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. Speaker, last week I attended the

Organization for Security and Cooperation meeting in Copenhagen,

Denmark, and there, to a person, including the Russians, we prepared

the position of the organization for security and cooperation in

Europe, outlining the exact same requirements as set forth by the NATO

alliance.

This bill, if it were to pass, sends an overwhelmingly negative

message to our troops and to our allies. Regardless of how one feels

about the need for the Congressional role in authorizing ground forces,

this bill represents precisely the wrong way to seek such a role. By

denying funding for the full range of actions we may need to take

against Slobodan Milosevic, we are tying one hand behind the backs of

our military.

This bill would prohibit funding for ground elements unless Congress

specifically authorizes a deployment.

``Ground elements'' is a pretty broad term. What happens if the

President has to act quickly but the Congress is out of session? The

legislation would require him to delay until he had specific

Congressional authorization. That delay could cost lives.

I do not think that it is responsible for us to go forward in this

manner.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke to my dear

colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. Campbell) regarding the

need for clarity with reference to the War Powers Act. On that I agree

with him thoroughly, and I indicated to him at that time that I would

be prepared to stand with him, and I am sure others will, once this

matter is litigated. I think the timing is poor, and I agree and

associate myself with the remarks of the previous speaker with

reference to the preserving of the process.

That said, the question is, why would we act unilaterally in

declaring war with Yugoslavia? Presently, we are not at war with

Yugoslavia; we are engaged in an international mission to bring about

peace in Yugoslavia. A unilateral declaration of war would signal that

the United States was intensifying the war, while others were fighting

for more limited objectives. OSCE and NATO this past week confirmed as

our partners the objectives that we have set forth. Why, then, would we

destroy our credibility with NATO and destroy NATO's credibility?

I suggest that we defeat this declaration.