton
Dickey	Knollenberg	Scarborough
Doolittle	Kolbe	Schaffer
Dreier	Kuykendall	Sensenbrenner
Duncan	LaHood	Sessions
Dunn	Largent	Shadegg
Ehlers	Latham	Shaw
Ehrlich	LaTourette	Shays
Emerson	Lazio	Sherwood
English	Leach	Shimkus
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Shuster
Ewing	Linder	Simpson
Fletcher	LoBiondo	Skeen
Foley	Lucas (OK)	Smith (MI)
Forbes	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Fossella	McCollum	Smith (TX)

Souder	Thomas	Watts (OK)
Spence	Thornberry	Weldon (FL)
Stearns	Thune	Weldon (PA)
Stump	Tiahrt	Weller
Sununu	Toomey	Whitfield
Sweeney	Upton	Wicker
Talent	Walden	Wilson
Tancred	Walsh	Wolf
Taylor (NC)	Wamp	Young (AK)
Terry	Watkins	Young (FL)

NAYS—210

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Neal
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Norwood
Allen	Hall (TX)	Oberstar
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Baird	Hill (IN)	Olver
Baldacci	Hilliard	Ortiz
Baldwin	Hinchee	Owens
Barcia	Hinojosa	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Hoeffel	Pascrell
Becerra	Holden	Pastor
Bentsen	Holt	Payne
Berkley	Hooley	Pelosi
Berman	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Berry	Inslee	Phelps
Bishop	Jackson (IL)	Pickett
Blagojevich	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Blumenauer	(TX)	Price (NC)
Bonior	Jefferson	Rahall
Borski	John	Rangel
Boswell	Johnson, E. B.	Reyes
Boucher	Jones (OH)	Rivers
Boyd	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Brady (PA)	Kaptur	Roemer
Brown (CA)	Kennedy	Rothman
Brown (FL)	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kilpatrick	Rush
Capps	Kind (WI)	Sabo
Capuano	Klecicka	Sanchez
Cardin	Klink	Sanders
Carson	Kucinich	Sandlin
Clay	LaFalce	Sawyer
Clayton	Lampson	Schakowsky
Clement	Lantos	Scott
Clyburn	Larson	Serrano
Condit	Lee	Sherman
Conyers	Levin	Shows
Costello	Lewis (CA)	Sisisky
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Cramer	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lofgren	Snyder
Cummings	Lowey	Spratt
Danner	Lucas (KY)	Stabenow
Davis (FL)	Luther	Stark
Davis (IL)	Maloney (CT)	Stenholm
DeFazio	Maloney (NY)	Strickland
DeGette	Markey	Stupak
Delahunt	Martinez	Tanner
DeLauro	Mascara	Tauscher
Deutsch	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Dixon	McDermott	Thurman
Doggett	McGovern	Tierney
Dooley	McIntyre	Towns
Doyle	McKinney	Trafficant
Edwards	McNulty	Turner
Eshoo	Meehan	Udall (CO)
Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Udall (NM)
Evans	Meeks (NY)	Velazquez
Farr	Menendez	Vento
Fattah	Millender-	Visclosky
Filner	McDonald	Waters
Ford	Miller, George	Watt (NC)
Frank (MA)	Minge	Waxman
Frost	Mink	Weiner
Gejdenson	Moakley	Wexler
Gephardt	Mollohan	Weygand
Gonzalez	Moore	Wise
Goode	Murtha	Woolsey
Gordon	Nadler	Wu
Green (TX)	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt	Coburn	Slaughter
Archer	Cooksey	Tauzin
Barr	Engel	Wynn
Callahan	Moran (VA)	

□ 1220

Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. MEEKS of New York changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HORN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 99, on April 28, 1999, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN AND AROUND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Pursuant to House Resolution 151, it is now in order to debate the deployment of United States armed forces in and around the territory of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

The gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and an honor to begin this debate today, and I believe that it is an important one. There is no way for me in 1 minute to lay out all of the factors to take into consideration here, but let me just make two observations at the beginning of this debate.

We have a duty and a responsibility as a Congress to be heard on the issues before us. As a Nation, we must face the fact that this is not over and may not be over for some time and that we will be dealing with the consequences of American actions in the Balkans for the next decade at least. Our relationships with NATO, United States' relationships with Russia, NATO's relationships with Russia, the problem of the refugees, the pressure for a greater Albania with claims to Macedonia and Greece, all of these things we will have to deal with as a consequence of American actions, and they will be influenced by the decisions and the votes that we take today.

We cannot and should not avoid this discussion on the merits. That is our responsibility as elected representatives from the districts that we have come here to serve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) will control the time of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDEN-

SON), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, we are here with one single primary purpose, and that purpose is to stop the murder in Kosovo. Mr. Milosevic continues to kill innocent civilians and tries to chase the rest away.

This country has led the world, sometimes single-handedly, in military actions in Korea and Vietnam, in Panama, in Lebanon, in Grenada and in Kuwait. In Nicaragua, we armed people to fight themselves because we were worried about the economic and political system that would end up in Nicaragua. We fought to stop communism. Some people say we fought in Kuwait to protect our oil reserves.

Here, Mr. Speaker, it is much simpler. We have a brutal dictator who is murdering innocent people and chasing the rest off the land. How do we stop this murder? That is our goal.

We cannot use the argument that as a country, we failed to act elsewhere. Yes, there have been other tragedies in recent years, and to my regret we either did not have the assets or the inclination to respond. In Rwanda, in Cambodia, in countless other places the world should have responded.

One advantage we possess here is that we have NATO; we have NATO united, that has been trained and operational together for decades. And this is not the United States as the Lone Ranger. How many times have we bemoaned the fact that America alone is left with this responsibility? This is the United States and it is other NATO partners together on a goal to stop murder.

Do not blame NATO for the acceleration or the deaths in Kosovo. I have said it before: As the American troops headed towards the concentration camps, the Nazis increased their production rate. They killed more people. We cannot use that as an argument for not going after them. Milosevic would have been happy to kill these people at a lower percentage, try to chase them out more slowly if he was not threatened.

We are going to have an amendment here that lets the Congress decide tactics. How many years did we hear about Lyndon Johnson picking targets in the White House? Now we are going to have 535 Members of Congress determine the tactics in the battlefield. Whatever my colleagues' debate is on war powers, I think most people understand that is bad policy.

I look around this Chamber, as I did yesterday in committee, and I have seen virtually every Member here at a Holocaust memorial. I have seen them come for a day of remembrance about the Armenian genocide. I have heard speeches by my colleagues here condemning our inaction in Rwanda. And now what are we going to do here in Kosovo?

We will make a decision whether we simply repeat history so we can have one more day with the Speaker's approval in the Rotunda, bemoaning the