

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