Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I had a law school professor that in difficult

discussions in class, he would say, ``Read it.'' I suggest, Mr.

Speaker, that every Member read the bill that is before them. This is

not a bill that prohibits the use of ground troops. This is a bill that

prohibits the use of ground elements, a far broader, more difficult-to-

define definition.

Look at this through the eyes of a sergeant stationed in Albania,

working on helicopters as a mechanic; look at it through his eyes. Does

this term, does this prohibition of ground elements, include

helicopters because it is an air-to-ground weapon system? What is that

sergeant going to think of what Congress is doing?

Even if not, what if a helicopter lands in Kosovo for whatever

reason; does it then become a ground element if they engage in a

firefight, therefore illegal under this bill? Are the rescue operations

which are permitted under this bill limited to those who are in the

Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as a result of their operations only?

What if troops, Mr. Speaker, of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia

cross the border into Albania, or into Macedonia, and capture U.S.

personnel? And that happened. Would a rescue operation then be

prohibited if we saw them a hundred yards away and we could bring them

back? That would be illegal under this bill.

Is hot pursuit of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia troops

prohibited by this? Do they have a safe haven? Remember the argument,

the discussions, in the Korean War that there was a sanctuary north,

north of the Yalu River?

This is creating a sanctuary for those troops who could cause harm to

the sergeant and his men and women who serve under him.

We cannot allow this bill to pass. This is not a prohibition of

ground troops; this is a prohibition of a much broader definition.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of practicing law some 20 years, of

helping debate definitions in court, and I can read a proposed statute.

``Ground elements'' is all inclusive. It disallows preparation, it

disallows hot pursuit, it disallows so many things other than just

ground forces.

If we are talking about ground forces, why does the bill not say

that? Why does it not limit it to ground troops or ground forces? It

does not do that.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to close, and to

mention briefly that the President sent a letter to the Speaker dated

April 28, part of which reads as follows: ``However, were I to change

my policy with regard to introduction of ground forces, I can assure

you that I would fully consult with the Congress.'' That should put an

end to that.

Let me tell the Members what this legislation does. If this is

passed, this legislation would prohibit any preemptive attack by

American forces based on an intelligence assessment of an impending

attack by enemy forces.

It would prohibit American forces from pursuing attacking enemy

forces following an enemy incursion across international borders. It

would prohibit the rescue of any non-U.S. headquarters personnel. It

would prohibit the rescue or support of any non-U.S. personnel from a

nongovernmental agency. It would prohibit the rescue of any military

personnel from Albania, Bulgaria, Macedonia, or Romania. It would also

prohibit the rescue of peacekeeping forces in a peacekeeping role in a

permissive environment.

Again, I say, read this. This bill, with the language thereof, has

been a moving target. We cannot allow this to pass. If a bill should

come up at a time that is proper, based upon what the President says,

that is what we should debate at that time. This is out of time. This

improper bill is poorly written. I certainly urge a no vote thereof.

Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to

point out that my friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. Fowler) a

few moments ago stated that this was language inserted and written by

the legislative counsel, and that they knew what they were doing.

The language in this bill, since it was first initiated, has been a

moving target. We cannot allow it to go forward with the uncertainty of

this language, the uncertainty of this bill, and I very, very sadly,

because she is a friend, I very sadly have to object.

Mr. Speaker, one of the truest sayings is that ``second

place does not count on the battlefield.''

We are engaged in a conflict to bring the Europeans' last dictator

into light. It has to be a victory for the North Atlantic Treaty

Organization. It has to be a victory for the United States to bring

Milosevic to the table, to do what is right by the refugees, to get

them back to their home, to make sure there is autonomy for these

people. But more than that, it is a matter of credibility for NATO and

for the United States.

If the world perceives NATO, led by our country, not winning and not

being successful in this effort, NATO will then become a paper-debating

society. That we cannot have.