

Bunning	Hastings (WA)	Paxon	Hilliard	Meek	Schroeder
Burr	Hayes	Pickett	Hinchev	Menendez	Schumer
Burton	Hefley	Pombo	Holden	Mfume	Scott
Buyer	Heineman	Porter	Hostettler	Miller (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Calvert	Herger	Portman	Hoyer	Minge	Serrano
Camp	Hilleary	Pryce	Jackson-Lee	Mink	Skaggs
Canady	Hobson	Quillen	Jacobs	Moakley	Skelton
Castle	Hoekstra	Quinn	Jefferson	Moran	Slaughter
Chabot	Hoke	Radanovich	Johnson (SD)	Morella	Spratt
Chambliss	Rahall	Horn	Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Stark
Christensen	Houghton	Ramstad	Johnston	Neumann	Stokes
Chrysler	Hunter	Reed	Kanjorski	Oberstar	Studds
Clinger	Hutchinson	Regula	Kaptur	Obey	Stupak
Coble	Hyde	Riggs	Kennedy (MA)	Olver	Taylor (MS)
Coburn	Inglis	Roberts	Kennedy (RI)	Ortiz	Tejeda
Collins (GA)	Istook	Rogers	Kennelly	Owens	Thompson
Combest	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher	Kildee	Pallone	Thornton
Cooley	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen	Klecicka	Pastor	Thurman
Cox	Jones	Roukema	Klink	Payne (NJ)	Tiahrt
Crane	Kasich	Royce	LaFalce	Payne (VA)	Torres
Crapo	Kelly	Salmon	Lantos	Pelosi	Torricelli
Cremeans	Kim	Sanford	Levin	Peterson (FL)	Towns
Cunningham	King	Saxton	Lewis (GA)	Peterson (MN)	Vento
Danner	Kingston	Scarborough	Lipinski	Petri	Visclosky
Davis	Klug	Schaefer	Lofgren	Pomeroy	Volkmer
Deal	Knollenberg	Schiff	Lowey	Poshard	Ward
DeLay	Kolbe	Seastrand	Luther	Rangel	Waters
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Shadegg	Maloney	Richardson	Watt (NC)
Dickey	Largent	Shaw	Manton	Rivers	Waxman
Dicks	Latham	Shays	Markey	Roemer	Williams
Doolittle	LaTourette	Shuster	Martinez	Rose	Wilson
Dornan	Laughlin	Sisisky	Matsui	Roth	Woolsey
Doyle	Lazio	Skeen	McCarthy	Roybal-Allard	Wyden
Dreier	Leach	Smith (MI)	McDermott	Rush	Wynn
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)	McHale	Sabo	Yates
Dunn	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)	McKinney	Sanders	
Edwards	Lightfoot	Smith (WA)	Meehan	Sawyer	
Ehlers	Lincoln	Solomon			
Ehrlich	Linder	Souder			
Emerson	Livingston	Spence	Callahan	McInnis	Waldholtz
English	LoBiondo	Stearns	Chenoweth	Tucker	
Ensign	Longley	Stenholm	Hancock	Velazquez	
Everett	Lucas	Stockman			
Ewing	Manzullo	Stump			
Fawell	Martini	Talent			
Fields (TX)	Mascara	Tanner			
Flanagan	McCollum	Tate			
Foley	McCrery	Tauzin			
Forbes	McDade	Taylor (NC)			
Fowler	McHugh	Thomas			
Fox	McIntosh	Thornberry			
Franks (CT)	McKeon	Torkildsen			
Franks (NJ)	McNulty	Trafficant			
Frelinghuysen	Metcalf	Upton			
Frisa	Meyers	Vucanovich			
Funderburk	Mica	Walker			
Ganske	Miller (FL)	Walsh			
Gekas	Molinar	Wamp			
Geren	Mollohan	Watts (OK)			
Gilchrest	Montgomery	Weldon (FL)			
Gillmor	Moorhead	Weldon (PA)			
Gilman	Murtha	Weller			
Goodlatte	Myers	White			
Goodling	Myrick	Whitfield			
Gordon	Neal	Wicker			
Goss	Nethercutt	Wise			
Graham	Ney	Wolf			
Greenwood	Norwood	Young (AK)			
Gunderson	Nussle	Young (FL)			
Gutknecht	Orton	Zeliff			
Hall (TX)	Oxley	Zimmer			
Hansen	Packard				
Hastert	Parker				

NAYS—181

Abercrombie	Clement	Farr
Ackerman	Clyburn	Fattah
Andrews	Coleman	Fazio
Baesler	Collins (IL)	Fields (LA)
Baldacci	Collins (MI)	Filner
Barcia	Condit	Flake
Barrett (WI)	Conyers	Foglietta
Becerra	Costello	Ford
Beilenson	Coyne	Frank (MA)
Bentsen	Cramer	Frost
Berman	Cubin	Furse
Bevill	de la Garza	Gallegly
Bonior	DeFazio	Gejdenson
Borski	DeLauro	Gephardt
Boucher	Dellums	Gibbons
Browder	Deutsch	Gonzalez
Brown (CA)	Dingell	Green
Brown (FL)	Dixon	Gutierrez
Brown (OH)	Doggett	Hall (OH)
Bryant (TX)	Doolley	Hamilton
Cardin	Durbin	Harman
Chapman	Engel	Hastings (FL)
Clay	Eshoo	Hayworth
Clayton	Evans	Hefner

Hilliard	Meek	Schroeder
Hinchev	Menendez	Schumer
Holden	Mfume	Scott
Hostettler	Miller (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Hoyer	Minge	Serrano
Jackson-Lee	Mink	Skaggs
Jacobs	Moakley	Skelton
Jefferson	Moran	Slaughter
Johnson (SD)	Morella	Spratt
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Stark
Johnston	Neumann	Stokes
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Studds
Kaptur	Obey	Stupak
Kennedy (MA)	Olver	Taylor (MS)
Kennedy (RI)	Ortiz	Tejeda
Kennelly	Owens	Thompson
Kildee	Pallone	Thornton
Klecicka	Pastor	Thurman
Klink	Payne (NJ)	Tiahrt
LaFalce	Payne (VA)	Torres
Lantos	Pelosi	Torricelli
Levin	Peterson (FL)	Towns
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (MN)	Vento
Lipinski	Petri	Visclosky
Lofgren	Pomeroy	Volkmer
Lowey	Poshard	Ward
Luther	Rangel	Waters
Maloney	Richardson	Watt (NC)
Manton	Rivers	Waxman
Markey	Roemer	Williams
Martinez	Rose	Wilson
Matsui	Roth	Woolsey
McCarthy	Roybal-Allard	Wyden
McDermott	Rush	Wynn
McHale	Sabo	Yates
McKinney	Sanders	
Meehan	Sawyer	

NOT VOTING—7

Callahan	McInnis	Waldholtz
Chenoweth	Tucker	
Hancock	Velazquez	

□ 1553

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. McInnis for, with Ms. Velázquez against.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT ON AMENDMENTS TO THE COMPREHENSIVE ANTITERRORISM ACT

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee may be meeting as soon as this Saturday, December 16, to grant a rule which may limit the amendments to be offered to H.R. 1710, the Comprehensive Antiterrorism Act of 1995.

Subject to the approval of the Rules Committee, this rule may include a provision limiting amendments to those specified in the rule. Any Member who desires to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by 4 p.m. on Friday, December 15, to the Rules Committee, at room H-312 in the Capitol.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of the Hyde-Barr substitute, which has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 5, and which has also been introduced as a separate bill (H.R. 2703). The rule is likely to self-

execute in the Hyde-Barr amendment as a new base text for H.R. 1710.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

FURTHER CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1530, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. SPENCE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1530) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes:

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO U.S. TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-405) on the resolution (H. Res. 304) providing for debate and for consideration of three measures relating to the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO UNITED STATES TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 304, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 304

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to debate the deployment of United States Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2770) to prohibit Federal funds from being used for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of any peace-keeping operation, or as part of any implementation force. The bill shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Dornan of California and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. After disposition of or postponement of further proceedings on H.R. 2770, it shall be in order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 302) relating to the deployment of United States Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to enforce the peace agreement between the parties to the conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Buyer of Indiana and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 4. After disposition of or postponement of further proceedings on House Resolution 302, it shall be in order to consider in the House a resolution relating to the deployment of United States Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. The resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for debate purposes only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous materials.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us in designed to enable the enable House to debate the President's policy of deploying American ground troops to Bosnia as part of a NATO peacekeeping contingent.

Because the peace agreement is scheduled to be signed in Paris tomorrow, and because the President has asked the Congress to vote on the deployment of U.S. troops before the peace agreement is signed, we are taking this unusual action of a same-day consideration rulemaking this debate in order. It, therefore, can be legitimately argued this qualifies as an urgent or emergency matter on those grounds.

Having said that, however, I want to make clear that my own preference would have been that we not vote on anything today since the House has already twice expressed its overwhelming opposition to send American troops in Bosnia. That should have been sufficient. I seriously doubt that many minds have been changed since our last vote on November 17—less than a month ago.

However, it was the feeling of our conference, and of many Members on the other side of the aisle, that the House should vote again on the President's policy, because it was not officially and fully unveiled or presented, until after that last vote took place on this floor. That's an understandable argument for today's debate and votes, even if I don't happen to agree with it.

The rule before us will give the House ample time to both debate the President's Bosnia policy, and to vote on three distinct alternatives measures. Under the rule before us, there will first be 1 hour of general debate on the subject of deploying American troops to Bosnia, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the International Relations Committee.

Following that debate, the rule first makes it in order to consider in the House a bill introduced by Representative DORNAN of California, H.R. 2770, which prohibits the use of appropriated funds for deploying American troops to Bosnia. That bill will be debated for 1 hour, divided between Mr. DORNAN and an opponent. It will not be subject to amendment but will be subject to one motion to recommit which may contain instructions.

Following the disposition of the Dornan bill, the House will consider a sense-of-the-House resolution, House Resolution 302, by Representative BUYER of Indiana. The Buyer resolution first calls attention to the previous two House votes in opposition to sending our troops to Bosnia, and the President's subsequent decision to do so anyway, notwithstanding those votes.

The resolution then reiterates, and this is important, the concerns and the opposition of the House to the President's policy, but goes on to express for American servicemen and women who will be deployed to Bosnia and calls for their full protection, and the supply of sufficient resources to carry out the mission.

The Buyer resolution will be debated in the House for 1 hour, and is not subject to amendment or to a motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule allows the minority leader or his designee to offer a resolution in the House on the subject to United States troop deployment to Bosnia, debatable under the same terms and conditions as the Buyer resolution.

Let me emphasize that we are talking about three, free-standing measures, each of which will have a separate vote, regardless of the outcome of votes on the other measures. This is not a king-of-the-hill or most-votes procedure. It is conceivable that all three measures could pass, that all three measures could be defeated, or that only one or two could pass.

The House will be able to work its will on all three.

Mr. Speaker, I know there will be some who will still criticize this process for one reason or another. It is not perfect, but it does allow for substantial debate on at least three options. I say "at least three options" since the minority is also protected in its right to offer a motion to recommit the Dornan bill with amendatory instructions subject to 10 minutes of debate. So, there could actually be four alternatives before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, the process will still be criticized by some, I suppose, because none of the measures has been reported for a committee or is subject to amendment.

But the President's Bosnia policy has been the subject of considerable hearings and discussions in several committees of the House and Senate, as well as the subject of the previous debates and votes on this floor which I have already referred to.

So, while this may not be a perfect process, I think it is still fair and open in giving this House the ample amount of debate time that many have asked for on the President's Bosnia policy, and the opportunity to choose among several alternatives in response to that policy. By the end of the day today, there should be no question as to where this House stands. I personally remain adamantly opposed to the present policy of placing American troops in harm's way in a place where they are not wanted and do not belong.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, for bringing this resolution to the floor.

House Resolution 304 is a rule which would permit the consideration of three, free-standing bills in response to our commitment to use United States troops to bring peace to Bosnia and implement the Dayton peace accord. The three bills are H.R. 2770, introduced by Mr. DORNAN; House Resolution 302, introduced by Mr. BUYER and Mr. SKELTON, and a Democratic alternative, offered by the minority leader or his designee.

As my colleague from New York has ably described, this rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The rule further provides for 1 hour of debate for each of the other three proposals. No amendments are permitted.

I must express my disappointment with the process on this rule. We all knew that the President asked Congress for a vote of support for the troops. We have had weeks to plan this rule. However, not even 3 hours ago, key decisions had not been made on this process. Now we are debating this on this floor. As a matter of fact we just debated on the rule 15 minutes ago. This is a vital matter of war and peace. Ram-rodging this issue through the House on such a grave issue does a disservice to Members on both sides of this question.

Mr. Speaker, there are two issues of substance at stake here. The first issue

is whether the United States will be a leader for world peace. We have an opportunity to bring peace to a turbulent region in Europe that has been ravaged by war for 4 years. Opportunities like this do not come about easily or often. We should seize the chance for peace while we have it.

The second issue is whether we will support our President and retain credibility in the international community. Or will we tie the hands of our President, embarrass ourselves, and let down our supporters and friends in Europe. President Clinton has taken a bold step for peace. We should back him up.

This past summer, I traveled to the former Yugoslavia and witnessed the terrible conditions there. When I visited refugees in Tuzla and Zenica, I saw many children that had not only lost their homes. They had lost hope. When I looked into the eyes of these children, I saw pain, confusion, and sadness. I found that many of these children had not been immunized or educated during the 4 years of the Bosnian war.

When I returned to America, I called Carol Bellamy, the executive director of UNICEF, and asked her to help implement a plan to immunize the children of Bosnia. She quickly pulled together a detailed proposal.

Two weeks ago, I was with President Clinton at the White House when he endorsed the proposal and he pledged funding. This humanitarian initiative is now going on. I compliment the President for supporting the children.

My constituents and I have a special reason for wanting the peace process to go forward. The treaty between the warring factions was negotiated at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, which is partly in my district. We are proud of the role that we played in the crafting of this agreement.

Two days ago, the mayor of the city of Dayton and all the city commissioners signed a proclamation expressing pride and support for the men and women of our Armed Forces who are helping to implement the Dayton peace agreement. The resolution also calls on "all nations of the world to support the Dayton peace agreement."

I would like to insert the text of the proclamation in the RECORD.

The rule before us will give House Members an opportunity to support the President and peace. I regret that the rule did not make in order a proposal by Mr. KENNEDY that would have required our NATO allies to pick up the costs associated with this mission.

Mr. Speaker, our national security interests are at stake. I urge defeat of the Dornan bill, defeat of the Buyer/Skelton resolution, and support of the Democratic alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the proclamation to which I referred.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, The Dayton Peace Agreement represents an opportunity for all parties within Bosnia and Herzegovina to work to-

ward building a lasting peace for its people; and

Whereas, the last four years have yielded untold suffering of families and innocent victims who have lost homes, friends, and a way of life to the worst atrocities and war in Europe since World War II; and

Whereas, The Dayton Peace Agreement calls for free and democratic elections to be held throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina, and commits all parties, including Serbia and Croatia, to cooperate fully and abide by international humanitarian law; and

Whereas, The Dayton Peace Agreement also commits all parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina to respect the highest level of internationally recognized human rights; and

Whereas, The Dayton Peace Agreement acknowledges the need for international assistance to help the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina rebuild communities after the devastation of four years of war; and

Whereas, The Dayton Peace Agreement is testimony to the leadership that The United States and its allies must play not only to preserve peace, but to build peace in the world.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the City of Dayton Ohio, and its citizens commend all the parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina for courageously agreeing to peace for all its people; and

Be it further resolved, that the City of Dayton, where, through leadership of the United States and its allies, terms and conditions for a fair and just peace were forged, extends its hopes and prayers to the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina that their peace may be lasting and free; and

Be it further resolved, that the City of Dayton with pride and support wish the men and women well, of our armed forces, who will assist the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in implementing the Dayton Peace Agreement; and

Be it further resolved, that the City of Dayton commits to working with Sister Cities International in providing a network of cities to assist our counterparts in further building the peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina; and

Be it further resolved, that the City of Dayton encourages all nations of the world to support the Dayton Peace Agreement.

Signed and presented to the President of the United States, William J. Clinton, December 11, 1995.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have to take exception to the statement of my very good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], that we are ramming these measures through the House.

My colleagues, let us be perfectly clear about it, the reason we are on this floor here today over my objections, I might add, because I do not think we should be here, period, is because President Clinton has asked Speaker GINGRICH to have this body take another vote on this issue before the Paris signing tomorrow. That is why we are here today. If it were not for that request, I can guarantee you that I would not have let this matter come before this body today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], a very respected new member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I will support this rule because it gives

ample opportunity to the Congress to support the very serious question of the Bosnia intervention. In the last 2 weeks, in multiple discussions held with colleagues in this House about the imposition of the Clinton administration of the new Secretary General, Mr. Solana, of NATO, various colleagues have stated to me that that decision by the Clinton administration seriously and legitimately calls into question the foreign policy judgment of the administration.

Mr. Speaker, NATO of course is the military wing of the western alliance. It was greatly responsible for maintaining the security of Europe throughout the cold war and, of course, today we are poised to intervene militarily in an armed conflict in Europe for the first time since World War II and in the Balkans under the military shield and utilizing the military structure of NATO for the first time in history.

Thus even though NATO was always important, it is perhaps even more important today. So who is the man who was named last week in Brussels as the new Secretary general, the head of NATO? Javier Solana is the foreign minister of the Spanish Socialist Workers party government. Mr. Solana opposed NATO with vehemence throughout the 1970's and the 1980's. As late as 1986, when a Socialist-sponsored referendum was held in Spain to determine whether it would remain in NATO, Mr. Solana, then culture minister in the Spanish Government, was one of the most outspoken opponents of Spain remaining in NATO.

He also opposed the presence of United States military bases on Spanish soil. As late as 1985, precisely on that subject of the presence of United States bases on Spanish soil, he I think somewhat contemptuously stated, and I quote, If need be, we will send a copy of the Spanish Constitution to Washington so they will know what a sovereign country is.

Until September 29, 1979, Mr. Solana was formerly a Marxist. That is the date that his party, the Socialist Workers Party, erased the word Marxist from its political program so as to help and win the next Spanish general election. Despite the opposition of almost all western Europe, the Clinton administration, Mr. Speaker, insisted upon Mr. Solana to be the new NATO Secretary General.

Much of the military and intelligence community of the NATO countries simply could not understand why the Clinton administration would insist on Solana as the new NATO head with other available candidates in contention such as Mr. Ruud Lubbers, former Dutch Prime Minister, who was endorsed by France and Germany and Great Britain and was always a dedicated supporter of NATO with exemplary security credentials.

The Clinton administration insisted on imposing the Spanish Socialist Solana as we prepare to use NATO to intervene militarily in Europe for the

first time since World War II, despite the fact that the Spanish Government is being wracked by unprecedented corruption, despite the fact that Solana, while Spanish Foreign Minister, just ended a 6-month stint as chairman of the European Union and during that time named a buddy of his, Mr. Garcia Vargas, a former defense minister in the Spanish Cabinet, who was so personally affected by corruption, including illegal wiretapping that he had to resign from the Spanish Cabinet. Mr. Solana named him European Union Special Envoy to Bosnia.

□ 1615

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that Spain is not part of the military structure of NATO, that was the candidate, that Foreign Minister of that government that is not part of the military wing of NATO, was the imposition of the Clinton administration for Secretary General of NATO, and that is the administration that is now asking the American people and the Congress to trust it with respect to Bosnia. I think this debate is long overdue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say before I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILEN-SON], that the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], took issue with the fact that I said that we were ramrodding this rule through this process. I say to the gentleman, I really believe that, Mr. SOLOMON, and I know that the gentleman is trying to react to the fact that the President is going to the peace signing tomorrow, but I must say that we have known about the fact that we wanted to have this debate, and it has been many weeks in coming, and what has happened is that we had a Committee on Rules in which we just passed a rule 20 minutes ago of which we have three amendments; not three amendments, three bills and one rule. Only one amendment has any teeth in it; it is the Dornan amendment, because in fact it is really law if it would pass. The other two are sense of Congress. But of the other two, one is changing, and probably as I am talking, the Skelton-Buyer amendment. At least it was changing as of 110 minutes ago. I just got the Democratic alternative, which to me as I read very quickly is I wish it could be stronger, and the fact is that it is being ramrodded, and it is a heck of a way to debate probably one of the more important issues that we are debating this whole year, is the commitment of troops.

So, it is being ramrodded. I realize the pressure that the chairman is under, but I must stick by my original comment, that this is a heck of a way to bring up a serious issue like this, and I very much object to it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEIL-

ENSON], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BEILEN-SON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me such a generous amount of time.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us provides for consideration of what is clearly one of the most significant foreign policy measures we shall take up in the foreseeable future, the measure dealing with congressional support, or disapproval, of the President's decision to send troops to Bosnia-Herzegovina to participate in the peacekeeping operation there. This is a decision we all hope will mark the beginning of the end of the tragic conflict.

With respect to the rule itself, our main concern in fashioning it was enough time be provided so that Members on both sides of the aisle and on all sides of the issue have an adequate opportunity to offer their arguments and to hear the opinions and arguments of other Members. We should have preferred more debate time, and many of us felt that a full day of debate was necessary for a measure of this significance. We do hope that every Member who has a desire to be heard during this important debate is given the opportunity to speak during the time that is provided under this rule.

Mr. Speaker, for almost 4 years now most Americans have been angered and sickened by the seemingly endless savagery and destruction being perpetrated in the lands that comprise the former Yugoslavia—and have urged and prayed that someone, somewhere, would try to put an end to the suffering.

Finally, after years of failure of the combatants themselves and of their neighbors in Europe to stop the fighting, the United States has stepped in and done what every decent and caring American has wanted.

We have asserted our leadership of NATO and participated in air strikes that sent an unmistakable signal for the first time that continued aggression would be punished forcefully, and we have asserted the moral authority that only the United States seems to represent to many people throughout the world and have brokered a peace treaty between the former combatants.

Finally there has been a cessation of hostilities; finally, a peace agreement has been approved by all the warring parties.

I hope one can assume, up to this point at least, virtually all Americans approve of and applaud what we have done. Yet many Americans are voicing unalterable opposition to sending any U.S. personnel to help enforce this newly achieved peace agreement, and even more are questioning the advisability of such further involvement by us in attempting to help keep this tragic conflagration from restarting.

That is an entirely proper and normal concern, it seems to me. In fact, it should be part of the debate that we

have not really had since the end of the cold war, about what the international role of the United States should be, and when and where, and under what circumstances, we should use our Armed Forces other than to repel a direct attack upon our own Nation.

It has, understandably, been difficult since the end of the cold war to agree upon a role for the United States to play in world affairs. The threats to us, and to much of the rest of the free world, are certainly less obvious and less specific than they used to be. But it has become painfully clear over the past few years that concerted efforts to help bring about the results most of us in the United States would hope for seem unable to be brought about successfully without active involvement and, in fact, leadership from the United States.

Now we are faced with a peace agreement that was made possible by American-led NATO air strikes and American diplomacy, and one that all of the parties want American forces to help carry out. One could argue that it does not necessarily follow that we cannot now walk away from a truly hopeful situation that we were instrumental in creating, but if Americans really want us to do just that, it probably would have been better for us not to have tried to end the fighting in the first place.

Not everyone agrees, of course, but some of us like the idea that the world looks to us for leadership so long as we determine how, and when, and whether we should respond. In this case we are not faced with the situation confronted by the British, French, and other nations' troops under the banner of the United Nations, who have tried to enforce a peace on warring parties that required their being in the middle of an ongoing war.

The parties have now agreed to stop fighting, and our troops will be in the position, finally, of peacekeepers, rather than peacemakers, which was sadly the position in which the United States troops found themselves both in Somalia and in Lebanon. In this current case, too, the Pentagon itself is satisfied with the role our troops will play and the circumstances in which they will be deployed which represents a complete about-face from their position, quite a proper one it seems too. I think all of us over the past couple of years were against committing United States troops to Bosnia for war-fighting purposes.

If our military, which is far and away the most capable, best-trained, and best-equipped in the world, is ever to be deployed for purposes other than defending our own territory, this, it seems to many of us, is the best possible use.

We are proud of the fine men and women of our Armed Forces, and if we are ever to use them at all, we can think of no better way than that of honest peace-keeping in a situation

where our presence, United States presence, literally will make all the difference.

There is no one here in Washington who wants us to be the policeman of the world, or solely responsible for enforcing the peace in Bosnia or anywhere else, but this is the kind of cooperative and multilateral effort that many Americans have, for many years now, called for and insisted upon, and it is being done under rules of engagement that provide that American troops will be under American command, and that they will have the authority to respond immediately, and with overwhelming force.

It may not be possible for us to define to our own satisfaction, and in advance, exactly when and in what capacity American troops should be used in this new and more complicated—if oftentimes less threatening—world than we used to face during the cold war, but we are a moral, and a caring, and a peace-seeking people; we take our ideals and beliefs seriously; and, when our involvement, with others, will stop the kind of terrible suffering that has been going on in this corner of Eastern Europe for 4 years now, common decency and concern for other human beings dictates that we do what we can.

President Clinton, in fact, offered a useful, pragmatic, and yet moral policy for this Nation to follow in the years immediately ahead, and I quote him, if I may, Mr. Speaker: "We cannot stop war for all time, but we can stop some wars. We cannot save all women and all children, but we can save many of them. We can't do everything, but we must do what we can."

This is something we can do, and it is something we must do, if we are to have any respect for ourselves and for this great Nation whose people we are privileged to represent.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules who has been very much involved in this issue.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee from Glens Falls, Mr. SOLOMON, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I support the rule to allow this critical debate to come to the floor. The rule provides for ample debate time especially since this body has debated and spoken clearly twice recently, and it provides for consideration of a range of motions, fairly representing—in my opinion—the broad range of views and conflicting positions held by Members of this body. There is no question that the President has used his authority to deploy troops—against the clear wishes of this House of Congress. Nevertheless, we must deal with the situation as it exists. It

is a curious situation. Why is the President flying to Paris on December 13 when we are in budget crisis that threatens to shutdown Government Friday? Where do the President's priorities lie?

But Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to begin this debate that has national and international ramifications, I want to take a minute to talk about individuals—those I represent in southwest Florida and those who will be spending a cold winter in the hills of war-ravaged Bosnia under the Dayton agreement and the President's plan. This past weekend I held two town meetings, and the topic that evoked the sharpest response from my constituents at these meetings was Bosnia. Not Medicare, not the budget, but Bosnia. And the questions were direct and heartfelt and to the point: Why are we putting our young men and women on the ground in Bosnia? These were not political people asking political questions—these were honest folks demanding an answer.

I have listened to the President and his advisors and his spokesmen, and I still cannot find a convincing answer. I have yet to be convinced that the United States has a compelling reason to put people on the ground in Bosnia. I say "people," because these are individuals—sons and daughters—who will be put in harm's way. And it is not a country or an army that will suffer casualties and loss of life if things go wrong; it is those individual people.

In considering where to go from here, I cannot support a complete withdrawal of funds and support for the United States troops who are already on the ground in the former Yugoslavia. These men and women are wearing the uniform of the U.S. military and obeying orders, and we cannot leave them stranded in hostile territory. I would like to see them brought home, however, and I certainly will not give the President a blanket approval to continue as he sees fit. Because too many Americans have taken the time to tell me that they strongly disagree with the President's actions so far. In addition I have serious questions about the role of NATO in this operation, and the arrangements for burden sharing that have been put together. Our forces have been trained in conventional warfare, and are the best in the world—however, the greatest threat in Bosnia comes from unconventional sources. And I am concerned that when it comes time to withdraw our troops under the President's plan, extraction will be extremely difficult.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I do want to draw attention to the parallel that many inside and outside the administration are drawing between the mission in Bosnia and the mission in Haiti. I think this is a good comparison, but not, I suspect, for the same reasons as the White House. It is a useful comparison because despite a virtual media blackout and attempts by the Clinton administration to spin the situation

otherwise, the conditions in Haiti are deteriorating and could very well collapse as soon as our troops leave. We are reminded that efforts at nation building are not as simple as they seem, and that internal problems of foreign countries spanning many generations cannot be solved by a year of occupation by the United States Armed Forces, especially in difficult terrain, harsh climate, and the dangerous atmosphere we know is Bosnia. And we are disarming in Haiti and rearming in Bosnia. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

□ 1630

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule because it promotes wishy-washiness. The gentleman from New York, [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the committee, has commented on the fact that we have had hearings in other committees. We have, but not about the particular language that we are getting ready to vote on. There have been no committee hearings in that regard. I have been to every hearing on the Committee on International Relations that was officially held concerning Bosnia. It does not permit any amendments, and then we are just seeing the language, as I speak. It is a work in progress. We do not have any idea what we are getting ready to vote on. This is political posturing in the extreme.

Mr. Speaker, we were sent here to lead, not to seek cover for our political, personal safety. What do we have with this rule? Cut off the troops. The other body just voted something like that. We voted on Hefley here on authorization. The other body just rejected that soundly, 77 to 22. Trash the President but support the troops. You all trash the President every day around here, so what else is new about that? Support the troops? But we have some reservations.

Is this leadership? We should support the President, any President, Republican or Democrat, when they deploy troops under their constitutional aegis, and we should promote and praise the troops that I saw when I was in Croatia this past weekend. These children are magnificent, and we should reject this rule. Here is why.

Let me quote, for those who keep asking, "What is the stake for the United States, and why does United States participation make a difference?" Admiral Leighton Smith, a four-star in charge of every American child in that theater, said:

The question is about United States leadership in the world. If we don't go in, our credibility goes to rock bottom.

Let me repeat again what Admiral Leighton Smith said, in response to the question "What is the United States' stakes in Bosnia, and why does United States participation make a difference?" He said:

The question is about United States leadership in the world. If we don't go in, our credibility goes to rock bottom. The next time, when vital U.S. interests are engaged, our allies and friends are not going to be with us. If we don't go in, there will be more killing and the war can spread. Do not underestimate the volatility of the Balkans.

What I saw in the way of destruction in Sarajevo, no man or woman in this body can say that we should not somehow or other, as the leader of the world, promote a period of decency and give peace a chance.

Reject this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Florida, ALCEE HASTINGS, who is leaving the floor there, and he is a good friend, but I have just about heard all I am going to hear on this. This bill is on this floor because the President asked for it to be here. Mr. Speaker, I would just as soon pull this rule. We do not need to debate this today. However, if you are going to continue trashing us, we might as well do that. Keep that in mind. We are bending over backwards to be fair, I want to tell the gentleman, and he can trust my sincerity in that.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, we have 97 people on the ground in Tuzla, 97, scouts, that is all. It snowed 2½ feet yesterday. There were 16 flights ready to go in, not big C-141's and certainly not C-5 Galaxies, Hercules, hard landing aircraft. One got in out of 16. I am waiting for a weather report right now. I do not think anybody got in today. It is snowing again.

I am the one who drove this, so we could have one more vote before we start the First Armored moving. I do not want this on the floor today after what I have just heard. I really do not. I want to give you time to study it all night.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORNAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I share with the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] the concern about that snow. The weather or the elements there are the most serious threat to our troops, but you do not pick your theater when you are trying to preserve some kind of semblance of peace. It is going to be a difficult theater. No war is risk free, and nobody here knows that better than he does, I would say to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for saying that. My

problem is basically constitutional. I testified to this up at the Committee on Rules. Bless everybody's heart around here for loving our men and women in uniform going in harm's way.

I have spoken on this floor about the atrocities in Bosnia as much as anybody. I begged President Bush to do something, to hit those concentration camps with an air assault using Blackhawks with Cobra and Apache gunship support, and extract the people from the concentration camps. I did not want, and it is a rough word, but it is fair, I did not want the current President to dither away 3 years.

The other sides are not going to kill one another with three feet of snow. You cannot find your own land mines without landmarks, and I do not give Bill Clinton much advice, but if he wanted to be a hero with the First Armored Division, he could very easily, at Paris tomorrow, say:

We are holding off the deployment because of the severe weather, and I am telling my young dads and moms in Europe that are on their way there, enjoy Christmas with your children and your wives. We will start moving on the 6th or 7th.

Imagine the cheer that would go up in the day rooms in Germany, which will probably have half a foot of snow, and nobody knows what the buildup in weather is going to be until Christmas. I just heard a European weather projection. They are predicting the worst weather since the winter of 1944 and 1945, which was the worst in 50 years, so I do not want this on the floor if we are going to have all this angst. Jerk it, and we can do it tomorrow, or better yet, Friday.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate hearing my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS], and his spirited comments a few moments ago. I would point out a phrase that he used: "No war is risk free." Mr. Speaker, this is not a war. We are told that our troops are being sent there as peacekeepers, but I am afraid and I will explain this further in debate on the general bill and during the amendments, why this is not an evenhanded, impartial peacekeeping operation, and how it may very well end up in a very high-risk situation as far as our troops are concerned.

I would also point out that the bill that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] and I put forth, and on which there will be a vote later this evening, is based upon hearings that we had in the Committee on National Security. We had numerous hearings there. What is in there, we took from the hearings the testimony and combined it into this bill that we have put forth as number 302.

I also wish to point out that early on November 11, I set forth some eight conditions under which we could deploy troops to the country of Bosnia. I

gave full expression of my concern in those eight conditions as of that moment. I tell this body, Mr. Speaker, that six of those conditions have been met, two have not been met.

As a result, I have chosen to be a principal cosponsor with my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, and I hope that when we reach that, that there will be a sizeable, sizeable vote in favor of it. I also will vote for this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Greensboro, NC, Mr. HOWARD COBLE, a very distinguished Member of this body.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am fresh off the Christmas parade circuit back home. I rode in nine Christmas parades. While these parades are not scientific polls, they are accurate barometers of public opinion. The consistent theme I heard from thousands at these Christmas parades was twofold: Do not back down on your effort to balance the budget, and stay out of Bosnia.

I spoke with many of these constituents personally, Mr. Speaker. They oppose our presence in Bosnia, not because they are insensitive or uncaring about the problems that plague Bosnia, but rather because they view it as a lose-lose proposition for the United States.

The reasons for this conclusion are apparent: No vital national interest in Bosnia; fighting that has endured over the centuries there is not likely to cease with the presence of 20,000 American men and women on the ground; severe, unforgiving inclement weather in a country generously laced with land mines located Lord only knows where.

Our Bosnian operation, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion is a recipe for failure at its best, a recipe for disaster at its worst. The arms embargo should have been lifted months ago, but that cannot be corrected at this late date.

America cannot continue, Mr. Speaker, to be the world's peacekeeper eternally. American men and women should not be placed in harm's way at this time, and virtually nothing, Mr. Speaker, has been said about the enormous cost to the American taxpayer. It has been estimated at \$2 billion. All of us know that is the low end. It will exceed probably \$3 to \$4 billion, money that we do not have.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate the message of Christmas parade goes in the Sixth District of North Carolina: Stay out of Bosnia.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is the most important national security vote that we have cast since the Persian gulf war. We have to ask ourselves, and that is what we are doing, why is United States involvement in

Bosnia in the national interest? There are three reasons:

First, America's values are at stake, and we can stop genocide and war in the Balkans.

Second, America's interests are at stake. We need a stable Europe, and Europe's stability is in danger if this war simmers.

Third, America's leadership is at stake. The peace agreement that we pushed, initialed, and fathered would collapse.

If we do not support the President on this issue, our credibility in other crisis areas, North Korea, the Middle East, Northern Ireland, and many other arenas will be eroded.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 4 years more than half of Bosnia' pre-war population has been murdered, starved, or driven from their homes. One million are homeless; one million. The people of Bosnia have witnessed Europe's worst human rights atrocities since the end of World War II: ethnic cleansings, mass executions, torture, rape. The only way to stop this killing for good is to make peace.

□ 1645

Our conscience demands that we seize this chance. America needs a strong Europe as our partner in fighting security threats from terrorism to proliferation of mass weapons of destruction, and Europe's stability is in danger if this war continues. Without United States participation, the peace agreement would literally collapse and the war would reignite and spread through Greece, Turkey, Macedonia. That is not in our interest. NATO would collapse literally.

Third, America's leadership brokered this cease-fire and brought the parties to Dayton to make peace. Now we have to take the lead in securing that peace.

This vote is not popular. My constituents let me know their views, too. But once in a while when national security and America's interests are at stake, we must take the tough votes. If we fail to keep our commitment in Bosnia, what is going to happen on North Korea and the nuclear issue? What are the North Koreans going to think? Or in containing Saddam Hussein in Iraq? Or in Northern Ireland and the Middle East where we are brokering peace?

If we fail to keep our commitment in Bosnia, the credibility of our leadership in Europe and around the world will suffer and with it our ability to protect America's interests.

Mr. Speaker, all of us here want to do the right thing. I cast no aspersions on any Members' motives. Therefore, we should do the right thing and support the President as we have done with President Bush in the Persian Gulf and other important national security votes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to the time.

Mr. Speaker, just like the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina about the numbers of his constituents who have registered there opposition to the deployment of troops in Bosnia, I am here to report to the Congress that the same is true in my district. Even the gentleman who just preceded me in the well acknowledged that of his constituents. The question that was posed to our people by the action of the President is: Should we support deployment of troops in Bosnia? The answer is no.

But the next question now has to be asked, since the president has decided once and for all, without looking back and without any chance of changing his mind, that the troops will be deployed. So the question now that the people must register there opinions on is as follows: Shall we abandon our troops in Bosnia? The answer to that is no.

I cannot vote under any circumstances to abandon our troops. Not to fund them? Unheard of. I cannot support that. Not to supply them with foods, materiel, ammunition, all the weapons that they require to do their mission? All the accoutrements of carrying on a peacekeeping mission? I will not be a party of not supplying all that is needed to our troops. I will not abandon our troops. I deplore the action of the President, but it is his decision and I will abide by that decision and support it, but know well that it is a tragedy about to unfold.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I take a back seat to no one in the House. For years I have fought, as chairman of Military Construction, for quality of life for our troops and for better living conditions. And I have served on the Defense Subcommittee for a lot of years with my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

This is not a political argument. In my view we should not be trashing the President of the United States. This is the price that we pay for being who we are, the most powerful country on the face of the Earth, the only superpower that is left.

Our negotiators went to a part of the country where people had been fighting for 4 years, and we saw on our television screens the precious old grandmothers that were crying and trying to find their place and trying to get across the street to get water. We saw in the marketplace where they were being shelled, we saw the children with their limbs blown away. Total devastation. Something that would make any honest human being cringe at the atrocities that were being committed on these human beings.

There people all came together, and our negotiators said, "We want you to

come. You are tired of war, and we want you to come to Dayton, Ohio," in the great United States of America, in our chairman's home district. "We want you to come, and you are going to sit down and we are going to talk about trying to come to grips with this, because we are so tired of war. We have people being slaughtered."

The city of Sarajevo where we saw the beautiful winter games many years ago, the stadium now has now been turned into a cemetery, the buildings destroyed, people absolutely ravaged. Thousands have been buried in the skating rinks and the coliseum and all the places where we had the beautiful games. They have been turned into graveyards, and the stadium seats, the wood has been used to make coffins.

People were tired of war. So our negotiators said, "Would you come to Dayton, Ohio? We will sit down, we will try come to some kind of a peace accord." They came and they hammered out and all the parties signed on to a peace agreement.

Every other time we have been involved in a confrontation, we have fought our way in, we have gone in with guns blazing. This is different. It may not work. But is it not worth, for God's sakes, to go in with other countries to try to make some effort to establish peace and to police a peace process for these people that have been so devastated in the past few years?

I would hope and pray at this time close to Christmastime that we should talk about peace on Earth and good will to men, that we would bypass the political cheap shots and at least make an effort to establish some peace in a part of the world that has been so devastated by the havoc that has been perpetrated on these citizens for so many years.

I would hope that we would support our troops and our effort to proclaim peace on Earth and good will to men this time at Christmastime.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYNE].

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

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the effort to try to keep the peace and to send troops to Bosnia as part of the peace agreement recently reached in Dayton.

The United States has committed troops to serve in Bosnia as part of the NATO peacekeeping force.

The United States has been able to broker a peace agreement in Dayton among the various factions in Bosnia. As the President stated in his address to the Nation November 27, America's mission will not be fighting a war. "It will be about helping the people of Bosnia to secure their own peace agreement."

The United States mission in Bosnia is limited, focused, and under the command of the American general.

This deployment of troops in the United States's national interest. The

United States mediated the Dayton peace accord. If we want to be credible in future international negotiations, we must take the necessary steps to implement that which we have arranged. If we do not follow through in this instance, we will not have much credibility in any future negotiations.

Furthermore, the United States has a vital interest in maintaining stability in Europe. Instability in any part of that region can not only intensify but expand to include other countries as well. As we all know, events in Sarajevo earlier this century led to World War I and the eventual involvement of the United States in a very wide conflict. Only 20 years later, the United States was inescapably drawn into war in Europe again. And for most of the last 50 years, the United States has been involved in NATO because its national interests were threatened by the prospect of Soviet hegemony over Europe. Even today, when Soviet Union has collapsed, the United States has a powerful interest in promoting peace, democracy, and free trade within Europe and around the world.

It is important to point out that the emphasis in this deployment is peace—U.S. troops will be part of a peacekeeping force which is implementing a peace agreement made by the various warring factions. We will be administering a peace, not imposing one.

We now have an opportunity to make peace in a conflict which could—and I believe would—eventually widen and draw us into it. We must consider whether the eventual cost of standing idly by and allowing the war to continue might not eventually far exceed the cost of this peacekeeping mission.

We should also not forget that we are implementing a peace agreement which will end the continuing murder of innocent civilians. These crimes against humanity have been so horrible that the United Nations has established an international tribunal to investigate them. We can not claim to be a civilized nation if we turn our backs on torture and murder when we have the power in our hands to stop it.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support the agreement in Dayton and support the U.S. military in its mission as a peacekeeping force in Bosnia.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this past weekend in Friedberg, Germany, I visited our troops of the 1st Armored Division, U.S. Army, who are being deployed to Bosnia.

One young soldier who served in both Somalia and Haiti told me, "The Bosnian mission is so much harder to understand. We're going in as neutral peacekeepers but also to get the Bosnian Muslims armed. You can't have it both ways!"

Mr. Speaker, this young soldier points out the inherent contradiction in the Administration's Bosnia policy.

As Vice President GORE said on Meet the Press Sunday, "We're going to make sure it (referring to arming the Bosnian Muslims) gets done."

The President is putting 20,000 American lives in harm's way, as neutral peacekeepers, while simultaneously helping arm one of the combatants. You cannot have it both ways!

This past weekend, as part of the congressional fact finding mission to the Balkans, I also heard Admiral "Snuffy" Smith, IFOR Commander, say that he does not want to be involved in any way with equipping, arming or training the Bosnian Moslems. And he also said we're not neutral because the Serbs don't think we're neutral. After all, Mr. Speaker, we just bombed them into submission.

My overriding concern is that we are placing our troops in an untenable position and committing them to "mission impossible."

As Serbian President Milosevic told our delegation, "If the Bosnians are armed, peace will be endangered and the treaty will fail."

Mr. Speaker, the Dayton peace accord has a rigid formula on weaponry that, relatively speaking, ensures the Bosnian Moslems remain weak.

Therein lies the basic problem with the President's Bosnia policy. If a balance of power in the Balkans is not established, how in the world can we ever expect long-term peace and stability in the region?

Yes, we should lift the arms embargo. Yes, we should train and equip the Bosnian Moslems to defend themselves.

But, no, Mr. Speaker, not with 20,000 U.S. troops on Bosnia soil at the same time.

Let us establish the equilibrium of power in the Balkans by creating a stable military balance. But let us arm, equip and train the Bosnian Moslems in a neutral country and out of harm's way for 20,000 American troops.

Mr. Speaker, as we heard from every military officer on our recent trip to the Balkans, this is a very dangerous mission.

There are as many as 6 million land mines awaiting our troops in the snow where they are almost impossible to find.

Also, Bosnian Serb mortar and sniper positions are well-established. Our troops are being deployed primarily to Tuzla where 71 civilians were killed in a single mortar attack in May.

The mujahadeen—some 4,000 Islamic extremists—represent a real threat to our troops as well.

And as one commander put it, "The threat of guerrilla warfare with grenades is very real."

Mr. Speaker, our ambassador to Croatia told us that the biggest problem is Serb Sarajevo. He said, "We can expect big trouble if the Serbs there don't accept the peace agreement."

Yesterday, the Serbs in Sarajevo overwhelmingly rejected the agreement in a referendum.

As one Serb woman in Sarajevo told me, "I would rather kill myself than accept the new boundaries."

Mr. Speaker, I stand here with a heavy heart because I want to support our Commander in Chief on foreign policy matters, especially those involving U.S. troops.

However, Mr. Speaker, my first obligation is to our troops and their safety. I cannot and will not support a policy that is fundamentally flawed and inherently inconsistent.

But if our troops are deployed, as it now appears they will be, I will support them 100 percent and do everything I can to see that they return home safely and as soon as possible.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Youngstown, OH [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, we forgot about some of these cities. Maybe that is the way to start this debate. There are great problems in Bosnia. There are great problems in America.

I support the rule. I commend the chairman for bringing the rule forward. He is trying to help the President. The President asked for this vote. This is a nonbinding, after-the-fact vote. The President has already decided to send troops into Bosnia.

I oppose sending troops into Bosnia for the following reasons: First, our generals have told us that Bosnia does not pose a security threat to the United States of America. Second, Europe has adequate manpower and money to handle this problem.

And, ladies and gentleman, we have been subsidizing Europe for too long as it is. These countries just dial 911 and we send over our troops to fight their problems, whether or not they have the money and the personnel or not. Then we send a credit card with them, an American Express card.

□ 1700

I am opposed to sending our troops. If, in fact, Europe cannot contain this civil war and it would spread. I would then support ground troops. But I cannot at this point.

Let me also say this: The Constitution speaks to these issues. Everybody who continues to talk about the history of Vietnam should take a look at the debate that is occurring in the House here tonight. Vietnam started with some trainers, some consultants, some technicians. That is about what we have.

But I think it is time to look at the Constitution. The Constitution is explicit. The founders took great pains to debate one issue: No one person could ever place America and our troops at war. And the potential for hostilities here is very great, folks.

So I do not think we are sending peacekeepers over to Bosnia. I think we are sending over targets, with bull's-eyes on their backs, and I believe this is a flawed policy.

But what bothers me in America anymore, the people do not govern. If the people govern, the House of Representatives and the other body would not allow for a nonbinding, after-the-fact vote on placing troops in harm's way. I think this is very bad move for us to make.

I am going to support the Dornan amendment, folks. I do not believe it will pass, and I will probably vote for every one of these nonbinding, after-the-fact, feel-good, kiss-your-sister types of votes here tonight. But it is not good policy, and the Congress of the United States should govern and the American people should govern, and right now, ladies and gentlemen, the American people do not govern anymore; governance comes from the White house.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], one of the very most distinguished members of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago one of our Members stood up and said that he was opposed to sending ground troops to Bosnia, but once and for all the President has made the decision, so he is not going to be involved in abandoning our troops. That is pure nonsense, and I am sorry to say it came from this side of the aisle. I am appalled to hear something like that.

It can be stipulated that everyone in this body supports our troops, but we have a constitutional responsibility. It is to serve as a check on this President or any other President from the inappropriate deployment of American troops abroad. That is what we are here discussing in the Bosnia resolution that follows.

We will support our troops. That is clear.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy said in 1961 we must face the fact that the United States is neither omnipotent nor omniscient, that we are only 6 percent of the world's population, that we cannot impose our will upon the other 94 percent, that we cannot right every wrong or reverse each adversity, and that there cannot be an American solution to every world problem. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy was right.

Twice in the last few days I have spoken on this floor to say something that

I want to emphasize once again: There is absolutely no threat whatsoever to our national security because of what is going on in Bosnia.

Second, there is no vital United States interest in Bosnia, and we should never send young American soldiers to foreign battlefields or participate in any military adventure unless one of these conditions is unquestionably, unequivocally clear and certain. And there are many questions about, and much opposition to, our involvement in Bosnia.

I know that the pack mentality of those in our very liberal national news media has produced a drumbeat to try to gain support for this very ill-advised operation, but I really believe that this has much more to do with political correctness than it does with anything else. It is simply not politically fashionable today to be labeled as an isolationist. Yet someone who is not an isolationist and who wants good relations with and close ties to other nations still should be strongly against sending transportation to Bosnia.

First, Time magazine asked a few days ago on its cover the question: "Is Bosnia worth dying for?" It may be for Bosnians, but they should solve their own problems. It is not worth even one American life to temporarily stop this age-old conflict.

Second, even if by some miracle, for which I hope, we have no casualties, we still should oppose this mission.

We are \$5 trillion in debt, Mr. Speaker, and almost everyone believes we will crash in a few years if we do not turn this around. Yet now we are going to spend billions we do not have in Bosnia, and we are going to, further, very seriously jeopardize the futures of our own children and grandchildren.

I feel sorry for the people in Bosnia. Humanitarian aid, yes; military aid, no. We can prove world leadership in many other ways.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton ought to know that the American foreign policy has been to defend our democratic allies against external military attack that threatens the sovereignty of those nations that we are treaty-allied with or where America has a strong national interest that is threatened.

Mr. Speaker, there is no vital American national interest that would justify the taking of even one American life. President Clinton says we will hurt our standing with our NATO allies.

Well, if that were true, I would say, "So what?" It is still not worth one American life.

But even that is not true, Mr. Speaker. I have worked with our NATO allies as a member of the North Atlantic Assembly, the political arm of NATO, for the last 17 years. I am the chairman of the political foreign affairs committee

of that body, and I can tell you that they are shocked that we would even consider putting American troops in harm's way when there is only a European interest and no American interest there. That is why we should do everything in our power to stop President Clinton from putting those troops there.

Because he has made the decision, I do believe that we are going to have to support the Buyer amendment, the Buyer resolution, because it does say that we oppose the policy but we support our troops, and that is something that we absolutely must do.

So let us get on with it. Let us pass this rule and then take up the general debate on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 357, nays 70, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 855]

YEAS—357

Abercrombie	Buyer	Dornan
Ackerman	Callahan	Doyle
Allard	Calvert	Dreier
Archer	Camp	Duncan
Armey	Canady	Dunn
Bachus	Castle	Ehlers
Baessler	Chabot	Ehrlich
Baker (CA)	Chambliss	Emerson
Baker (LA)	Chapman	English
Ballenger	Chenoweth	Ensign
Barcia	Christensen	Eshoo
Barr	Chryslers	Evans
Barrett (NE)	Clayton	Everett
Barrett (WI)	Clement	Ewing
Bartlett	Clinger	Farr
Barton	Clyburn	Fawell
Bass	Coble	Fazio
Bateman	Coburn	Fields (LA)
Beilenson	Coleman	Fields (TX)
Bentsen	Collins (GA)	Flake
Bereuter	Combest	Flanagan
Berman	Condit	Foglietta
Bevill	Conyers	Foley
Bilbray	Cooley	Forbes
Bilirakis	Cox	Fowler
Bishop	Cramer	Fox
Bliley	Crane	Franks (CT)
Blute	Crapo	Franks (NJ)
Boehlert	Cremeans	Frelinghuysen
Boehner	Cubin	Frisa
Bonilla	Cunningham	Frost
Bonior	Danner	Funderburk
Bono	Davis	Gallegly
Borski	de la Garza	Ganske
Boucher	Deal	Gekas
Brewster	DeLauro	Gephardt
Browder	DeLay	Geren
Brown (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Gibbons
Brown (FL)	Dickey	Gilchrest
Brownback	Dicks	Gillmor
Bryant (TN)	Dingell	Gilman
Bunn	Dixon	Goodlatte
Bunning	Doggett	Goodling
Burr	Dooley	Gordon
Burton	Doolittle	Goss

Graham	Luther	Roukema
Green	Maloney	Roybal-Allard
Greenwood	Manton	Royce
Gunderson	Manzullo	Rush
Gutierrez	Markey	Sabo
Gutknecht	Martinez	Salmon
Hall (TX)	Martini	Sanford
Hamilton	Mascara	Saxton
Hancock	Matsui	Scarborough
Hansen	McCarthy	Schaefer
Hastert	McCollum	Schiff
Hastings (FL)	McCrery	Scott
Hastings (WA)	McDade	Seastrand
Hayes	McDermott	Sensenbrenner
Hayworth	McHugh	Serrano
Hefley	McIntosh	Shadegg
Heineman	McKeon	Shaw
Herger	McKinney	Shays
Hilleary	McNulty	Shuster
Hilliard	Meek	Sisisky
Hinchey	Menendez	Skeen
Hobson	Metcalf	Skelton
Hoekstra	Meyers	Smith (MI)
Hoke	Mfume	Smith (NJ)
Holden	Mica	Smith (TX)
Horn	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)
Hostettler	Minge	Solomon
Houghton	Mink	Souder
Hoyer	Moakley	Spence
Hunter	Molinari	Spratt
Hutchinson	Mollohan	Stearns
Hyde	Montgomery	Stenholm
Inglis	Moorhead	Stockman
Istook	Morella	Studds
Jackson-Lee	Murtha	Stump
Jacobs	Myers	Talent
Johnson (CT)	Myrick	Tanner
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Tate
Johnson, Sam	Nethercutt	Tauzin
Johnston	Neumann	Taylor (MS)
Jones	Ney	Taylor (NC)
Kanjorski	Norwood	Tejeda
Kaptur	Nussle	Thomas
Kasich	Ortiz	Thompson
Kelly	Oxley	Thornberry
Kennelly	Packard	Thornton
Kildee	Parker	Thurman
Kim	Pastor	Tiahrt
King	Paxon	Torkildsen
Kingston	Payne (VA)	Torricelli
Klecza	Peterson (FL)	Trafficant
Klink	Petri	Upton
Klug	Pickett	Volkmer
Knollenberg	Pombo	Vucanovich
Kolbe	Porter	Walker
LaFalce	Portman	Walsh
LaHood	Poshard	Wamp
Largent	Pryce	Ward
Latham	Quillen	Watt (NC)
LaTourette	Quinn	Watts (OK)
Laughlin	Radanovich	Weldon (FL)
Lazio	Rahall	Weller
Leach	Ramstad	White
Levin	Reed	Whitfield
Lewis (CA)	Regula	Wicker
Lewis (GA)	Riggs	Williams
Lewis (KY)	Rivers	Wise
Lightfoot	Roberts	Wolf
Lincoln	Roemer	Woolsey
Linder	Rogers	Wynn
Lipinski	Rohrabacher	Yates
LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
Longley	Rose	Young (FL)
Lucas	Roth	Zeliff

Visclosky	Waxman	Wyden
Waters	Weldon (PA)	Zimmer
NOT VOTING—5		
McInnis	Velazquez	Wilson
Tucker	Waldholtz	

□ 1728

Messrs. NEAL of Massachusetts, JEFFERSON, and TOWNS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. ESHOO, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. YATES changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the first section of House Resolution 304, it is now in order to debate the subject of the deployment of Armed Forces in Bosnia.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

□ 1730

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have come to this point in our debate over United States policy on Bosnia because the Clinton administration has resolutely declined to provide the necessary leadership.

In this campaign for President, Mr. Clinton stated that he favored using military force, if necessary, to ensure that food and other relief supplies could reach the desperate people of Bosnia. After his election in November 1992, President Clinton followed the lead of the United Nations and our European allies.

During that period, a number of us in the Congress sought to ease the suffering of the Bosnian Moslems by repealing the arms embargo that put them at such a terrible disadvantage.

Our legislation would have permitted the equipping and training of the Bosnians so that they could defend themselves.

The Government of Bosnia pleaded with our Government to do just that, to lift the immoral arms embargo the United Nations imposed with our Government's support.

In meetings with the President, again and again we strongly urged lifting the arms embargo, but the President did not act because our NATO allies opposed it.

The best we could obtain was enactment of legislation late last year that required our Nation to stop enforcing the embargo against other countries.

Had the arms embargo been lifted, we would not now be confronted with sending our troops to enforce a peace plan that raises more questions than it has answered.

Hundreds of our troops are now in Bosnia even as we speak. Thousands more will soon follow. Short of passing a law to cut off funds—which the Senate has declined to do—and which the President would veto anyway—we cannot prevent this deployment.

The administration has yet to convince the American people that we have a vital national interest in Bosnia that warrants the possible sacrifice of American lives there.

The American people have registered their overwhelming opposition to sending our forces on a mission whose purposes remain murky, and whose outcome is uncertain.

As the House debates the measures before it today, we must consider how to balance our opposition to the policy of deploying our forces to Bosnia with our support for the men and women who are being ordered into a real-life Mission Impossible.

In his speech to the Nation, the President stated that providing more than 20,000 American ground troops for the NATO implementation force is vital for the Bosnian peace plan to succeed.

The President stated that our mission would have realistic goals achievable in a definite period of time—1 year.

While the President has specified a time frame, he has not spelled out the criteria for success, or our options if those criteria are not met. There is an exit date, but no exit strategy.

The peace plan is complex and complicated. It states that our main military task will be to separate the warring factions from the lines of confrontation, and keep them behind boundaries that will partition Bosnia into two entities. If the factions do not comply, our troops are authorized to forcibly remove them. How does this differ from fighting a war, which the President has assured us is not our objective?

Justice Richard Goldstone, the Chief Prosecutor of the War Crimes Tribunal, has told us that there can be no peace in Bosnia without justice for the victims of war crimes.

The peace plan describes an elaborate framework for investigating and assigning responsibility for human rights abuses, but is silent on how its findings will be enforced. Will our troops be called upon to bring the guilty to justice? If not, who will?

The President has argued that failure to keep his commitment to send troops to Bosnia will undermine future United States leadership and NATO's credibility.

But what will happen if, when the year is up and the President prepares to withdraw our troops, our NATO allies object, saying that the mission is incomplete? Do we stay, or go anyway?

NAYS—70

Andrews	Gejdenson	Owens
Baldacci	Gonzalez	Pallone
Becerra	Hall (OH)	Payne (NJ)
Brown (OH)	Harman	Pelosi
Bryant (TX)	Hefner	Peterson (MN)
Cardin	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Clay	Johnson (SD)	Rangel
Collins (IL)	Kennedy (MA)	Richardson
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Costello	Lantos	Sawyer
Coyne	Livingston	Schroeder
DeFazio	Lofgren	Schumer
Dellums	Lowe	Skaggs
Deutsch	McHale	Slaughter
Durbin	Meehan	Stark
Edwards	Miller (CA)	Stokes
Engel	Moran	Stupak
Fattah	Neal	Torres
Filner	Oberstar	Towns
Ford	Obey	Vento
Frank (MA)	Olver	
Furse	Orton	