

Second, the rule gives priority to an amendment by myself and two colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from South Carolina. Our amendment uses a combination of NATO reimbursements and across-the-board reductions to ensure that the new, additional emergency spending in this bill will be fully offset.

We give the President to the end of this fiscal year to secure NATO reimbursements, and the remaining amount of offsets, if necessary, would come from small reductions in non-defense discretionary spending in the next fiscal year.

It is important to note that the amendment uses a sequester mechanism already in budget law and would exempt several programs from any reductions.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Committee on Rules, and I urge my colleagues to pass this rule.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. This bill, along with last week's votes on Kosovo, reveal a fundamental flaw in the majority party's vision of national security.

First, the majority of House Republicans voted against our military's effort to stop genocide in Kosovo. Now that same majority uses funding for the operation as an excuse for \$6 billion in non-Kosovo military spending. The majority whip calls us chicken hawks.

The other side complains that the administration's defense policy is "doing more with less." But in rejecting Kosovo while giving the Pentagon \$6 billion more, these critics embrace a doctrine of doing nothing with everything. In today's world, we cannot afford to do nothing. With today's budget, we cannot afford to buy everything.

Republicans complain that our military's efforts to bring peace to the Balkans undermines readiness. Ready for what, if not Kosovo? Ready for the Soviet Union to spring to life, or Nazi Germany? Readiness is not an end in itself, it is a means to an end, our military's ability to carry out its mission, a means to ensuring our own security and prosperity.

Ethnic conflict and regional instability, as in Kosovo, threaten our security and prosperity. It makes no sense to build up fortress America and sit inside idle while the world outside falls apart. Congress' decisions on the military must reflect the world as it is and will be, rather than a world of the past.

I urge my colleagues to support this needed funding for our troops over Kosovo, and to resist playing games with it. We are better than that.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. The rule is far from perfect, but it allows adequate debate, and it will certainly allow us who think that it is unwise to increase the spending to vote against the spending. It certainly allows an opportunity for those who think that we should double the spending to explain why we should spend so much money on a war that we have not declared.

Mr. Speaker, we have to realize that this war has been pursued for over a month. We have not appropriated the funds, so whether or not we act today, the war will continue, unfortunately. The war has not been declared, but if we go ahead and fund it, we become partners in this war. I do not think that is a wise policy. We should not provide the funding.

Mr. Speaker, there is a fallacy, that floats around this House that says that if we increase the funding for the military, we will have greater defense. That reminds me of the accusation from the right that always challenges the left that says, if there is a social problem, all you want ever to do is throw more money at it. The worse the problem gets, the more money they want to spend on the social problem.

It seems like the worse our defense gets and the more we get into quagmires around the world and the more we accept the policy of policing the world, all we seem to do is come back and say, well, if we just put more money in it, everything is going to be okay.

But if we are in a quagmire, if we are following a policy that is unwise, the money might just make conditions much worse. I think this is why we must defeat the spending on this program, because the problems with what is happening in Bosnia and Kosovo and Iraq will be compounded as long as the administration has the money to fund the war.

Yes, I am for a strong national defense, but if the policy is wrong, it will undermine all the spending. The money will actually be wasted. Funding encourages a policy that is in error. Funding is an endorsement of the war. We must realize that it is equivalent to it. We have not declared this war. If we fund it, we essentially become partners in this ill-advised war.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of this rule, despite my disappointment with several of my amendments not receiving waivers.

There will be lots of seemingly contradictory statements made during today's debate about this bill. Some will say this bill is about rebuilding our military, which it is. Some will say it is about raising the pay of our courageous men and women in service, which it is. Some will say it gives the admin-

istration the dollars which not only will escalate this war, but possibly expand it to a ground war, which it does.

This modified open rule not only restricts amendments that would have moved needed national defense funds to other appropriations categories, but also restricts a number, under House rules, of amendments that could have prohibited the buildup of the war, such as an amendment by my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DAN BURTON).

Overwhelmingly, the House had passed an amendment that would have restricted a ground war, but it is not allowed under this bill, where it would have had the force of law. Several amendments of mine that would have reached back were also prohibited.

So while there are a number of waivers, there are not any waivers for those of us who were trying to affect some of the ability of previous funds to be moved around.

However, by allowing a modified open rule, it still gives many of us the flexibility to offer amendments that are within the House rules that will greatly restrict this Administration's ability to escalate and expand this war, and possibly even force the needed peace settlement that is pending. Our House vote last week clearly pushed the administration towards that, along with the work of Reverend Jesse Jackson.

This rule will most likely, and it should, pass. That is quite a difference from the last few sessions of Congress. Quite frankly, in the last few sessions when we had a controversial vote like this, many of us were jammed. That resulted in us coming to the floor and taking down a rule. I learned there were more woodsheds out in this floor than I believed were possible. We were hauled in. We were told our party was collapsing. We were told the whole Congress was going to fold. We were going to lose control of Congress.

But in fact, a lot of this controversy inside our party has been alleviated by our new Speaker, who has at least given us the flexibility to offer different amendments. We as a party need to pull together and pass this rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to reluctantly support this rule because it does allow some amendments that will hopefully force the President to come before this body and the Senate before he would send ground troops into Kosovo. I am not sure it will do it, but I think at least it expresses the will of the Congress that we would like for him to come before this House and the Senate before sending our troops into harm's way.

When President George Bush decided to go into the Persian Gulf, there was great planning involved. We created an