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. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for

yielding me this time. We are in a very, very difficult situation

today, confronting one of the most dismal range of policy choices the

House has ever had to make.

We are forced to do that, in part because notwithstanding my

imploring him to do that, and others much more important than I

imploring him to do that, our President and Commander-in-Chief has

chosen not to come to this Congress or send to this Congress the best

articulation that he could come up with as to what our objectives are

in the Balkans and what authority he would ask in order to pursue those

objectives. He has not done it. It, therefore, should be our charge to

do it for the Nation.

We are not doing that by any of the four propositions before us

today. No one declares any objective, no one clearly authorizes in any

intelligent way the utilization of military force. The Fowler-Goodling-

Kasich solution says ``thou shalt not use ground forces''.

Inferentially, it is status quo. We can continue to use air power, but

it really does not say that or authorize that. It is left dangling.

The same can be said of the resolution of the gentleman from

Connecticut (Mr. Gejdenson), which he has just made abundantly clear by

his unusual response in the colloquy that was just suggested, which

leaves the resolutions of my dear friend, the gentleman from California

(Mr. Campbell), which say forget any objectives, forget any policy,

just withdraw; or if we do not do that, declare war.

None of these choices make any sense, and I think it is a very sad

day that we in the House are faced or not faced with some alternative

that does make sense and does authorize that which ought to be

authorized in proper discretion, and for what purposes it should be

authorized, and who should be paying the bill.