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. 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.