United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 1999 No. 59

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We give thanks, O almighty God, for all those who find in their daily work the place to be of service and support to other people. On this day we are grateful for all those who see in public service the opportunity to do the works of justice and who use the abilities and gifts they have received in ways that contribute to the public good. O God, as You have called us to be Your witnesses in our responsibilities, so let us see how a cup of water to the thirsty, food for the hungry, shelter for the homeless can be ways that we help heal those who are hurting and be of benefit to all. In Your name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The SPEAKER. 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 348, nays 46, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—348

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vento
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu

NAYS—46

Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Clay
Clyburn
Costello
DeFazio
Filner
Ford
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hinchey
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Kennedy
Kucinich
LoBiondo
McDermott
McGovern

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

McNulty	Pickett	Talent
Meek (FL)	Ramstad	Thompson (CA)
Miller, George	Rothman	Thompson (MS)
Moran (KS)	Sabo	Visclosky
Oberstar	Schaffer	Waters
Olver	Stenholm	Weller
Pallone	Stupak	
Peterson (MN)	Sweeney	

NOT VOTING—39

Aderholt	English	Norwood
Archer	Fattah	Owens
Barton	Ganske	Rangel
Burton	Gordon	Salmon
Chenoweth	Hoyer	Sandlin
Coburn	Hyde	Slaughter
Cox	Kingston	Tauzin
Crane	Klink	Taylor (MS)
DeGette	Markey	Velazquez
Deutsch	Martinez	Whitfield
Dixon	McKinney	Wynn
Edwards	Meeks (NY)	Young (AK)
Engel	Moran (VA)	Young (FL)

□ 1024

Mr. DINGELL changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Today, April 28, I missed the vote on the Journal, the initial vote of the House. Although my pager was charged and turned on, it failed to function and I did not receive the announcement of the vote. My pager has been turned in for repair.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). Will the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THUNE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the tragic shooting at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 105 (adopted April 13, 1989), as amended by Senate Resolution 149 (adopted October 5, 1993), as amended by Public Law 105–275, and further amended by Senate Resolution 75 (adopted March 25, 1999), the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the appointment of the following Senators to serve as members of the Senate National Security Working Group—

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), Majority Administrative Cochairman;

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), Majority Cochairman;

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), Majority Cochairman;

The Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS);

The Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR);

The Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER);

The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE); and

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 101–509, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of Elizabeth Scott of South Dakota to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that he will entertain 1-minute speeches at the end of legislative business.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1569, H. CON. RES. 82, H. J. RES. 44, AND S. CON. RES. 21, MEASURES REGARDING U.S. MILITARY ACTION AGAINST YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 151 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 151

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 Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for one hour equally divided and controlled among the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committees on International Relations and Armed Services.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, it shall be in order without intervention of the question of consideration to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1569) to prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense from being used for the deployment of ground elements of the United States Armed Forces in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia unless that deployment is specifically authorized by law. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. After disposition of H.R. 1569, it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or the question of consideration to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 82) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces from their positions in connection with the present operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 4. After disposition of H. Con. Res. 82, it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or the question of consideration to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 44) declaring a state of war between the United States and the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. After disposition of H.J. Res. 44, it shall be in order on the same legislative day without intervention of the question of consideration to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) authorizing the President of the United States to conduct military air operations and missile strikes against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), if called up by Representative Gejdenson of Connecticut or his designee. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 6. The provisions of sections 6 and 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1545–46) shall not apply during the remainder of the One Hundred Sixth Congress to a measure introduced pursuant to section 5 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544) with respect to Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Dayton, Ohio (Mr. HALL) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded will be for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 151 provides for the consideration of four separate measures relating to the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces in the Republic of Yugoslavia, each under a closed amendment process with 1 hour of debate. The first measure made in order by the rule is H.R. 1569 which prohibits the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense from being used for the deployment of ground elements of the U.S. Armed Forces in Yugoslavia unless that deployment is authorized by law. Debate time on H.R. 1569 will be controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The next two resolutions made in order by the rule were introduced by my friend from Campbell, California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and reported unfavorably yesterday by the Committee on International Relations. Both resolutions, H. Con. Res. 82 and H.J. Res. 44, have a unique procedural status under the War Powers Resolution of 1973. Without this rule, both Campbell resolutions will become the pending business of the House today as a result of having been reported by the Committee on International Relations. Motions to proceed to consideration of the resolutions would be privileged, and the resolutions would not be subject to general debate but would be subject to an open but clearly unfocused amendment process.

As a result, this rule structures the consideration of these measures in accordance with the War Powers Resolution while providing for a full, fair and focused debate on the broader issues surrounding the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces in Yugoslavia.

Debate time on both of these resolutions will be controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

The fourth resolution, Mr. Speaker, that we make in order with this rule is S.Con.Res. 21, authorizing the President to conduct military air operations and missile strikes against Yugoslavia. This resolution may only be called up by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) or his designee. Debate time on S.Con.Res. 21 will be controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

Prior to consideration of these four measures, the rule provides for 1 hour of debate on measures relating to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, equally divided and controlled among the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Armed Services.

Finally, the rule provides that provisions of sections 6 and 7 of the War Powers Resolution shall not apply during the remainder of the 106th Congress to a measure introduced pursuant to section 5 of the War Powers Resolution with respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when Americans are engaged in armed conflict, the House of Representatives is invariably faced with important and very difficult questions. That is the responsibility handed to us by our Nation's forefathers when they crafted democracy's most enduring and enlightened document, our Constitution. Today is such a day. President Clinton has directed our Armed Forces to join our NATO allies in a battle against the forces of Yugoslavian dictator Slobodan Milosevic. It is a fight to preserve civilized society in a corner of Europe that has been wracked by atrocities, violence and Civil War on a scale unseen in Europe since the Second World War.

The United States is not the world's policeman. The American people know too well that we cannot intervene in every civil war. We cannot stop every act of brutality. We cannot keep the peace and protect democracy all on our own. But that is not what is going on today in the Balkans.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a cornerstone of the world's civilized and democratic nations, is engaged in military action in Yugoslavia. When the President, the Commander in Chief, made the decision a month ago that it was in our national interest to lead NATO in this effort, America became a full participant in that undertaking. Our pilots are risking their lives every single day.

Whether or not in hindsight that was the right decision is a question for presidential historians. This really is not about whether we agreed with the President at the time either. Today the overriding question is: What policy best protects and advances our national interests?

Article 2, Section 2 of the Constitution clearly and unequivocally establishes that the President is the Commander in Chief. The deployment and direction of the armed forces is his job. In fact, since my first day of service in this legislative body, it has been my view that the direction of our foreign policy and national security is the President's first and foremost responsibility. Everything else comes after that.

Although I have had some doubts about the President's original policy in Kosovo, I believe that the facts on the ground have overtaken those concerns. Now we must win. We must achieve the goals that the President set out to achieve when he committed our forces to battle. The price of failure is simply too great. American prestige and power, two of the most positive forces of good in the world today, must not be abandoned on the field of battle.

Mr. Speaker, vacillation and hesitancy in the face of this challenge to the leadership of the United States and NATO, a challenge undertaken by a gang of thugs in Belgrade and their brutal underlings in Kosovo will severely undermine our Nation's ability to stand up and defend clear American interests across the globe. If that happens, we lose. The American people lose. Freedom loses.

Mr. Speaker, as the House undertakes this important debate, I will focus on doing what is best for our national interests and for the American service men and women doing their jobs with bravery and commitment. First and foremost I believe that means opposing micromanagement of our foreign and military policy. We know we cannot engage in combat by committee. One of the most serious objections to the conduct of the Kosovo campaign thus far has been the fact that too many people, in particular too many political leaders, have been involved in this effort. I do not support adding to that problem. The President is constitutionally charged with leading and winning this campaign. He must do it, and we must stand behind him so that he can.

I urge support of this rule which provides for, as I said, a full, fair and very focused debate on the broader issues surrounding the introduction of U.S. armed forces in Yugoslavia.

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. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me the time. As my colleague from California has explained, this rule provides for the consideration of four different measures dealing with U.S. troops in Yugoslavia. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on International Relations and Armed Services. For each measure, this rule provides an additional hour of debate.

Under the rule, none of the measures may be amended on the House floor. Furthermore, the rule prohibits consideration of any other measure with respect to Yugoslavia brought up under the War Powers Act for the remainder of the 106th Congress.

The purpose of considering these four resolutions is to give Congress a role in the decisions affecting U.S. military actions against Yugoslavian President Milosevic and his reign of terror directed against the Albanians in the Yugoslavian province of Kosovo.

The rule was approved by the Committee on Rules late last night on a straight partisan vote with Democrats against it, and I strongly oppose the rule, and I ask for its defeat.

The first measure called up under the rule H.R. 1569 prohibits the use of funds for deploying ground troops in Yugoslavia without additional congressional authorization. This measure raises numerous legal and military questions. In a worst case scenario, this resolution would result in the Federal courts defining what operations are legal in Yugoslavia. The measure was only introduced yesterday, and it had no hearings and no committee consideration. If passed by the Congress, it would certainly face a presidential veto.

The second measure, House Concurrent Resolution 82, calls for the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops in Yugoslavia. On a bipartisan vote of 30 to 19 the Committee on International Relations recommended against passing the bill. The committee report said that this resolution would have severe consequences for U.S. national security and severe repercussions with the North Atlantic Alliance. It stands little chance of passage on the House

floor. Enactment of this measure would undermine the President, our military forces and destroy any hope that our air campaign against the Serbs would have a positive outcome.

The third measure, H.J. Resolution 44, declares war against Yugoslavia. The Committee on International Relations unanimously recommended against this resolution. The legislation is intended to clear up the legal question of whether or not the U.S. is at war. Unfortunately, this resolution does more harm than good at this point. In fact, the report of the Committee on International Relations warned it could actually strengthen Milosevic politically. This measure also does not stand any chance of surviving a presidential veto.

Lastly, the rule makes in order S. Con. Resolution 21 authorizing the President to conduct military air operations and missile strikes against Yugoslavia. This bill passed the Senate with bipartisan backing.

Considering a declaration of war is one of the most solemn duties of Congress under this Constitution. Only 11 times before in our Nation's history has Congress ever formally declared war. This rule mocks the dignity of that responsibility. What we have here is a grab bag of conflicting, contradicting and confusing resolutions about the war in Yugoslavia which stand little chance of enactment, and proceeding in this fashion is an embarrassment to the United States, to our President, to the men and women in our Armed Forces and to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, what would it say if none of these resolutions pass, or some of them pass, or if they all pass but are vetoed? The only signal that can possibly result from this rule is that our Nation is confused and hesitant. That certainly is not the message we want to send to our NATO allies, nor is it the signal we want to send to our troops.

□ 1045

It is not the signal we want to send to the American people. Indeed, Congress does have a role in going to war, but finding that role at the end of the 10th century in an era of modern warfare is difficult, and this rule does not find it.

Under the War Powers Act, both H. Con. Resolution 82 and H.J. Resolution 44 would be amendable on the House floor, but this rule prohibits amendments to all four resolutions.

Furthermore, the rule prohibits any further resolutions about Yugoslavia to be brought up in the 106th Congress under the expedited procedures of the War Powers Act. This is a terribly restrictive clause, that nullifies a key part of the War Powers Act. It reduces the ability of each House Member to participate in the decisions about this war.

At a hearing before the Committee on Rules yesterday, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the author of two of these resolutions before us today, urged the committee to remove this provision. The expedited procedures are everything, the gentleman said.

I appreciate the Republican Committee on Rules majority granting a full five hours of debate time to these measures. Still, the cause of democracy is not served by this restrictive rule. Under the War Powers Act, the House is required to consider H. Con. Resolution 82 and H.J. Resolution 44, so I have no issue with their consideration under the House rules. However, bundling these four measures together makes the House look weak and indecisive.

I agree with the backers of these bills that Congress should not, cannot, be left out of the loop on vital decisions of war, but this rule is a clumsy, ineffective way to participate. The only way to get our voice heard is through careful, deliberate and bipartisan measures.

The American people are hurting for leadership from Congress. They want us to work together. Painful experience with controversial issues in the recent past should have taught the House that bipartisanship is the only way to reach the American people.

This rule will not increase the role of Congress in the decision to make war. It will only further undermine our ability to be taken seriously. I urge the defeat of this rule.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from Newport News, Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN), one of the great champions of our Nation's national security.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this is certainly I suspect the most sorrowful day in my now 17 years in this body. It is a solemn day.

We are here because of the circumstances of what I think has been a very, very poor implementation of a national security policy, founded on good intentions, but run amuck in the execution and the failure to appreciate all of the consequences that would ensue from the way we sought the objectives, all of which we would endorse, but we are indeed here.

I am speaking in debate time on the rule; not so much in objection to its technical terms, but for the fact that it does not leave an alternative that I feel is logical and supportable given the incredible mess in which we find ourselves. But the one thing we cannot deny is the fact that we are in the mess.

I have urged for weeks that the president, our Commander in Chief, come to the Congress and lay out in whatever terms he chose in support of a resolution framed by the White House, to ask for the authorization of the actions and of the objectives that he was pursuing, with great intention and expectation on my part that I would have voted for them.

He has not chosen to do that. Yet I think very clearly it is incumbent upon the Congress as part of its obligation to the people who wear our uniform in the military that we let them know that the Congress has authorized what they are doing or what they may be asked to do and that we state the objectives pursuant to which they do it. None of the resolutions before us today do that.

I cannot possibly vote for either of the Campbell resolutions. I cannot vote for an alternative that says it is all right to continue, bomb, bomb, bomb, without restriction or reservation, but, my goodness gracious, we cannot possibly contemplate the use of ground forces, even though I think that is a bad idea. But it is an even worse idea, when no one is proposing to do it anyway, to announce to your potential enemy, your real enemy, you are not going to do it.

The reverse of that is what we do basically in the Senate joint resolution passed, you may recall, the day before the bombing began. It did not seem to me to be a good idea then. I do not think it has improved since.

There are things we need to say and we need to do. I think this rule ought to make in order something that, when in effect, enunciates on behalf of the Congress the kind of policies incorporated in the statement of the gentleman who chairs the Committee on Rules, which was a very eloquent statement of why we are involved, what the stakes are, and what we as a Nation ought to be doing together to see that our objectives prevail. I wish the rule and debate was going to make that possible.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), a very important member of the Committee on Rules and Chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. FROST. 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. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I simply would like to say to my friend that it does not prevent a Member from having an opportunity to offer a resolution. It simply moves under standard

procedures without going through the expedited process.

Mr. FROST. 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.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Surfside Beach, Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly to oppose the rule, and I do this hesitantly, because it is difficult to write fair rules and I generally support the rules. But today I have to oppose this rule, mainly because we are going to be debating war, a declaration of war, and a full hour is not adequate to debate an issue of that magnitude. I know there was an attempt to provide for a lot of debate today, but, for instance, on the one issue of declaration of war, only one hour was given; that is just not enough.

The other reason is that it does preclude a House Resolution coming up again under an expedited procedure. This is not right. This is undermining the whole purpose of the War Power Resolution of 1973, and we should not be doing this.

This is taking more authority away from the Congress and giving more authority to the President and to the administration and for us not to have a say. The whole issue of war should be decided here in this Congress, and we are here today because we have been negligent on assuming our responsibilities.

I saw this coming, and on February 9 of this year, I introduced a bill that would have prevented this whole problem by making certain that our President could not spend one penny on waging war in Kosovo. That is what we should have done. We have not, and now we are in this mess.

But we do not need to be once again taking more responsibility from the Congress and giving it to the President. We have a policy problem, we do not have a resolution problem. We have a foreign policy that endorses intervention any time, anyplace, assuming that our Presidents know when to insert troops around the world. That is our basic problem. Until we in the Congress take it upon ourselves to assume our responsibility with the issue of war, this problem will continue.

So I applaud the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for bringing these resolutions to the floor, but, unfortunately, I cannot support this rule today as written.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), a very distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, some of us stood in this chamber 8 years ago when President Bush called on the Congress to support his military plans in the Persian Gulf. I was one of those Democrats who strongly supported the President at that time. But I recall, Mr. Speaker, that we were given 16 hours of debate, 16 hours of debate, on one single resolution. Every Member of this body had full opportunity to speak his mind. We now have four conflicting, contradictory, mutually exclusive resolutions, with each of them given one hour of debate.

With all due respect, I think this is an outrage. This will be one of the most significant issues this Congress will debate in this session or for many sessions to come, and I strongly call on my colleagues to defeat this rule. This is a rule which is giving us 30 minutes on each side to decide on war or peace, which is an absurdity, and it is not worthy of this body.

This past weekend, Mr. Speaker, my distinguished Republican colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and I represented this body at the NATO summit.

□ 1100

Nineteen countries devoted 2 full days to discussing the plans for the future. It is unconscionable that the Congress of the United States should be denied the opportunity to seriously discuss issues of war and peace. The President has just asked for the call-up of some 33,000 reservists. We have a major military engagement, and this body and the country are entitled to a full airing of all of the issues involved in this.

I trust that my colleagues will see fit to turn down this rule. It is poorly crafted. It is a gag rule. It allows not a single amendment, and it gives over 200 Republicans and over 200 Democrats 30 minutes to discuss each of these issues. This is simply unacceptable, and I earnestly call on the majority to rethink this restrictive, un-American rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Knoxville, Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule because it is a fair rule and it allows all views to be heard and will allow far more than 30 minutes that the previous speaker mentioned. We will be debating this for many hours to come today, and on into tonight.

However, I rise in strong opposition to this war in the Balkans. First of all, as our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has pointed out, it is an unconstitutional war because Congress has not and, I assume, will not declare war against Yugoslavia. Secondly, we have made the situation in Kosovo many times worse by our bombings and we cannot hide behind NATO because NATO would never have gone in there if the U.S. had not wanted it done. Ninety percent of the bombings have been paid for and done by the U.S. In fact, if the President is going to send in ground troops, as many people think, let the European members of NATO send them in. We have carried almost the entire financial and air war burden thus far and we

should not have to carry the ground war burden too.

If we get further into this mess by sending in ground troops, there are estimates that ultimately we will spend $40 billion to $50 billion in air and ground war costs and resettlement and reconstruction costs, money that will have to come from Social Security and many other valuable programs.

Pat Holt, a foreign affairs expert writing in the Christian Science Monitor wrote a few days ago, ''The first few days of bombing have led to more atrocities and to more refugees. It will be increasing the instability which the bombing was supposed to prevent.''

Richard Cohen, the very liberal columnist for The Washington Post wrote, ''I believe, though, that the NATO bombings have escalated and accelerated the process. For some Kosovars, NATO has made things worse.''

Philip Gourevitch, writing in the April 12 New Yorker Magazine said, ''Yet so far the air war against Yugoslavia has accomplished exactly what the American-led alliance flew into combat to prevent: Our bombs unified the Serbs in Yugoslavia, as never before, behind the defiance of Milosevic; they spurred to a frenzy the 'cleansing' of Kosovo's ethnic Albanians by Milosevic's forces'', and on and on.

A.M. Rosenthal writing in The New York Times a few days ago asked this question: ''Would we again bomb, bomb, bomb the capital of the Serbs, who thought of themselves as far more our friends than his,'' meaning Milosevic. ''So far this has produced three major results: humiliating Serbs forever, turning friendship into enmity, and persuading many to rally around a man they detest and fear.''

All we have done, Mr. Speaker, is turn friends into enemies and waste billions and billions of dollars. We have gone into an area where there is absolutely no threat to our national security and no vital U.S. interest, and we should negotiate a settlement and get out of there as soon as we possibly can.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the former chairman and now ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to object to the part of the rule that turns off the action-forcing elements of the War Powers Act.

Today, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) is using the War Powers Act to force the House to debate and vote on two resolutions. The first is the concurrent resolution to withdraw the troops from Yugoslavia, and the second is a joint resolution to declare war on Yugoslavia.

But after today, Mr. Speaker, no other Member will have that right. If this rule is adopted, no matter whatever else may happen in Yugoslavia, no matter how much the situation there may change, no other Member will be able to bring this issue for a vote.

In the Committee on Rules last night, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) himself complained about this rule and he said, and I agreed, that ''the War Powers Act is there so that any Member of the House can request the House to take action against the war.''

Mr. Speaker, this resolution prevents the average Member from exercising their war powers rights for the remainder of this Congress. This Congress has just started. The war has just started. A great deal may happen over the next 20 months, and nothing, nothing should be taken off the table.

My colleagues might compare this to the rule in 1991 on Somalia. On that rule, the House turned off the War Powers Act only with respect to concurrent resolutions of withdrawal and only for a period of 2 weeks. We turned it off for only a period of 2 weeks. That rule retained Members' ability to introduce privileged resolutions declaring war, and it also reinstated the war powers for the second session of that Congress which was scheduled to start in 2 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, there is no comparison. We did it for 2 weeks, for a limited number of resolutions. My Republican colleagues today are doing it for 20 months, 20 months, for all resolutions. This is a very dangerous situation, to tie Congress's hands in the matter of war, and I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Dallas (Mr. SESSIONS), a very able member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule today, and I want to extend my appreciation to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for his forthright and honest War Powers Resolution Act that he is bringing up.

The purpose of the War Powers Resolution is to ensure that the collective judgment of both the Congress and the President will apply to the introduction of United States armed forces into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in the hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, and to the continued use of such forces and hostilities or in such circumstances.

What we are talking about today is a rule that would allow us the opportunity to bring forth the debate and the discussion about foreign policy and the use of troops in a foreign country. Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about is the use of ground forces that would be engaged in war, the debate about the probability and possibility that U.S. lives would be lost overseas. We intend to utilize this time to discuss not only our foreign policy, but what we intend to engage in and be involved in overseas.

I am opposed to us being in Kosovo. I am opposed to the war being escalated and us not seeking a peaceful resolution. This is why a debate is so important. Obviously, the other side does not want to have this debate. Obviously, the President feels like that he does not even need to fall within the confines of this law. The bottom line is that what we are discussing is that which democracy brings about, which the laws of this country have brought about, and I believe that it is important for us to do this.

Previous Presidents have submitted 72 prior reports on the War Powers Resolution. President Ford, 4; President Carter, 1; President Reagan, 14; President Bush, 7; and President Clinton, 46 times has asked for these types of powers. It is time that we openly engage in the debate.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, among the duties of a Member of Congress, there is nothing more serious than the issues of war and peace; committing the wealth and the might of our Nation, putting the members of our armed forces in harm's way. Before we went to war with Iraq, we debated around the clock. Every Member of this body who so wished was allowed to come to the floor and debate and discuss the issues of conscience and war and peace.

Today promises a pathetic, pale and perverted version of that grand debate. Four contradictory resolutions, 1 hour each. Vote on a declaration of war, 13 seconds per Member of Congress, if it is equally apportioned. Vote on immediate withdrawal, 13 seconds per Member.

Is the press of business on this body so heavy that we cannot allocate more time, or are the leaders on the other side afraid of a full and fair debate? Yesterday, the House adjourned at 4:30 in the afternoon. Tonight, after exhausting ourselves in this debate, we will leave at 7 p.m. What is more important to the other side, fund-raisers, or issues of war and peace fully and fairly debated?

Fair debate? No amendments will be allowed from the floor of the House of Representatives. And, we are only having this debate today because of the War Powers Act and its expedited procedures. They have to have a debate, although they are trying to pervert it in different ways, but after today, no further votes will be allowed.

This is an outrageous abdication of our duties as Members of Congress. Vote ''no'' on this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Atlanta, Georgia (Mr. LINDER), my very good friend and a very able and hard-working member of the Committee on Rules and chairman of the Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, this is the right time to have this debate. I too wish it would be longer, but this body needs to be heard on this issue.

I served in the Air Force during the Vietnam War. At that point we had one

nation trying to overtake another nation, and this country thought it was worth the effort to stop it. After 10 years and 58,000 American lives, this body stopped the Vietnam War on a rider on an appropriation bill.

We now have a dispute in the Balkans, and it is not one nation against another. There are two bad actors in this. Last year, 2,000 people died in this area. Not nearly as many deaths as those that died in Sierra Leone in January of this year alone, but of the 2,000 that died, nearly a third were Serbs and two-thirds were Kosovars.

There are two bad actors in this war. I do not know why we are there. If we are there, why are we not in the Sierra Leone or the Sudan where in 10 years, 2 million people were exterminated in ethnic cleansing? I do not understand our end game, if there is one, and I do not know what victory is. But this body ought to say no. This body ought to say enough of the adventurism. We are the only institution that can declare war, and this administration has admitted that it is at war. This body ought to be heard.

I think the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) is doing exactly the right thing to raise precisely the right issue, and I hope that this body will pass this rule. I too hope that we will strike section 6; I supported the gentleman from Massachusetts last night in his effort to do so. I think that is a mistake. But after we strike that, I hope we will pass this rule and be heard on this issue. It is exactly the right thing to do.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCNULTY).

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I only have a minute, so let me get right to the point. I oppose this closed rule, I oppose the declaration of war and the use of U.S. ground forces, and I oppose the motion to withdraw from our efforts to liberate Kosovo.

Mr. Speaker, when one says what one is against, one ought to stand up and say what one is for. I support the current air campaign, which is already weakening Milosevic's military capability, and I support arming the KLA so that we have a ground operation composed of individuals who actually know the terrain.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this closed rule, oppose both Campbell resolutions, and support the continuation of the air campaign, coupled with the creation of a more effective KLA ground force.

□ 1115

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed by the tragedy taking place in Yugoslavia. I urgently call on all parties to this conflict, including the United Nations and the Russians, to seek a negotiated settlement to this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I do not relish breaking with my President, particularly when matters of war and peace are being debated. But in my opinion on this issue, this administration is headed in the wrong direction.

The Clinton administration would have us believe that there are only two alternatives in this crisis, either do nothing or bomb. That premise is false. In following it, President Clinton has taken us on the slippery slope towards war.

Our bombing started in Kosovo and has now thoroughly saturated Serbia and Kosovo. It triggered a dramatic increase in the refugee crisis and violence against the Kosovar Albanians. We have killed many innocent civilians, both Serb and Albanian. In addition, the Yugoslav democracy movement has been a casualty, as has been the peaceful Albanian Kosovar resistence to Milosevic's tribal fanaticism.

Another unfortunate casualty in this episode has been U.S. respect for international law. The administration sidestepped the United Nations and flouted international law.

Mr. Speaker, my gut check on this issue is personal. I am a mother. The question I have asked myself is am I willing to sacrifice the life of my son to follow this administration's policies in Kosovo. It is very clear that the administration has backed itself into a corner, and now wants to take all of us there with it.

As for the Rambouillet agreement, I do not hear the administration even mentioning it anymore. For a peace agreement worth bombing for, it has had an amazingly short shelf life. So from Rambouillet implementation to Milosevic's removal to the return of the Kosovars to Kosovo, the goalposts keep shifting. How can we know if we have won if we do not know what we are fighting for?

The objective first touted was autonomy for the Kosovars, and now we find ourselves allied with the KLA. So while our rhetoric remains the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia, our actions promote a secessionist movement along ethnic lines in the heart of Europe.

Smart bombs are only smart when they back up smart policy. This is the wrong policy for too many reasons.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, limiting debate and blocking all amendments on this question of life and death is all too typical of this House Republican leadership. They would convert the War Powers Act to the ''In War, Powerless Act.'' Through its previous inaction, this House has largely abrogated its responsibility to approve this Nation's involvement in foreign conflicts. Today's action will only prolong that irresponsibility.

As a few of us indicated in letters to the President in August and in October of last year, and again on February 19 of this year, authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), there should have been no military action in the Balkans, not bombing, not troops, not any military action until this Congress had given it approval.

The Constitution prescribes that no president should commit the lives of our youth and the billions of our taxpayers' dollars in nonemergency situations like this without involvement of the American people, through their representatives in this House.

While NATO raids Belgrade, the same Republican leadership proposes to raid the United States' Treasury. They are determined to divert billions of dollars to purposes that have little or nothing to do with Kosovo. They are using Kosovo as an excuse to subvert the budget limits or caps that helped bring us a balanced budget, and which only months ago they swore to uphold.

Yet now that this conflict is underway, it would be folly not to consider the facts on the ground. Milosevic is a war criminal, who is committing genocide. No doubt he and his thugs are watching these proceedings as they unfold today in Washington. We ought not to send the wrong message to him or to the other petty tyrants from Iraq to North Korea who may be watching these proceedings.

What is wrong, further, with this rule, however, is that it denies us the opportunity to invoke the War Powers Act in the future, as we may well need to do. This rule is outrageous. It ought to be rejected firmly.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the war powers resolution. It provides for congressional action in committing and maintaining our men and women in harm's way. I oppose this rule because it compromises the ability of Congress to exercise its responsibility under the war powers resolution.

I believe it is appropriate for this body to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 21. It supports the President's decision to join NATO in air strikes. I will support that resolution, considering the atrocities being committed by Mr. Milosevic.

For many reasons, I have serious concerns about ground troops. If the President believes it is necessary to use ground troops, I believe he must come to Congress in compliance with the war powers resolution. H.R. 1569 by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) goes well beyond the war powers resolution. It compromises the safety of our military operation. I will oppose H.R. 1569.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, if this rule passes and permits the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, then Congress will have, in effect, declared war and permitted both bombing and ground troops, all in one.

Let me explain how. The Senate passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, which authorizes bombing. In Dellums versus Bush, the court case against the Iraq war, Judge Green wrote in his opinion that Congress has the sole power to authorize the use of U.S. forces overseas, where the lives of our men and women would be put in danger.

The President, at the very least, in order to be in accordance with the Constitution, needs a resolution passed by both Houses that authorizes him to use force. He does not need a declaration of war to proceed with the war.

Therefore, if the House joins the Senate in Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, it meets the constitutional test of both Houses, and the President is authorized to send ground troops and to prosecute the war.

Some say we must win the war. I believe we must win the peace. Some people believe that only military action can bring about peace. I believe that only diplomatic initiatives and constant negotiations can bring about peace. Some believe we need to teach the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia a lesson by bombing their Nation to rubble. I believe that violence is not redemptive but it breeds more violence, and places the hope of resolution far beyond the horizon of peace.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule for four reasons.

First of all, it limits the debate to 30 minutes on each side on something as momentous as this. Contrast that with the Persian Gulf debate. We debated all day, late into the night, all of the next day before we finally came to a vote.

Secondly, it makes in order four measures. One, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) is a flawed product. It needs to be amended and changed considerably. It has already been amended since it was reported. It will be unamendable when it comes to the floor.

What is missing among these four is something truly bipartisan. When we had the Persian Gulf debate we had a bipartisan resolution, Michels-Solarz-McCurdy. I joined and voted for it. But we do not have an option like this, or even the opportunity for crafting one here.

Finally, it crowns these four choices, four bad choices, three bad choices, with an exceptional, unprecedented declaration overriding statutory law and saying if there are any more measures like this to come up this year, they will not be entitled to the expedited procedure that the War Powers Act, a black letter law, provides them.

This is no way to deal with something as important as war. This rule should be voted down.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a very distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

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

I note with regret that the President, who once pledged to the world that no American ground troops would be deployed, now refuses to pledge to seek congressional approval before such a massive deployment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule because the last paragraph of it nullifies the War Powers Act until the end of this century, and the War Powers Act is a tool we may need to influence policy.

There are those who argue against any congressional involvement in the grave decision that lies ahead. They say that our enemies will tremble in fear if one man, without congressional approval, can deploy 100,000 American soldiers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I tremble in fear and the Founders of this Republic would tremble in fear if they thought that one man, without congressional approval, could send 100,000 of our men and women into battle.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, in 1968 to 1970 I was a physician in the Vietnam War and dealt with the casualties from that war. That war was started on this floor by a voice vote.

If we think about the fact that we committed 500,000 people, 50,000 of whom are dead and on a memorial not very far from this building, on the basis of a voice vote, it seems to me that the United States Congress can spend more than 1 hour deciding whether or not we are going to go into this issue.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had a debate for a few minutes and got out of here at 4 o'clock. Last week we came back here. One day we gave a gold medal to Rosa Parks. That is all we did that day. What have we got on our calendar that prevents us from spending the time to give the Members of this House the opportunity to speak about something, where we are potentially sending our young men and women to die?

I think this rule should be defeated.

□ 1130

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the acting chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding this time to me. I was asked to speak on the strategy of why these issues have come forward. I have told the acting chairman of the Committee on Rules that if I spoke I would speak on the rule as well, so it is with his permission that I say I object strongly to section 6. I went to the Committee on Rules last night and said that we should not cut off the opportunity of other Members to make use of the War Powers Resolution.

I am an average Member of the Congress. I am not a senior Member, I am not in any leadership position, I am not a chairman, yet I have the rights simply granted me under the War Powers Resolution, which are remarkably important. I do not know of any other statute that provides that right. It is a right that a Member of Congress can come to the floor and require other Members of Congress to vote on the record, up or down, when the question is war. That is what we will be doing today, whether under this rule or otherwise.

The purpose is to fulfill the constitutional obligation. Are we at war? Yes, we are at war. There are only the worst possible arguments to say that we are not at war. We have a President who has designated combat pay for our soldiers. We have the Secretary of Defense who has said we are in hostilities. We have the Secretary of State who has said we are in conflict and her designee who said we are in armed conflict. We have the Deputy Secretary of State who has said that Serbia would be within its rights to consider a bombing of Kosovo to be an act of war. We have all the reasons common sense gives to suggest that this is indeed war.

Secondly, we are on the verge of ground troops. I do not think anybody today should be mistaken about that.

In our Committee on International Relations I asked the Secretary of State whether she thought that the approval of Congress was needed to prosecute the war, and she said no, she did not think so. And the ranking member of the Democrats in the Committee on International Relations yesterday stated that that even included ground troops.

Let me emphasize that. It was the position of the ranking member of the Democratic Party in the Committee on International Relations that even for ground troops there was no need for Congress to give authority.

Well, I am sorry, that is contrary to the Constitution. The Framers were quite clear that war was too important to be commenced by the action of one single individual. Those are the words of Alexander Hamilton and also of representatives at the Constitutional Convention.

Are ground troops imminent? All one can do is look at the newspapers from this weekend and see the headlines that were prepared. In particular I refer to the Washington Post: ''Clinton Joins Allies on Ground Troops'', and the Wall Street Journal: ''Clinton Edges Closer to Backing the Use of Ground Troops''. The quotations from the articles under those headlines, which I will be distributing to my colleagues on the floor or make available, are quite clear that ground troops are very seriously being considered.

If ground troops are introduced and Congress has not acted, we all know what will happen. The argument will be, how can we do anything that might possibly undercut American troops while they are on the ground in operation? So the moment is now. The moment was earlier, actually, before the bombing started, but no one can be surprised if the ground war starts.

So those are the two premises. Number one, we are at war; and, number two, it is distinctly possible that the bombing will move into ground war. And, therefore, we must vote. My own view is that we should vote to withdraw the troops. My own view could be in error. I understand people of good will feel differently, but my view is that this is a civil war, and that if our purpose is to help the Albanian Kosovars, we have not succeeded. Milosevic has done the harm. He is the tyrant, he is the one at fault, but it is a fact that the Albanian Kosovars are worse off after our bombing has commenced than they were before. That is simply a fact. I wish it were not so.

And if ground troops go in, and they must, even if Milosevic signs the Rambouillet Agreement this afternoon, what Albanian Kosovar will go back into Kosovo without the protection of ground troops? Thus, ground troops are the option, slugging their way through Kosovo, either because the Serbian army is resisting or taking up positions in Kosovo because the Rambouillet Agreement still requires that placement of ground troops.

And as to those options, I put to all of my colleagues that we have the question of lives and the question of money. Lives will be saved if we do not commence a ground war. I am speaking of NATO lives, American lives, Serbian lives and Kosovar lives.

And, lastly, regarding money, we are bombing bridges that we will be asked to rebuild tomorrow. Please mark my words. My colleagues know that. We all know we are going to be asked to appropriate taxpayers' money to rebuild the very buildings that today we destroy. We can, for the same amount of money or less, help the Albanian refugees right now immensely better where they are, in Albania and Macedonia.

As for Milosevic, he should be denounced to the International War Crimes Tribunal. If he leaves his country, he will be subject to arrest, as has happened to Augusto Pinochet as he has tried to go around the world. And the time will come when there will be a change in government in Yugoslavia. But by putting in ground troops to force that change, it will cost innocent lives, and it will cost more economically than helping the Albanian refugees where they are now.

So the options today are to declare war, which is what it is, to be honest under our Constitution, and thereby empower the President to carry on war, which is our constitutional right. After we declare war, then the President can conduct it. That is his constitutional right.

I am very wary of the Congress telling the President, well, it is war, but now we want to overview every step of the war. No—if it is war, we declare it and then the President conducts it. But if it is something the American people do not wish to become engaged in, this is the moment to say no, this is the moment to remove the troops, and this is the moment to help the Albanian Kosovars where they are. Mr. Speaker, the choices are obvious.

I want to conclude by offering my thanks to the Speaker of the House particularly for his graciousness and consideration, and to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), for the same and allowing these two resolutions to come forward.

Shall we be at war? Then vote to declare war. That is what the Constitution says. If we say no, then vote to withdraw troops, bring them home, and start the humanitarian assistance for those refugees where they are. I suggest the second is the better option.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just advise my colleagues that I am going to close on this myself, and I will do so informing the House that I intend to offer an amendment to the rule which will strike section 6 in the rule itself.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FROST. Since we are amending the rule on the floor, would the gentleman also consider amending the rule to extend general debate time?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that I do not intend to offer an amendment to do that. With this hour we have a total of 6 hours that have been included for the debate.

We all know this is a very important, a very serious, a very grave issue, and I think 6 hours of debate is an appropriate amount of time for this. So it is my intention, following the concern that was raised by my friend from Dallas and many others, to offer an amendment to the rule which will strike section 6.

Mr. FROST. If the gentleman will continue to yield just briefly, those of us on this side raised several concerns, not just about section 6 but also about the debate time. I think it is unfortunate that the gentleman would not agree to amend the rule to also extend the debate time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for accepting the fact that I am going to offer an amendment to strike section 6.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, let me state at the outset that I appreciate the chairman of the committee for announcing his amendment to strike section 6. I thought that was among the worst things about this rule. After the eloquent statement by the other gentleman from California, which I do not agree with at this point in time, to say to the House and to the country that the House will have one opportunity and one opportunity only to address the War Powers Act and only one Member will get that opportunity, I think would have set a very bad precedent.

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

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify again that that is not what section 6 said. What would happen, if section 6 were to have been included, it would have meant that it would have gone through the leadership structure and the only change that would have been made is we would not have proceeded with the expedited process. So it would have not have been a one-time-only thing.

Mr. BENTSEN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, again, I commend the gentleman for agreeing to make that change. Perhaps that sets a precedent for more fair rules going forward in the remainder of the 106th Congress.

I think it is also a mistake that we are spending such little time to debate this issue. This is a very critical issue for the Nation, and I am afraid that this underscores the way this House is going to operate on issues that should be addressed in a bipartisan manner. I would encourage my colleagues to oppose this rule even as amended.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to this rule, which will govern our debate over the situation in Kosovo today.

Under the terms of this rule, we will be debating four measures, each for only one hour. This means that each side will only receive but 30 minutes to make known their concerns, just slightly more than is allowed for a bill on the suspension calendar. These measures are of precious importance to our troops, and to our national security, and we should have ample time to debate them.

Furthermore, the timing for the debate on these bills is poor. Like many other conflicts, the factual circumstances are fluid, and require our flexibility if we are to be effective. We should not be pigeonholing our position and threatening the safety of our troops.

Neither NATO nor the United States believes that a state of war exists in the current conflict in the Balkan region. The President has not requested that Congress issue a declaration of war. I believe that a declaration of war would be entirely counterproductive as a matter of policy and is unnecessary as a matter of law. Yet we stand to debate this measure today.

On only five occasions in the United States history and never since the end of World War II has the Congress declared war, reflecting the extraordinary nature of, and implications attendant on, such a declaration. Yet it seems Congress is willing to do that today. While we are not at war with either the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or its people, Slobodan Milosevic should not doubt the determination of NATO to see the stability of Europe reasserted. Yet, with this debate today, we show Milosevic weakness. With resolve NATO can attain a durable peace that prevents further repression and provides for democratic self-government for the Kosovar people. Yet, with our votes today, we send mixed signals to our trusted allies.

As it stands, I must question the genuineness of at least three of the measures we will be debating today. That is especially true because we will see Committee leadership bringing a resolution to the floor that they will be voting against. Those at home watching this debate on television will undoubtedly see through this charade, and know that what transpires here today will be less about the importance of our mission in Kosovo, less about ending human suffering, and more about partisan politics and taking shots at the White House.

What we should be debating here today, and acknowledging, is the suffering that is taking place in the Balkans. We should be doing something to help the refugees who have been cast out of their homes, and their homeland, by a tyrant. We should be debating how we can bring stability to this region, and appropriating funds to help thousands of innocent children eat. We should be passing resolutions of support for our brave troops.

Instead we stand here today, using the floor of the House of Representatives, to play tired, partisan politics. I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule, and to bring to the floor meaningful debate that can help save lives in Kosovo.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and would simply say that there is nothing more powerful than when this body speaks with one voice, and the only way to get our voice heard is, I think, through careful, deliberate and bipartisan measures.

I believe that the American people want us to work together. They believe, I think, that we are hurting for leadership here in the Congress, particularly on issues like this. It is not that the issues that we are debating are not important. They are important, each and every one of them, and the vote we will take on them, but the way we are packaging this makes it look like we are frivolous.

This rule will not increase the role of Congress in the decisions to make war, it will only further undermine our ability to be taken seriously. The rule, in my opinion, is not the way to go.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I rise in strong support of this rule.

I am going to move that we strike section 6, but before I do that, let me make a couple of comments about this rule and the procedure around which it was considered.

For starters, we had a request that came from the minority that we extend by an hour the debate. We agreed to that. We are allowing the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), under this rule, to call up or not call up a freestanding bill, which I believe, if it is not unprecedented, it certainly is unusual. We have also agreed to the requests that have been made by Members on both sides of the aisle to address this section 6 question.

I should say that the section 6 which was included in the bill was not an idea of Republicans. As has been pointed out by some, in 1993 when the resolution on Somalia was considered, it was a proposal that the majority, the Democratic majority at that time, offered. We were simply following along the line with that. But from discussions that have been held, we are going to move to strike section 6.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DREIER: Strike Section 6.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I know we are rapidly approaching a vote. I think we have very clearly explained it.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment I just offered and the resolution itself.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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 that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that 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 213, nays 210, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—213

Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)

Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—210

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt
Archer
Barr
Callahan
Coburn
Cooksey
Engel
Moran (VA)
Slaughter
Tauzin
Wynn

□ 1220

Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. MEEKS of New York changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. HORN changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 99, on April 28, 1999, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN AND AROUND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Pursuant to House Resolution 151, it is now in order to debate the deployment of United States armed forces in and around the territory of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

The gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and an honor to begin this debate today, and I believe that it is an important one. There is no way for me in 1 minute to lay out all of the factors to take into consideration here, but let me just make two observations at the beginning of this debate.

We have a duty and a responsibility as a Congress to be heard on the issues before us. As a Nation, we must face the fact that this is not over and may not be over for some time and that we will be dealing with the consequences of American actions in the Balkans for the next decade at least. Our relationships with NATO, United States' relationships with Russia, NATO's relationships with Russia, the problem of the refugees, the pressure for a greater Albania with claims to Macedonia and Greece, all of these things we will have to deal with as a consequence of American actions, and they will be influenced by the decisions and the votes that we take today.

We cannot and should not avoid this discussion on the merits. That is our responsibility as elected representatives from the districts that we have come here to serve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) will control the time of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, we are here with one single primary purpose, and that purpose is to stop the murder in Kosovo. Mr. Milosevic continues to kill innocent civilians and tries to chase the rest away.

This country has led the world, sometimes single-handedly, in military actions in Korea and Vietnam, in Panama, in Lebanon, in Grenada and in Kuwait. In Nicaragua, we armed people to fight themselves because we were worried about the economic and political system that would end up in Nicaragua. We fought to stop communism. Some people say we fought in Kuwait to protect our oil reserves.

Here, Mr. Speaker, it is much simpler. We have a brutal dictator who is murdering innocent people and chasing the rest off the land. How do we stop this murder? That is our goal.

We cannot use the argument that as a country, we failed to act elsewhere. Yes, there have been other tragedies in recent years, and to my regret we either did not have the assets or the inclination to respond. In Rwanda, in Cambodia, in countless other places the world should have responded.

One advantage we possess here is that we have NATO; we have NATO united, that has been trained and operational together for decades. And this is not the United States as the Lone Ranger. How many times have we bemoaned the fact that America alone is left with this responsibility? This is the United States and it is other NATO partners together on a goal to stop murder.

Do not blame NATO for the acceleration or the deaths in Kosovo. I have said it before: As the American troops headed towards the concentration camps, the Nazis increased their production rate. They killed more people. We cannot use that as an argument for not going after them. Milosevic would have been happy to kill these people at a lower percentage, try to chase them out more slowly if he was not threatened.

We are going to have an amendment here that lets the Congress decide tactics. How many years did we hear about Lyndon Johnson picking targets in the White House? Now we are going to have 535 Members of Congress determine the tactics in the battlefield. Whatever my colleagues' debate is on war powers, I think most people understand that is bad policy.

I look around this Chamber, as I did yesterday in committee, and I have seen virtually every Member here at a Holocaust memorial. I have seen them come for a day of remembrance about the Armenian genocide. I have heard speeches by my colleagues here condemning our inaction in Rwanda. And now what are we going to do here in Kosovo?

We will make a decision whether we simply repeat history so we can have one more day with the Speaker's approval in the Rotunda, bemoaning the

death and destruction of the Kosovar Albanians, or we will try to take an action united with our other NATO partners that will put this murder to an end. The Constitution gives us the prerogative to take action. It does not demand that we vote on the first three proposals in the affirmative. We, the independent Congress, can make the choice of what statement we want to make here today.

Do not let process get in the way of policy. We can follow process. We can reject both proposals of the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), we can reject the proposal of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), and we can vote for a proposal that authorizes, as the Senate language does, the present action be consistent with the Constitution and war powers.

□ 1230

At the end of this debate, at the end of this conflict, I do not want to come here in this chamber to remember one more group of victims and to bemoan the inaction of our generation. We fought again in other places to fight theoretical battles about communism and what have you. Here we are talking about simple murder. Let us join together to put an end to Mr. Milosevic's attacks on the Kosovar Albanians.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support today of H.R. 1569. Given the current ongoing military operations and the fact that the American men and women of our Armed Forces have their lives on the line, I do not think that now is the time to have a constitutional showdown on the War Powers Act.

We had an opportunity to repeal the War Powers Act in 1995 and the administration, despite the urging of several former presidents, failed to support the effort to end this legal obstacle. I believe that the War Powers Act is indeed unconstitutional, but today the debate is on Kosovo and the policy of our pursuing military operations against Yugoslavia.

I continue to be extremely concerned about the current military operations in the Balkans and the obvious lack of long-term goals and objectives. We were initially told that our military objectives were to deter Serbian attacks against the people of Kosovo and to reduce their ability to pursue offensive operations in Kosovo. Two weeks ago we were told that our objective was to remove all Serbian troops from Kosovo, a political moving target. After five weeks of bombing targets, which have been limited by politicians, Serbian forces have created a humanitarian crisis where over 1 million refugees have now retreated from Kosovo, and, in fact, have dug in along the Kosovo border.

In 1995, the President said that we would send troops to keep peace in Bosnia for a year. We are four years later and we still have 6,000 American soldiers serving in Bosnia, with no end in sight.

Where are we headed in Kosovo? We still do not have a clear, well-defined mission or strategy for what we are pursuing in the Balkans. There may be conceivably some point in time at which I would very reluctantly support the use of overwhelming force, including ground troops, to ensure that the United States is victorious in this military engagement. Dictators around the word must know that when America becomes involved, we intend to win.

The President must show leadership and define our mission and the end game strategy, clarify our objectives and provide the resources required to ensure victory. We must know when we have achieved success and how we measure our progress.

Our military is already overextended and underfunded, and we are fighting a war without a clearly defined objective. Mr. Speaker, we cannot win that. We need leadership. We need to support H.R. 1569.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Ms. FOWLER's bill to prohibit the deployment of ground troops in Yugoslavia unless specifically authorized by Congress.

Given the current ongoing military operations and the fact that the American men and women of our Armed Forces have their lives on the line, I do not think that this is the time to have a constitutional showdown on the War Powers Act. We had an opportunity to repeal the War Powers Act in 1995 and the administration, despite the urging of several former Presidents, failed to support the effort to end this legal obstacle. I believe that the War Powers Act is indeed unconstitutional, but the debate today is on Kosovo and the policy of pursuing military operations against Yugoslavia.

I continue to be extremely concerned about the current military operations in the Balkans and the obvious lack of long term goals and objectives. We were initially told that the military objectives were to deter Serbian attacks against the people of Kosovo and to reduce the ability of the Serbian military to pursue offensive operations in Kosovo. Two weeks ago we were told that our objective was to remove all Serbian troops from Kosovo. However, after five weeks of bombing targets which have been limited by politicians, Serbian forces have created a humanitarian crisis with over a million refugees, have not retreated from Kosovo, and in fact have dug in along the Kosovo border.

In 1995, the President said that we would send troops to keep the peace in Bosnia for a year. Here we are almost 4 years later with 6,000 American soldiers serving in Bosnia with no end in sight. Where are we headed in Kosovo? We still do not have a clear well-defined mission or strategy for what we are pursuing in the Balkans.

There may conceivably be a point at which I would very reluctantly support the use of overwhelming force, including ground troops, to ensure that the United States is victorious in this military engagement. Dictators around the world must know that when America becomes involved, we intend to win. The President must show leadership and define our mission and the end game strategy, clarify our objectives, and provide the resources required to ensure victory. We must know when we have achieved success, how we measure our progress, and thoroughly understand new long term commitments we are accepting.

Our military is already overextended and under funded. They are brilliantly executing a questionable policy. Without a significant change, another long term, open ended commitment in the Balkans will continue to degrade military readiness and our ability to deal with other national security challenges around the world.

It is clear that the President has failed to plan for the possible contingencies and the unintended consequences of military action in the Balkans, he has failed to demonstrate clear and decisive leadership in leading this military campaign to a successful conclusion, he has failed to provide the necessary resources to adequately support our brave men and women serving in the military. I am gravely concerned about the incremental and gradual escalation of this conflict without the clear understanding of where we are headed.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill to ensure that we in Congress are engaged in this before the President commits us further to war in the Balkans.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there have clearly been set two goals among a group of us. We have been striving to make sure this Congress follows procedure, that is, if we go to war, that we do it properly. It is pretty difficult to achieve this, especially when a president is willing to go to war and then we have to do this as a second thought. I am pleased that, at least today, we are trying to catch up on this. The second issue is whether it is wise to go to war.

Certainly, under these circumstances, I think it is very unwise for the American people to go to war at this time. The Serbs have done nothing to us, and we should not be over there perpetuating a war.

Our problem has been that we are trying to accommodate at least a half century of a policy which is interventionism at will by our presidents. We have become the policemen of the world. As long as we endorse that policy, we will have a difficulty with the subject we are dealing with today.

Today we are trying to deal legally with a half a war. A half a war is something like a touch of pregnancy. You can't have a half a war. If we do not declare war and if we do not fight a war because it is in our national interest and for national security reasons, we'll inevitably will not fight to win the war. That has always been our problem, whether it was Korea, Vietnam, or even the Persian Gulf war.

To me, it is so important that you fight war for national security reasons only, you declare a war and you fight to win the war. We are not about to do that today. We are not going to declare war against Serbia. Serbia has done nothing to America. They have been close allies of ours, especially in World War II. We are not going to do that. Are we going to demand the troops be removed? Probably not.

So what are we going to do? We are going to perpetuate this confusion. But what we should do is vote down a declaration of war, vote to get the troops out of Yugoslavia, and vote to stop the bombing. The sooner we do that, the better. That is in America's interests.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the Goodling-Fowler bill sends the wrong message at the wrong time to a person who has been more responsible than anyone else for the grievous wrongs committed in the Balkans.

If any issue should be above politics and should be above partisanship, it should be these life and death issues. But the majority in this House, too many of them, talk the nonpartisan talk, but have difficulty walking a bipartisan walk on this issue. No one should ask blind loyalty on this kind of a matter, but neither should there be masked politics.

The President has not rushed to use ground troops, and he should not. But the opposition often is not sure whether to criticize the President for being too weak, or too strong; for using too little, or too much force.

I found the public at home is ahead of many officials. Fifty-nine Members, or I think it may be 57, of the 927th Air Refueling Wing at Selfridge Air Base have been called to duty. We met some of these men and women a few weeks ago. Their reaction was symbolized by what was said yesterday by Chief Master Sergeant William Shaw: ''If called up, I will go where I am asked to go, and with pride.''

How many more entanglements do we want of Macedonia, Greece and Turkey before we act? How many more mass murders do we have to see? How broad does the genocide have to become?

I suggest that we vote down Goodling-Fowler, vote down the Campbell motions, and support the resolution that was passed by the Senate. It is the right thing to do at this right time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), our Top Gun from San Diego and a gentleman who won the Navy Cross carrying out America's foreign policy in Vietnam.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this is the most inept foreign policy in the history of the United States. The Pentagon told the President not to bomb, that it would only exacerbate the problems. We have forced over 1 million refugees. 2,012 were killed in Kosovo prior to the bombing. NATO has killed more Albanians than the Serbs did in an entire year, and yet we have exacerbated those problems.

''So, what do you do, Duke?'' First you halt the bombing, then you have your POW's returned and you have Milosevic take his forces out of there. Use Russian troops. Right now they are the antagonists. Make them part of the solution. Use the Russians, use the Greeks, use the Scandinavians, use the Italians, to come in there as peacekeepers and separate these people.

The President has to look Izetbegovic in the face, he has got to look the President of Albania in the face, and say we want 100 percent of the Iranians, the Iraqis and the Afghanistanis, with the KLA and Mujahedeen and Hamas, out of there, because Albania has been in expansionism since the 1850's, tried to take Montenegro, Macedonia and Greece. You have got to get them out of there or they are going to be a problem. The Albanians have got to stop their expansionism. Cantonization possibly of Kosovo, but you have got to take Kosovo off the table.

One of the President's big faults, he did not recognize what Kosovo means to the Serbs. It is their Jerusalem. Yes, maybe you can Cantonize it, like you do in the Scandinavian countries, but it will have to be part of Serbia. It is not just Milosevic. The Serbia people and their nationalism will not give up Kosovo. Until they realize that, there is going to be a problem.

You need to take a look at 95 percent of the aid goes to the federation. You have got Croatians, about 70 percent are out of work; the Serbs, the same, and you have got to stabilize that part of the country.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, in five conflicts since the Constitution was ratified we have declared war, first including the War of 1812, last including World War II. In the period since then we have had bombardments and blockades and occupations and conflicts of all kinds, civil wars, and war has become sort of a subjective concept.

There are so many variations on it, that if you read the UN charter you will not find the word ''war'' anywhere included. The charter refers to hostilities, to armed attacks, to breaches or threats to the peace, to acts of aggression.

The War Powers Resolution was written with that reality in mind, written in the aftermath of Vietnam and Korea, two wars that were never declared wars, and its authors recognized that there were some lesser included alternatives under the rubric of war.

The War Powers Act gives us, the Congress, an explicit alternative to declaring war, total outright war. Within 60 days of a deployment, when we are notified by the President, we can enact a specific authorization of such use of the Armed Forces. That was laid out for us when we passed the War Powers Resolution.

The Campbell resolutions I disagree with and believe frame the choice falsely. They imply that we can only declare total war or withdraw totally.

S. Con. Res. 21 takes a different course, and I think a legitimate one. It concurs in the air and missile campaign that is now being waged, and, by not going any further, reserving judgment on the introduction of ground forces if the air forces do not accomplish their objectives.

Fowler-Goodling, on the other hand, is deficient in several major effects. It

does not approve a sanction or concur in an ongoing campaign. It dodges the issue. Then in the most emphatic, flattest possible way, it lays down a prohibition against ground war, barring any expenditure whatever on ground elements in Yugoslavia.

□ 1245

Now, ground elements include personnel and materiel, it includes weapons and equipment. Secretary Cohen has just written us a letter saying this could be interpreted as retrenchment. This could actually undercut the intended effect of the ground war. But worse still, in trying to keep us out of the quagmire of a ground war, and I understand their concerns, Goodling-Fowler runs the risk of putting us into a legal quagmire. If we pass it, we better call up the reserve JAG officers, because the lawyers are going to be busy making tactical interpretations of its effects.

It would prohibit any expenditure on ground elements. That would prevent prepositioning of equipment in the theater, weapons in the theater as a contingency, either to be used by a ground force in a ground war, or by an implementation force if there is a settlement. It would bar special forces operations in Yugoslavia. It would bar on-the-ground military intelligence operations anywhere in Yugoslavia. It would bar forward observers. This is not the way to go.

We have a good alternative in S. Con. Res. 21. It is limited in its effect, and it is the proper application in these circumstances.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for bringing these resolutions to the floor at this time so that we can properly consider our role in the Balkans.

The NATO military air operation now taking place over Serbia is a response, belatedly in my opinion, to more than a year of the most callous brutal acts of repression of innocent men, women and children in Kosovo whose only crime is being Albanian. The architect of these policies is Slobodan Milosevic, a ruthless dictator, who has accumulated an abominable record in the former Yugoslavia, and who should be indicted by the War Crimes Tribunal at the Hague.

The cost of Milosevic's aggression has been the uprooting of hundreds of thousands of people, thousands of whom are now refugees in neighboring countries. Last fall it appeared that tens of thousands of the displaced Kosovars were in danger of freezing to death during the winter months.

As we all know too well, the Serbs never withdrew their police and military, and the violence gradually escalated until in January we had the massacre by Serb police of a small village that killed 45 unarmed civilians. At that point we told the Serbs that they had to agree to a plan put forward by our government and other members of the contact group of the international community that would have restored substantial self-rule to the Albanians in Kosovo; and, if Serbia did not agree, they were advised that NATO would escalate its military action.

The Serbs have used NATO bombing as a pretext, a pretext to escalate the ethnic cleansing that they had prepared for Kosovo when the spring weather permitted conditions for their military operations.

The major issue confronting our Nation and the Kosovo crisis has been, and continues to be, the humanitarian situation facing the refugees in Kosovo, and now in Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro, as well as some other countries in that region.

A second priority of our policy should be to support those frontline States in order to create stability and a bulwark against a possible spread of the conflict which could be an objective of Mr. Milosevic.

We need to recognize that the issues we are facing are complex, and the resolutions of these problems are not readily achievable. We are nevertheless embarked upon a course of action that must succeed. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to be supportive of these efforts, even as we continue to probe into questions of policies that underline them.

I urge my colleagues to carefully consider these very important issues that we are about to address, and their impact upon the peace in the Balkans.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Cleveland, Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, some say we must win, but we must win the peace. We cannot win peace through war. The failure of the bombing campaign is proof. We can win peace through negotiation, through diplomacy. We must pursue peace as vigorously as we would pursue war.

We will decide today whether to escalate an undeclared war. Better to push diplomatic initiatives, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is attempting. We will decide today whether to send ground troops. Better to put peacekeepers on the ground in Moscow, in Belgrade, to obtain a negotiated agreement. Today we will decide whether to continue bombing; bombing which has not worked, bombing which has been counterproductive, bombing which has destroyed villages in order to save the villages, bombing which is killing innocent civilians, both Kosovar Albanians and Serbians; bombing which is leaving little bomblets across the terrain in Kosovo, injuring young Albanian children, unexploded bombs being played with by children. There are more amputations now in Kosovo than have ever occurred probably anywhere because of these unexploded bombs that children are finding and playing with and are blowing up.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is a metaphor for the war. This entire war is an unexploded bomb which is ready to maim and kill children. The sad fact is that today, if we pass Senate Con. Res. 21, we will be authorizing not just continuing the bombing, but sending ground troops, and we will have given a license to expand an undeclared war. The cruelest irony is that Congress will take money from the Social Security surplus, money that our senior citizens need to assure their Social Security, they will take that money and use it to send the grandchildren to fight.

We must continue to give peace a chance, declare a cease fire, halt the bombing, help the refugees, pursue peace, not war.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for yielding me this time.

First of all, let me just say to my colleague from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) if we were in recess, the President could call us back for an emergency session within 24 hours to get an authorization for the money, so I think that it really is a red herring, although I have respect for my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, is this war in our national interests? Does it involve the security of the United States? I think anybody who is familiar with this operation realizes that it is not. The Persian Gulf, on the other hand, did involve our national security, because 50 percent of our oil reserves came from that part of the world, and it also involved one country invading another.

Should we be involved for humanitarian reasons? Look at the Sudan. Two million people, 2 million people, died in the Sudan. We did not do a darn thing about it. In Ethiopia, there have been 10,000 deaths in just the last couple of months. In Tibet, nearly 1.2 million people have died, and we have not done anything. In Sri Lanka, 56,000 people have lost their lives; 200,000 in Indonesia, and I could go on and on. In Croatia, in the former Yugoslavia, 10,000 Serbs were killed and 200,000 were driven out in ethnic cleansing in 1995, and we did not do a darn thing about it. That was a humanitarian crisis right next door. Why did we not do something about that?

Should we be involved? At the NATO Summit here in Washington just last

week, a resolution was passed to involve NATO in peacekeeping and humanitarian missions, like this one, anywhere in Europe. Are we going to be the world's policeman? We are already paying two-thirds of the costs and flying 90% of the missions. Can we afford it? My colleague from Cleveland just noted that we are going to have to take money out of the Social Security trust fund and other areas in order to pay for this war, if it is prolonged.

Was this war properly planned like the Persian Gulf War? No. We all know that. It is piecemeal, and this President does not know where we are going. We have a man who knows nothing about the military directing this, even though the people at the Pentagon have told him that the bombing is only going to exacerbate the situation.

Is this a prelude to more? I think it is. Putting in ground troops over there is going to bring back what to us? A lot of body bags, a lot of problems, a lot of costs that we simply do not need. We do not need to be there. We should support H.R. 1569, bring our troops home, and let the people in Europe deal with a European problem.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Con. Res. 21, which has been offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) to authorize military air operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

I am not a hawk, not by any stretch of the imagination, and I have been a peace activist for years. I do not support a full-scale war with Serbia. We are not in a full-scale war, and I hope it can be averted. I believe, however, we should do everything possible to avoid taking any actions that would create a full-scale war.

However, I vowed that I would never again remain silent in the face of genocide, and the Albanians in Kosovo are clearly facing genocide.

The United States did not act quickly enough to stop the Holocaust during World War II. Throughout the 1930s, persecution against the Jews in Nazi Germany continued to escalate, yet the world community did nothing. Even after the United States entered the war, we did not take any action to shut down the gas chambers. As a result of this genocide, 6 million Jews were murdered.

Between April and June of 1994, the Tutsi people of Rwanda were systematically slaughtered. Throughout the months of April and May of that year, the U.S. Government failed to support any action to stop this genocide. The United Nations finally authorized the peacekeeping force, but it was too late to save the lives of 1 million Rwandan people who were slaughtered.

Kosovo is not the only place where genocide is happening today. The Government of Sudan is conducting a genocidal war against the people of southern Sudan. More than 1.5 million people have been killed since 1983 as a result of aerial bombings, massacres and attacks on civilian villages. The survivors of these attacks are routinely murdered or taken to northern Sudan and sold into slavery.

We cannot allow genocide to be ignored. I know there are limits to what the United States can do to stop genocide. Although war is not always the answer to oppression, we know that silence can never be the answer.

We must take action to stop genocide in Kosovo. That is why I support the President's efforts and the efforts of our troops to stop those deplorable crimes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise that the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has 8 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 7½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has 8½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from northern California (Mr. STARK).

□ 1300

Mr. STARK. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I applaud the efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for his resolution that forced this debate today. Without his efforts, we would continue to have U.S. military might, troops and weapons of war with no congressional deliberation whatsoever.

I support his resolution, House Resolution 82, because the administration policy is not defined, it is not clear, it is not viable with its use of force. Indeed, it is hardly existent.

Members have heard people talk about why we are not in other parts of the world, and excuse it blithely. I cannot. We cannot ignore all these other conflicts, but that does not give us an excuse, when we had no policy then, to begin killing people when we have no policy now.

This resolution is of the highest priority because we must exercise our obligation under the War Powers Act to debate the use of military force, particularly so in light of the absence of any comprehensive policy on the part of our administration.

Unfortunately, we are not allowed enough debate. We are going to talk about spending $13 billion, approving the committal of ground troops, which we all know is beginning while the debate goes on, and I support this resolution authorizing House Resolution 82 of the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) because the use of force is not working and will not work here.

NATO has made matters worse, not better. The administration chose force as the most probable outcome by our expectations and deliberations in Rambouillet. The administration left no room for further negotiation or diplomatic efforts. They chose war. I do not.

Our children, by the way, learn firsthand from our adult behavior. The Colorado deaths are no coincidence. They are the natural consequence of what our children see the national leaders in their adult role models perform.

When the President held a press conference at the school to talk about conflict resolution, as he was talking, NATO-based troops were dropping bombs and explaining away civilian deaths as collateral damage.

These civilians died because of our inability to resolve this crisis. The Campbell resolution provides that the troops should be withdrawn. I support this as a first step, not a last step, to bring peace in Kosovo.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern with several of the resolutions that we will consider here today, because I believe that several are too extreme, and others would tie the hands of U.S. military commanders like General Clark.

These legislative proposals would undermine the flexibility of our military leaders to ensure the safety and security of American forces in the Balkans. We can debate whether or not we should be in Kosovo at all, but the fact remains we are there. We must now listen to our military leaders and not prohibit them from carrying out their mission effectively and safely.

In war or conflict, or whatever it is that Members want to call this, we never want to be in a situation in which we are fighting a limited war and our enemy is fighting an unlimited war. We do not want our enemy to know what we will not do or they will exploit that weakness to their advantage.

If we, by our votes today, tell Milosevic that we will force a long, protracted process to allow ground troops, then he can exploit this situation to his benefit and to the detriment of our men and women in uniform.

As a Vietnam veteran, I remember being in a war in which the military was not provided the tools that it needed. I remember only too well being in Vietnam and being exploited by the commentary that was occurring in this country and sometimes in this body.

For example, when we decided not to mine Haiphong, we allowed the Soviets to continually supply surface-to-air missiles to the North Vietnamese, which placed our service personnel in greater danger.

In 1992 in Somalia, Lieutenant General Montgomery, the then theater commander, requested Bradley Fighting vehicles and AC–130s, but the Secretary of Defense turned him down. We saw what happened to our Rangers there when the hands of the military

commanders were tied. In that instance, it was the administration, not the Congress, affecting the battle, but I simply use this as an example to simply demonstrate what can happen when we tie the hands of our military leaders.

We must not allow such a horrible event to happen again.

Please understand my position. I am not here to support the use of ground troops. I believe that we must continue the air war until our military commanders tell us otherwise. I am here simply to support the military to allow them to decide what they need and to provide them with those resources.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), another distinguished veteran.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) for his comment. I compliment him on his words here in the well.

If the gentleman swings by my office, he will see hanging in my office as he leaves, and I look at it almost every day, the father who lost his son who bled to death in Somalia cut the Ranger patch off his son's uniform and sent it to me. It is on the wall in my office. It is a constant reminder about the pain.

If America is going to send our sons and daughters into a theater war, then they need to thoroughly understand what they are fighting for, what are the vital national security interests, what is at stake. I compliment the gentleman's words.

We are hearing some rhetoric on the floor about genocide, ethnic cleansing. Mr. Speaker, since when has that been a cause for U.S. intervention throughout the world?

I will not stand for the United States to have a racist foreign policy. Since when do we have a preference of ethnicity? Are we Europhiles, that we somehow want to go on the ground in Europe, but will not do so in Africa or Asia or Indonesia or in other countries?

Let us be very wise, prudent, and cautious about the words we use here today and about our foreign policies. Let us be the advisers and counsel to the President to make proper judgments. The reason American is confused is that the political rhetoric does not match NATO's political objectives, which does not match the military use of force.

If we say that Milosevic is a Hitler and Stalin and he has no right to lead that country, it appears as though that is our political objective, and therefore the use of military force is to overthrow Milosevic. That is not true. NATO's political objective is Kosovo and Kosovo only. So we should restrict our rhetoric, be careful for our words.

Then the ultimate question is, through the use of air power, does that accomplish the political objectives? That is why, when I returned, I said we have to return for the ground function. That does not mean I support troops on the ground.

Mr. Speaker, what I advise my counsel, I will vote this way today. I do not agree with the War Powers Act. I will vote no on House Joint Resolution 44, I will vote no on H. Con. Res. 82, I will vote yes for the Fowler amendment, because I want the President to define the end state, what does he want it to look like, how does he define success, before we go on the ground.

With regard to Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, let us be up front, this is a political vote. This is a cover vote for some Democrats here who do not have the stomach. We have had over 10,500 sorties that have already been flown. Now we are going to come in and have a vote to authorize? The question is moot.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, the resolution offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), and in opposition to the three other resolutions.

Now is not the time to run from the atrocities being committed by the sole remaining tyrant of Europe, or to limit our military options. Quite frankly, I am proud to support the NATO mission in Kosovo. It speaks to our values and principles as a Nation, and to our role as a leader of the NATO alliance.

I am proud of our young men and women in U.S. and NATO uniform who are being asked once again to restore the peace and stability in Europe. Twice in the first half of the 20th century young American soldiers were sent to Europe to restore that peace at a cost of 525,000 lives and over 900,000 casualties.

After the Second World War this Nation stood up and declared, never again. Never again can we afford to disengage from the continent of Europe and hope everything will just be all right. Never again will we stand idly by while innocent men and women are forcibly removed from their homes and wiped out by military forces under a policy of genocide.

Elie Wiesel, the Nazi concentration camp survivor, reminded us last week that the only miserable consolation that they had in those concentration camps had during the Second World War was the belief that if the western democracies knew what was taking place, they would do everything in their power to try to stop it.

History later showed that the Western leaders did know, but did not take action. This time, he said, the democracies do know. We are acting. We are intervening. And this time we are on the right side of history.

Mr. Speaker, today we face very serious votes. It is a rendezvous with history. This can be NATO's finest hour, or it may be the beginning of the end of the U.S. involvement in maintaining the peace and stability on the European continent. Let us hope that this is our and NATO's finest hour. I encourage my colleagues to support Senate Concurrent Resolution 21.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the State of Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), a Vietnam veteran.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will tell the Members, it is easy to be proud to send our troops into Kosovo if Members have never been there. They have to understand what we are asking our troops to do, and we need to clearly understand why we are asking the sons and daughters of American mothers to die for these humanitarian causes. There are other ways, if we act.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this debate will determine the course of American policy and military policy, foreign policy, for the next century. I urge my colleagues to totally ignore the partisan ramifications of our decisions and instead base our votes on the constitutionally defined security interests of this Republic.

Today we hear the argument that to withdraw from an unconstitutional war undermines the morale of our armed forces and steels the resolve of those with whom we contend. If we accept that argument, we will have granted absolutely war powers, not just to this administration but every administration in the 21st century. That rationale demands that we keep quiet, we go along with every military adventure of every president, for the same reasons.

Instead, I ask Members, I plead with them, to listen to the words of John Quincy Adams in 1821: ''(America) knows well that by once enlisting under other banners than her own . . . she would involve herself, beyond the power of extrication, in all the wars of interest and intrigue, of individual avarice . . . She might become the dictator of the world;'' or the police power, in my words; ''she would no longer be the ruler of her own spirit.''

If we refuse to do our constitutional duty in this body, in this House, the horrible warnings of President Adams may become reality. Serbs are fighting Albanians, Albanians are fighting Serbs. People in the Balkans have fought and have committed atrocities against one another for at least 500 years. Now we allow our Nation to be dragged into a quagmire for which there will be no exit.

I believe that within the next few days the President will be delivering a new speech if we send troops into the Balkans. He will lament the death of Americans in combat in the Balkans. He will call on the Nation to ensure that their ultimate sacrifice will not be in vain. Have we heard this before?

In the process, he will commit my great-grandchildren to policing the Balkans, not because we are threatened, not because we are under attack, not because freedom of this country is not secure, but simply to enforce a new world police order in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, let me allow the President not to make that speech. Do not help him make that speech. Vote to end this nastiness today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some general comments about our position in Kosovo, and then focus on the resolutions that are before us today.

Some think that this is a stark choice, that we must either ignore the refugees of Kosovo and ignore the fact that America's credibility and NATO's credibility is on the line, or we must, instead, commit ground forces and incur hundreds, perhaps thousands, of American casualties.

I think we do need to focus on other options. One of those is to train, though not necessarily arm, a force of Albanians perhaps independent of the KLA. Then when Milosevic reviews the situation, he will see that he is up not only against the most powerful air armada ever assembled, not only against a ragtag band of lightly armed KLA guerrillas, but also will soon be up against a force of heavily armed Albanians with tanks and heavy artillery willing to take casualties.

We need to enlist the Russians in negotiating a settlement. I would suggest that that settlement would provide that 20 percent or so of Kosovo would be patrolled by a Russian peacekeeping force, and that some 80 percent would be patrolled by a NATO peacekeeping force.

□ 1315

The ultimate resolution of Kosovo could be decided later.

I see that my good friend and ranking member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), has returned to the Chamber, and I discussed with him earlier the meaning of his own resolution, which I know he intends, or is at least allowed by the rule, to introduce later today. I would like to have a colloquy with the gentleman, because it has been argued that the legal effect of his resolution, as interpreted by a court, his resolution is an authorization by Congress to send a large ground force into Kosovo or as waiving any of Congress' rights with regard to such a deployment.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, our intent with the resolution is simply to authorize the present campaign as it is presently being undertaken.

Mr. SHERMAN. And should any court interpret it as a congressional authorization to use any other kind of force?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I think my statement was clear, and I agree with that.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will look forward to further clarification.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN), a member of the committee.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for yielding me this time. We are in a very, very difficult situation today, confronting one of the most dismal range of policy choices the House has ever had to make.

We are forced to do that, in part because notwithstanding my imploring him to do that, and others much more important than I imploring him to do that, our President and Commander-in-Chief has chosen not to come to this Congress or send to this Congress the best articulation that he could come up with as to what our objectives are in the Balkans and what authority he would ask in order to pursue those objectives. He has not done it. It, therefore, should be our charge to do it for the Nation.

We are not doing that by any of the four propositions before us today. No one declares any objective, no one clearly authorizes in any intelligent way the utilization of military force. The Fowler-Goodling-Kasich solution says ''thou shalt not use ground forces''. Inferentially, it is status quo. We can continue to use air power, but it really does not say that or authorize that. It is left dangling.

The same can be said of the resolution of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), which he has just made abundantly clear by his unusual response in the colloquy that was just suggested, which leaves the resolutions of my dear friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), which say forget any objectives, forget any policy, just withdraw; or if we do not do that, declare war.

None of these choices make any sense, and I think it is a very sad day that we in the House are faced or not faced with some alternative that does make sense and does authorize that which ought to be authorized in proper discretion, and for what purposes it should be authorized, and who should be paying the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, may we have a review of the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) has 7 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has 4 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has 3 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

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

We should not be deploying ground troops of the United States armed forces in Yugoslavia until Congress has authorized such a deployment. That is what we did in Desert Storm, that is what the War Powers Act contemplates, and that is what we should do. I do not know today how I would vote on such an authorization.

I believe that we should be very cautious about getting ourselves into a ground war in the Balkans, and we should recall the lessons of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution and not pass a Gulf of the Adriatic Resolution that provides an open-ended and unconditional authorization for the use of ground forces. But we should also keep a ground troops option open in case the air campaign proves unsuccessful, the ethnic cleansing continues, and all our NATO allies agree that ground forces could achieve our military and political objectives.

I will vote for the resolution offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) to authorize the present air campaign in Yugoslavia. It is underway, it has had some success, and we should support it.

I will oppose the removal of our military forces from their positions in connection with the present air campaign, because I believe the President and NATO need to be given a chance to try to stop the bloodshed and ethnic cleansing.

I will also oppose the proposed declaration of war the gentleman from California offers us, because I believe that such a step would needlessly inflame an already tense political situation in Europe and our relations with Russia. But while I will oppose the gentleman's resolutions, I want to compliment him on bringing this debate to the House floor. It is the most important power that Congress has and it is critical that all our voices be heard.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK).

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time. I want to commend the leadership for allowing the two Campbell resolutions to be debated and voted on today.

We are in a precarious situation, maybe the most precarious in a generation. We are debating whether American blood will again be shed in a European war started in the Balkans. I believe we have three options: We can continue the current policy, which is ill-conceived, meandering and appears to have no comprehensive plan or exit strategy; secondly, we can declare war on Yugoslavia and follow General Colin Powell's advice that if we are going to act, we should use overwhelming force and win quickly.

While I oppose this strategy, I do think it is more responsible than the first option. The Constitution gives Congress the power to declare war. Our Founding Fathers lived in a world where kings dragged their populations into wars with no thought of the cost to citizens. They wisely wanted to ensure that America was governed differently. If we believe we should continue this war, then we should have the guts to formally declare war. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for recognizing this obligation and for having the courage to stand up for his convictions.

The third option, which I will support, is a 60-day pullout of our troops. This is the most logical and sensible option at this point, and can restart the negotiations that can allow refugees to return to their homes. The current military action has not stopped the flow of refugees or helped Kosovo become autonomous. It has only further destabilized the area and made things worse.

This is not a criticism of our men and women who are fighting in Kosovo. They are doing their job and they are doing it very well, but they are fighting with their hands tied behind their backs and suffering from the effects of years of neglect of our military infrastructure.

Air strikes do not win wars, and I do not believe the blood of American troops will end centuries of hatred and mistrust in the Balkans. I therefore will vote in favor of H. Con. Res. 82 requiring a 60-day pullout.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by commending the gentleman from California for forcing this Congress to do what it should have done long ago, and that is to exercise our constitutional responsibility to decide where and when young Americans will be called upon to place their lives at risk to defend this country.

I would like to remind my colleagues that despite much of the rhetoric against the President of the United States, it was the United States Senate on March 23 that voted to authorize air strikes against the former Yugoslavia. I must admit that the President, following up on that, has put me in a very strange situation. After all, just in December I voted to impeach President Clinton, but the majority of the United States Senate decided otherwise.

The question now is, do I face the reality that young Americans are at war, or do I do what is politically expedient and ignore that?

When I was a young State Senator, I once questioned a former Congressman by the name of Charles Griffin, who served during the Vietnam War. I remember asking him how he could serve for those years while Americans were coming home every day and, in effect, pretending there was not a war going on? I want to apologize to Congressman Griffin because basically I am seeing the same thing today. But in deference to now deceased Congressman Griffin, I certainly will not do what I accused him of doing.

I am going to vote to declare war. Americans are at war. I find myself at a horrible reluctance to do this, but the bottom line is Slobodan Milosevic has initiated four wars. As we speak, he is killing innocent men and women. And, yes, American credibility is at risk.

The question we have to ask ourselves is what are the unintended consequences of this Congress failing to act? Do we signal to North Korea, who it is anticipated will drop 600,000 rounds on the American positions the very first day of that war, that as a Nation we say one thing and do another when it becomes slightly politically inconvenient for the 535 Members of Congress?

I say this with great reluctance, because I know that in voting for war I share the responsibility for the lives of those young Americans who may die. But to do nothing is much worse. We are in this situation. We cannot choose to ignore it. And I think that the best course of action for this Nation is to use the overwhelming military might that we have at our disposal to end this war quickly, swiftly and with a decisive American victory.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has 4 minutes remaining,

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

Mr. Speaker, I think we have had an excellent debate, and it shows a great division. And there is great division because we have several legitimate interests, and it is a matter of balancing which of these interests outweighs the other. One interest is a humanitarian interest; another interest, of course, is our NATO alliance and their military objectives; another interest that many people have expressed here very eloquently is our concern for the safety of our men and women in uniform. Let me just review my own position and the history of this Congress in the last 15 years or so.

In Lebanon, in Libya, in Grenada, and of course in the Middle East, a number of us voted to give the President of the United States, President Ronald Reagan and President George Bush, great discretion and to attribute to them great presidential prerogative with respect to initiating conflict. And that accrued to our benefit, because the Presidents were able to strike swiftly and to move American force projection very quickly without asking for permission from Congress. We were able to achieve goals we could not have otherwise achieved.

So one principle I followed was that the Commander in Chief must be able to act quickly, using a full range of military options short of total war. And my feeling is that total war is what we have conducted in the past in World War I and II, the last war ending when we reduced Tokyo and parts of Germany to rubble. I do not want to reduce Belgrade to rubble.

I do not want to stand by and do nothing. So I agree with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) that the range of options is a range of options that does not serve this Congress well.

□ 1330

The second principle that I felt we were following over the last 15 years was that the Commander in Chief must be able to act with full military leadership authority when leading joint operations with our allies.

Somebody commented once that if we were not in the NATO alliance, it would be like that church full of townspeople without Gary Cooper, all of them with different ideas but all of them too timid to execute anything. And I think that is probably true.

So I am going to vote to be consistent with my votes that I exercised with respect to the presidencies of Ronald Reagan and George Bush. And I want to say to all my Republican colleagues who voted with me on those votes and voted not to force the President to seek a vote before he could go in with military force, that I think those principles which accrue to the benefit of the United States and save lives will long outlive this presidency in which many of us have a lack of confidence.

Now let me turn to my Democrat friends and simply say this: We have cut our military under President Clinton, almost in half. So to carry out this foreign policy that we are engaged in right now, whether it is in Kosovo or on the Korean Peninsula or in the Middle East, we now have 10 Army divisions instead of 18, we now have only 13 fighter air wings instead of 23, we are down almost 40 percent in Navy vessels, we are short $3½ billion in basic ammunition for the U.S. Army, we are short in almost all of our smart standoff weapons that save lives, and we are going to have votes in the very near future to increase that ammunition, spare parts and equipment that will ultimately save lives of our military people, whether they are operating in this theater or some other theater.

We need Democrats to vote in a strong defense. If we do not have them, we are going to go ahead with half empty ammo pouches in these wars, with our coffers of spare parts that are only half full, and we are going to repeat years like the one we just had in which 55 American military aircraft crashed in peacetime missions because of lack of training, lack of spare parts, and old equipment.

So I am going to join and try to be consistent with the votes I have made in the past. I hope all my colleagues will vote for a strong national defense regardless of their vote on this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The Chair will advise that

the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) has 5 minutes remaining and the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has 1 minute remaining. All other time has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his generosity in yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, in less than 30 days, 1.6 million Kosovars have been forced from their homes at gunpoint and torn from their loved ones. They have been stripped of everything, even their identities, all because of their ethnic heritage.

Now, some say the suffering Kosovars are not America's responsibility, that the gang rapes, the burned villages, the mass graves, they are not our problem. Well, to that I say we represent history's greatest democracy. We are a superpower at the peak of our prosperity and our strength.

What is America supposed to do? Are we supposed to look the other way? Hitler said in the 1930s, ''Who remembers the Armenians?'' before he unleashed his thugs to exterminate a people.

We stand here because so many of us have come to this well and said never again, never again would we stand by idly while genocide is committed. We stand against Slobodan Milosevic not just to stop a tyrant bent on ethnic cleansing but also against the very idea that such a barbaric campaign will be tolerated at the end of the 20th century. We simply cannot and will not let the worst of history repeat itself.

The NATO air campaign is taking its toll on Milosevic and his military power. Not only are his bunkers and his barracks cracking under the allied attack, but so is his domestic support. Just this week, Yugoslavia's Deputy Prime Minister publicly called on Milosevic to tell the truth to his people: that the world is against him, that he is alone, and that he cannot defeat NATO.

Now, my colleagues, is the time for this Congress to come together, united behind NATO. Now is the time for this Congress to be unyielding in our resolve. And now is the time for us to send Milosevic an unmistakable message: Ethnic cleansing will not stand, and we will persevere.

There are some in this Congress who seek to entangle us in legalisms, to micromanage military strategy, and to force us into false choices. Let us reject these traps. Let us reject the Goodling amendment.

Many of us believe that we should have a congressional vote before sending ground troops, but this amendment ties the hands of our military commanders and could leave the bordering nations, millions of refugees, and thousands of our own soldiers dangerously exposed.

Let us reject the Campbell proposal and reject the idea that we can pull out now and wash our hands of this humanitarian responsibility. Let us support the resolution offered by my friend the gentleman from Connecticut Mr. GEJDENSON. This is the same bipartisan language the Senate adopted to support the NATO air campaign.

It will show our resolve to turn back this genocidal tide. It will show our support for our troops. It will show our support for NATO. And it will show Milosevic our resolve that his brutality will not endure.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the most solemn responsibility a Member of Congress has is the consideration of a declaration of war. The four measures before us today which concern our military actions in Kosovo also concern our nation's standing in the world and the very future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

I support our brave men and women in uniform and all of the allied troops who are part of the NATO operations in Kosovo. Many of those who are flying missions in Kosovo are from Whiteman Air Force Base in my home state of Missouri. I thank them and the other men and women who are there serving our country, the Alliance, and the people of Kosovo. I pray for their safe return from a successful mission.

At the historic 50th anniversary of NATO summit, the leaders of the Alliance convened and reached consensus that Slobodan Milosovic's violence against the ethnic Albanians is abhorrent and must stop. As the leader of the free world, the United States is compelled to join in action to prevent the horrendous acts of genocide and ethnic cleansing that are taking place in Kosovo. In addition, we share a humanitarian obligation to assist the more than 550,000 refugees who have been forcibly evicted from their homes, and in many cases separated from their families. Until stability returns to this region, the United States and its NATO allies must provide an example to the world of generosity, compassion and commitment to those who are suffering at Mr. Milosovic's hand. The rebuilding process of both physical structures and people's lives must begin as soon as peace and stability is achieved.

Mr. CAMPBELL has introduced two resolutions which we will vote on today—H. Con. Res. 82 and H.J. Res. 44. I am opposed to both of these measures. The gentleman from California assumes only two choices exist for Congress: to declare war or to abandon our allies. These resolutions are partisan in nature and are merely intended to place the President in the politically untenable position of having to make an extreme choice, knowing that either alternative would undermine his ability to effectively act as Commander in Chief. The situation in Kosovo does not present a simple dichotomy of choices. We have entered into this conflict as part of the NATO Alliance, and for the U.S. to pull out now or to declare war as an individual country would directly contradict the agreements reached at the summit concluded just three days ago here in Washington.

The resolution introduced by Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GOODLING, and others, H.R. 1569, would prohibit the Department of Defense from using funds for ''ground elements'' without the authorization of Congress. I agree with the premise that Congress must protect the checks and balances laid out by the framers of the Constitution. During the ''Gulf of Tonkin'' crises 35 years ago a misinformed Congress conceded its foreign policy powers to the President. The resulting unchecked escalation of forces in Vietnam should never be repeated. While Congress has the responsibility to be vigilant, the President has assured us in writing that he will not commit ground troops without authorization from the Congress, making H.R. 1569 unnecessary. Further, passage would tie the hands of NATO leaders and seriously jeopardize NATO's chances of successfully completing its mission. This measure would also jeopardize our own leadership role in this most critical alliance, and would send the wrong message to Mr. Milosovic, thus undermining much of our efforts to date. For these reasons, I oppose this measure.

S. Con. Res. 21, passed in the Senate April 20, authorizes the President of the United States to conduct military air operations and missile strikes in cooperation with our NATO allies against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). I support this resolution. It is consistent with the goals and objectives of the United States and is key to NATO's ongoing military strategy.

Fifty years ago, at the end of World War II, President Harry Truman, whose hometown is in the Congressional District I am proud to represent, had a vision to reunite and rebuild Europe to avoid world war in the future. The successful result is NATO. Our country is the foundation and security that NATO requires to succeed in its mission of peace in Europe. For our armed services to succeed in their current mission we must support them with our actions. Let us learn from history and support the young American men and women who carry our flag into jeopardy. Let us support our President, Secretaries of State and Defense, our Joint Chiefs of Staff, our battlefield commanders, and the NATO allies we lead that we are unified in our resolve to end this inhumanity. We proclaim to the world, those who support us and those who would not, that we act in defense of American's core values; life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness and, of course, justice for all.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to vote in favor of legislation to put the Congress' voice where it should be—at the forefront of the national policy which guides our armed forces in the face of conflict. Under the Constitution, the Congress has the power to declare war and commit our troops to battle. As a Member of Congress who is opposed to putting American ground troops in Kosovo, I believe the Congress should have the opportunity to debate whether it is in our national security interests and vote to give the President the ability to put troops on the ground in Yugoslavia. I do not believe it is right for the President to act unilaterally to put our young men and women in uniform into ground battle in Kosovo without the explicit authority of the U.S. Congress.

President Bush acted correctly in seeking the authority of Congress to commit ground troops before we acted to expel Iraq from Kuwait in 1991. While the President is working with our NATO allies to persuade the Serbs to end their brutal actions in Kosovo through air

attacks and diplomatic initiatives, I believe he has an obligation to first seek the authority of the nation's legislative body before sending tens and possibly hundreds of thousands of our armed forces personnel to battle.

Many of my colleagues favor sending ground troops into Kosovo; others join me in opposing the use of ground troops. Either way, I believe there should be a full debate on the issue and a vote on giving the President the authority to commit our nation to what is the equivalent of a declaration of war on Yugoslavia, albeit under the aegis of NATO. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting legislation that restores the voice of the Congress in the debate on Kosovo.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not to put myself forward as an expert in national defense matters or in matters of military deployment. I do not serve on the Armed Services Committee or on the Appropriations Committee which handles military matters. Nor am I a member of the International Relations Committee. My experience in the military was as an enlisted person where I rose to the rank of Specialist 4.

I feel very strongly that we should not be in Kosovo militarily. Yes, we should help with humanitarian needs and could indeed do much more for those who are suffering as a result of the civil war by the use of only a small amount of the money which we are spending on the bombing.

In the current situation in Kosovo we are footing a major part of the bill and already talking about how we will use our resources to rebuild this area that is being bombed. Do we forget that we very properly asked for our allies to contribute in the gulf war, which in fact alleviated a major burden on American tax payers by the money that was paid by those who also had an interest in that military activity?

The Vietnam experience is one that I hope I will never forget. I believe that there are some very important lessons to be learned from that experience. I felt a feeling of betrayal by the leadership of this country as a result of the Vietnam war. We were told of the dire consequences if we did not fight to a victory in that conflict. We threw hundreds of thousands of young men and women into that fray, and in the end we had to acknowledge our mistake and withdraw. That has left a lasting scar on our country. Not our withdrawal, not our admission of a mistake, but the conflict and the controversy surrounding the war. And we are today, as we have through the years since Vietnam ended, paying a terrible price for our mistake and we are still reaping the bitter fruit of those decisions.

The war in Southeast Asia is very similar to the Balkans, a civil war. And I ask the question: ''Is Southeast Asia worse now because we withdrew?'' And I believe the answer is a resounding ''no.''

The civil strife has to be settled by those who are most affected—those who live there. This is a civil war in the Balkans and it will be impossible for us militarily from the outside to impose a successful solution on the problems faced by the people of this area.

I, would ask the question—what kind of a country would we have today, had England and France been successful in intervention in our own civil war on the sides of the Confederate States?

While I oppose the military action in Kosovo and am adamantly opposed to sending any ground troops, I am also concerned greatly by the cost of this operation. It is my opinion that the current administration will have easily spent a hundred billion dollars in soirees around the world from Bosnia to Iraq to Kosovo. This money will come from only one source, the American tax payer, and most likely from the surplus of Social Security money.

I, believe that the current expenditure of funds is unwise and will be of a major detriment to our efforts to save Social Security and Medicare. We have worked long and hard to improve the financial condition of this country over the last four years. Kosovo holds the key to totally reversing the successes we have had and returning us to a situation of using funds from Social Security to pay our bills. It was wrong when it was done during Vietnam and it is wrong today.

I, believe that it is also the greatest error when leaders of our country fail to recognize that they have made a mistake in judgement, and continue to push ahead with all of their vigor and might, often with the use of our fighting men and women and the expenditure of our funds, to prove that they are in fact right.

In the end I believe that we will see the error of our involvement militarily in Kosovo. I do not subscribe to this theory that we can't back out because we have military involvement now. I know of no endeavor anywhere that was won by pursuing a failed policy and failing to admit mistakes when they are so very obvious. I do not buy the theory that we must continue to pursue military action there simply because we are there.

All that we need to do is provide for the safe removal of our military, with hope that military bombs can be replaced by talk and negotiation which will help the troubled people of this area reach an agreement as to their future.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the H. Con. Res. 82, H.J. Res. 44, and H.R. 1569 and in support of S. Con. Res. 21.

All of us are concerned whether the United States through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is taking the prudent position with regard to airstrikes against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. All of us are just as concerned and even repulsed by the actions of the Milosevic Government to ethnically cleanse Kosovo of non-Serbs creating the worst human tragedy Europe has witnessed since WWII. The conflict involves a part of the world where ethnic violence has been commonplace since the fourteenth century and the scene of intense fighting in this century's two world wars.

At the same time, how can the free and democratic nations of the world, in particular the nations comprising NATO, which won the cold war against communist aggression, sit idly by and allow a dictator to use his military and police apparatus against innocent civilians and noncombatants, causing death and destruction of property and wreaking havoc on his neighboring sovereign states?

We must weigh the costs of engagement and non-engagement in the affairs of one nation which will impact the stability of others with consequences for the U.S. To do nothing and withdraw would send a message, I believe, to Yugoslavian President Milosevic that ethnic cleansing is an acceptable practice at the end of the millennium. It would send that same message to other would be dictators that barbaric treatment of your own citizens is an immoral but acceptable sovereign practice. But perhaps more important, allowing Milosevic to drive those citizens he does not want into other countries will only destabilize Albania and Macedonia. What right does a dictator have to shed his unwanted citizens whom he has not killed to another sovereign state?

Finally, if the U.S. decides to cut and run, where does that leave NATO? NATO, under U.S. leadership helped rebuild European democracies and create political stability after World War II, which has been of great benefit to the U.S. Stability in Western Europe through NATO led to the end of the Cold War and to the collapse of the Soviet Union, while at the same time preserving a strong market for U.S. goods and services. After fifty years of success is it time to abandon the partnership of NATO? I think not.

The Campbell resolutions calling for a declaration of war or removal of all U.S. military personnel are premature and misguided. First, we are involved in an air campaign jointly with our NATO allies in an effort to stop Milosevic's brutal campaign of aggression against the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo. For the U.S. to unilaterally declare war outside of NATO undermines the alliance and its efforts. Second, to call for the complete withdrawal of U.S. forces from the NATO exercise would only serve to enhance Milosevic's position, which I oppose, and weaken NATO's. And, it would completely undermine NATO and the U.S. leadership position in the alliance.

The Goodling legislation, H.R. 1569, would prohibit the use of any funds of the Department of Defense for the deployment of ground elements, including personnel and material to the FRY. This is both premature and sends the wrong message. I have stated publicly that I oppose the introduction of ground troops into the FRY at this juncture, but I also support our efforts as part of NATO to end the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo and bring stability to the region. It is premature for the Congress to prospectively limit the U.S.'s options because there is currently no plan to send ground troops in a military situation at this time. If at any time such a plan is developed, the Congress can move immediately to prohibit such activity.

I am also concerned about the limited exceptions in the Goodling bill, which would hamper the ability of U.S. and NATO commanders to gather intelligence necessary to prosecute the airstrike operation. Further, it would not allow U.S. and NATO commanders to pre-position tanks and military equipment, or allow for pre-emptive strikes based on intelligence reports. These exceptions would eliminate on-the-ground intelligence gathering and the use of special forces, which would impair NATO's decision making ability and its ability to obtain critical military information. Worst of all, this bill sends the wrong message to Milosevic at a critical time that the U.S. is not serious about pursuing a peaceful settlement which includes the repatriation of Kosovar refugees.

Finally, we should adopt the same resolution adopted by the Senate to endorse the U.S. participation in the NATO air operation. Regardless of the outcome of the Goodling resolution, we should unequivocally state our support for NATO. To do otherwise at this point would greatly weaken the NATO alliance, serving only to threaten the lives of the

men and women pursuing our military objectives, and weakening the international standing of the United States.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to first express how proud and honored I am of our brave men and women in the armed services. I salute them and offer them my unequivocal support for the wonderful job they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I was opposed to this operation from the beginning. Putting American troops in the middle of an ethnically charged civil war carrying six hundred years of cultural baggage is pure folly. Neither the Albanians nor the Serbs are interested in any sort of serious compromise. As I said two months ago and I say today, I do not believe that we should risk the lives of our American men and women in an ethnic conflict thousands of miles away where there are no American interests at stake.

This is an issue that should have been handled by the European nations, but it wasn't. We should not send American men and women thousands of miles from home to do what European men and women should be doing for themselves.

But now that we are embroiled in this foreign policy failure, now is not the time to disengage because to do so would be a blow to U.S. prestige and a license for Milosevic to continue his heinous actions.

With this in mind, today we will debate and vote on four separate bills dealing with Kosovo, and I would like to take this opportunity to outline my thoughts on each of them.

First, I support H.R. 1569. The bill would prohibit the Department of Defense from using appropriated funds for the deployment of ground elements of American troops in Yugoslavia unless authorized by Congress.

Our nation's first President, George Washington, said over 200 years ago: ''The Constitution vests the power of declaring war in Congress; therefore no expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they have been deliberated upon the subject, and authorized such a measure.''

George Washington's statement is as true today as it was 200 years ago. As duly elected Members of Congress and as representatives of the American people, it is our duty, and yes, it is our responsibility to exercise our constitutional right to authorize military deployments of this nature. As Stuart Taylor Jr. of the National Journal writes: ''Compliance with the Constitution should not be optional.'' Congress should not relax our role as an equal partner with the Administration in this decision-making process.

We must not allow ''compliance with the Constitution'' to devolve into an option. We must assert our constitutional prerogatives, which is why I support H.R. 1569.

Secondly, I oppose H. Con. Res. 82 and H.J. Res. 44, H. Con. Res. 82 would direct the President to remove American troops from their positions and cease military operations against Yugoslavia within 30 days of passage, and H.J. Res. 44 would declare war on Yugoslavia. While I certainly respect the gentleman from California's (Mr. CAMPBELL) keen intellect, I do not agree with the goals of either of his bills. H. Con. Res. 82 would send a harmful message to our American troops already there. It would undermine their efforts and our support for American men and women in the armed services. H.J. Res. 44 would just go too far.

The final bill to be considered on this floor today will be S. Con. Res. 21. This resolution would authorize the President to continue to conduct military air operations and missile strikes in cooperation with NATO against Yugoslavia. I oppose this resolution, but this does not mean that I want to stop the bombings.

Specifically, I do not support the current policy behind the bombings. The five week long bombing campaign against Yugoslavia has been an abject failure. NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, General Wesley Clark, admitted as much at a news briefing yesterday. The bombs have so far failed to stop the ethnic cleansing, failed to stop the buildup of Serb troops, and failed to break Slobodan Milosevic's resolve.

I would support the bombing if it were effective. I would support it if military professionals could carry out their mission unfettered by political persons with little or no military experience. There is no place for armchair generals here, only military professionals.

Perhaps it was doomed to fail from the start. There were questions that should have been answered for a military campaign of this nature such as what are the rules of engagement? How will we handle the massive exodus of Albanian refugees? What is the exit strategy? What are the goals? What will we do if air strikes prove to be ineffective?

Perhaps a political determination was made over the objections of the Pentagon—a decision to gamble and hope that Milosevic would cave in after a few days of air strikes. Unfortunately, the gamble failed, and no contingencies were planned. And now, the Administration's reactionary foreign policy has resulted in another situation.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain we will continue to debate this matter in the months to come, and so I conclude my statement with one final thought for my colleagues and for the Administration. It is fatal to enter any war without the will to win. We must recognize the fact that it's not tidy, and it's not clean, but if we're going to fight, we must fight to win.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say first that I stand in wholehearted support of the brave men and women who are currently risking their lives in this mission. I pray for their safe return. We should all be very proud of their dedication to their country.

The ongoing situation in Kosovo represents a grave humanitarian crisis. The government of Slobodan Milosevic has been engaging in the systematic slaughter and oppression of the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo. I have no quarrel with the Serbian people. The blame for the killing and persecution lies with Milosevic and he must be stopped. The United States cannot stand by as innocent men, women, and children are driven from their homes and villages, while countless others are brutally slaughtered. The history of 20th century Europe presents us with a moral imperative, and we have no choice but to act, and act now.

This conflict is occurring in a politically volatile region in an area of crucial importance to this country. This conflict could spread rapidly in the Balkans, affecting our NATO allies, and that has serious national security implications for America. If this conflict erupts into a major European war, U.S. involvement will be massive and much costlier than our participation in the NATO effort now underway.

Today, I plan to vote against two Resolutions being offered by my colleague, Congressman TOM CAMPBELL. While I have great respect for his views, I don't feel that these Resolutions encompass our best policy options in Kosovo.

H. Con. Res. 82 calls for the complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from current operations in Yugoslavia. The approval of this resolution would send a devastating message about America's commitment to NATO and to stopping the mindless slaughter of innocent civilians. It would allow Slobodan Milosevic to continue his policy of ethnic cleansing with impunity. In addition, any unilateral statement by Congress against the U.S. commitment to NATO would be especially ill-timed in light of NATO's reaffirmed commitment this past weekend to resolving the situation in Kosovo. Finally, I fear that this resolution would undermine the morale of our brave troops in the field.

H.J. Res. 44 calls on the U.S. government to issue a formal declaration of war against Yugoslavia. We have not declared war since World War II, and such a declaration is out of proportion to the current situation. The U.S. and NATO are seeking to stop the slaughter of innocent people and to stabilize the region for the long term, not the conquest of Yugoslavia. In addition, a unilateral declaration by the U.S. would shatter the delicate coalition of 19 NATO nations who have worked closely together to try to stop the violence that Milosevic and his forces are committing. Yesterday, this resolution was unanimously defeated in the International Relations Committee.

I also plan to vote against H.R. 1569, a bill that would cut off funding for operations in Kosovo if the President deploys ''ground elements'' without authorization. I have repeatedly voiced my hope that a ground invasion will never be necessary, but there are a myriad of circumstances that could necessitate the use of some ground forces. I do not believe Congress should tie the hands of the military commanders and risk putting our troops in any unnecessary risk.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote in favor of the resolution offered by Mr. GEJDENSON in support of continuing air strikes against Yugoslavia. This resolution is identical to the bipartisan measure which has already passed the Senate. I do this with reluctance and a heavy heart because I firmly believe that military action should always be our last resort. However, Milosevic's brutal actions and blatant refusal to negotiate have left no other options. I sincerely hope that NATO's air campaign will bring about a successful conclusion to this conflict, avoiding bloodshed of innocents on all sides of this conflict, and so we can get our troops out of harm's ways as quickly as possible.

I support this Gejdenson resolution, first and foremost, because I am convinced that it represents the right policy. I also support it because Congress has a unique responsibility—both constitutionally and morally—to speak out on matters of military conflict. Whether one supports or opposes our mission in Kosovo, it would be unconscionable for Congress to be silent on this issue. Doing so would effectively disenfranchise the millions of Americans who want to voice their views on this topic through their elected representatives.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my heartfelt thanks and gratitude to the American people for their generosity to the refugees of Kosovo. Once again, they have responded to

a humanitarian crisis with compassion and generosity, donating food, clothes, and money and countless hours of their time. This past weekend I visited Direct Relief International in my district and met with representatives from DRI, Missions Without Borders, and New Horizons Outreach. They showed me the tons of supplies they have gathered and are sending to the refugees. We all owe groups like this, and the thousands of volunteers and donors across this great land who support them, our debt of gratitude.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share my thoughts about the current situation in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and more specifically, my deep concern about the role of the United States military in the ongoing conflict.

There are no easy answers to the questions posed by the country's civil war and the reprehensible actions of Slobodan Milosovic. Thousands of Kosovars have been killed and driven out of their homes and out of their homeland. We see their suffering every night on the evening news. And we keep asking, ''What can we do?''

Without second guessing the decisions of the President and his national security team, I think it is important that we look at the status of this military action realistically. After more than a month of NATO bombing of Yugoslavia, the suffering of the Kosovars has not been eased. More refugees are being forced out of Kosovo every day, destabilizing other countries in the region. We are now learning that NATO bombing is killing innocent civilians.

The Constitution requires that Congress act on matters of war. Accordingly, Congress has two options to address the current situation—one, declare war; or two, withdraw our troops.

Declaring war on Yugoslavia is not an option. Yugoslavia has not attacked the United States, and the President has never made the case that it is in the vital interest of the U.S. to declare war.

Instead, today I voted to withdraw U.S. troops from Yugoslavia because we are not at war, and yet there is no mistake that the President is indeed waging war with our troops. In fact, ninety percent of the NATO missions are flown by U.S. pilots. Until the President explains to Americans why this military action is necessary, why we are bombing a sovereign nation, and how success is determined in this mission, I do not believe U.S. troops should be participating in this military action.

This current situation in Kosovo highlights an even larger and looming problem with our national defense policy. I am concerned that the President has stretched our national defense to the breaking point. We have too many deployments by too few troops who are under-trained and ill-equipped to put out fires in every corner of the world. Since 1991, U.S. troops have been deployed 33 times—compare that to only 10 deployments during the forty years of the Cold War.

Mr. Speaker, the United States needs a consistent foreign policy and understanding of our role in the world. That need is more evident today than every before. I am pleased that the U.S. Congress today is fulfilling its role in helping determine that policy, and would hope that the President would do the same.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to participate in this historic debate on the tragic situation in the Balkan region. We find ourselves in a disturbing conflict, and I believe the public is concerned about our long term strategy.

The President and the Secretary of Defense have recently begun a call to duty of more than 33,000 reservists and National Guardsmen. Each one of us here represents men and women that could be called to fight in the Balkans. I am confident that these men and women will represent our country well. This conflict in the Balkans has been generally viewed by my constituents as a mostly international issue taking place in areas that are unknown and unfamiliar to many of us. However, the recent call up of reservists and National Guardsmen has hit my district square in the heart, since it could involve the potential deployment of the National Guard and Air Force Reserve components stationed at March Air Reserve Base.

I am very proud of the efforts by our military personnel. Although this is the longest and largest such campaign in which no American lives have been lost, chances are this may not continue. The credit for this extraordinary accomplishment should be placed on the shoulders of our American and allied troops. These brave men and women deserve our praise. Let me take this opportunity to extend enormous gratitude from myself and everyone living within the 43rd District of California for the job and effort of our troops.

As proud as I am of our troops, I am concerned that the President has not done enough to involve Congress in the decision-making process throughout the Balkans crisis. Still today, Congress has not been advised on the exit strategy once hostilities have ceased. Yet, at the same time, this President is asking Congress for additional funds for this campaign. Mr. Speaker, I hope the President will begin to involve Congress.

I have every confidence that our men and women will do their jobs. I do not have confidence that they will have the material support that they deserve over the long haul. That is why we desperately need to pass a large defense supplemental bill to make up for previous years of inadequate defense requests from this administration.

I have voted today to reserve the decision to start any ground war to Congress, where it belongs. I have also voted against the extremes of media withdrawal and declaring war. Authorizing the air war merely recognizes reality—a reality which Congress must monitor daily so that the will and interests of the American people are reflected in our foreign policy.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of this crisis, my central concern has been the human rights situation in Kosovo. I believe that we cannot simply look the other way during this disaster. I believe that our policy must be directed toward saving as many Kosovars as possible from death, rape, torture or other atrocities. To that end, on March 24th, I issued a statement supporting NATO's targeted air strikes against military targets. I supported targeted air strikes in order to diminish President Slobodan Milosevic's ability to wage war on more than a million of his own citizens. I believed it to be the best of many bad options available to NATO after rejection of the peace plan by Milosevic and more than a year of failed diplomatic efforts.

Since the air strikes began, we have seen the focus of our bombing shift from strictly military infrastructure targets to include the civilian infrastructure. My support for the air strikes waned when this shift began occurring, because our military actions were no longer connected to my central goal of addressing the human rights crisis. In fact, I believe that bombing the Yugoslavian civilian infrastructure will worsen rather than improve the humanitarian situation.

I believe that Congress and the President must share in the responsibility of deciding whether or not to introduce U.S. troops into hostilities. The War Powers Resolution is unambiguous on that issue. The U.S. House of Representatives has not yet taken such a vote. I believe that we should.

Votes on war and peace are the most serious votes that a member of Congress ever has to cast. In the end, votes of this magnitude must be guided by conscience, not politics or party loyalty. For that reason I am today casting votes in favor of H.R. 1569, prohibiting the use of funds to deploy ground troops without Congressional authorization; in favor of H. Con. Res. 82, invoking the war powers resolution and withdrawing our troops in the absence of Congressional authorization for their continuing presence; against H.J. Res. 44, declaring war on Yugoslavia; and against S. Con. Res. 21, authorizing continued military air operations against Yugoslavia.

What most concerns me about today's votes is that we are not addressing our most important goals. I would like to be voting on a resolution devoting as much time, energy, money and human resources to assisting the refugees as we are to prosecuting this military action. While we fight allegedly on their behalf, refugees remain in unsafe and squalid conditions. There is much more we could be doing to assist those whose lives we are fighting for. I would also like to be voting on a resolution that says unequivocally to our troops—especially those who are being held prisoner—I support and honor you in your work, regardless of whether my vote is in the majority or minority today.

In the final analysis, our mission must be a moral one to relieve the suffering of hundreds of thousands of displaced families and to seek lasting peace in the region.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep concerns for the current situation in Kosovo and the military policies being pursued by the Clinton Administration.

Let met say at the outset that I fully support our military men and women. They are the finest in the world. Further, in no way do I wish to send a message to Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic that I consider him to be anything other than a barbarian and a thug. His policies in Kosovo of ''ethnic cleansing'' and mass deportation of the Albanian majority are nothing short of deplorable which serve to reinforce his pathologic quest for ultimate power and authority. There can be no doubt that as Secretary of Defense Cohen has stated, ''Mr. Milosevic and his minions are engaging in rape, pillage, and murder on a scale that we have not seen since the end of World War II'' * * * ''Milosevic is an ex-communist thug who has been appallingly brutal to the Kosovo Albanians.''

Kosovo is much more than a civil war. It is in effect an extension of what we have already experienced in Slovenia, Bosnia and Croatia. Serb forces, including elements of the Yugoslav Army, Serb special police and paramilitary units have attacked towns and villages

throughout Kosovo in a clear pattern similar to what we saw in Bosnia. The world has a right to be outraged and to demand that Mr. Milosevic end his brutal campaign of hatred and expulsion.

Like many, I do believe that the nations of Europe had the right to decide that the situation in Kosovo was no longer tolerable and had to be stopped before a broader war in the Balkans ensued. NATO's reason for taking action in Kosovo is honorable. Ethnic cleansing must be condemned. Clearly, the United States does have a national interest in a peaceful resolution of this conflict. Peace and stability in southern Europe is important. If the current situation persists, Montenegro could be next and perhaps Bosnia could flare up again. The current situation also places our friends and allies in Greece and Turkey in a tenuous situation which could rekindle old animosities. But does the United States have such a strategic national interest in the Balkans that we should commit U.S. military forces to the region? I do not believe so. Is it in the best interest of the European nations of NATO to act to resolve this conflict? Yet it is. And, as a member of NATO, should the U.S. participate in some way? Yes, we could. But do we need to be in the forefront of the military operation, providing the bulk of the airstrike forces and potentially the ground forces? I do not believe so. If the European nations of NATO wish to intervene militarily, I believe the U.S., as a NATO ally, can assist with communications, intelligence, logistics, and medical support. And if that is not enough for the NATO alliance to act in a case such as this to enforce their own responsibilities to preserve stability in Europe, then I question the real resolve of the alliance and wonder what kind of an alliance we have if it cannot function without the U.S. in the lead.

That is why I voted today to remove our air forces from the operations over Yugoslavia and will oppose the commitment of United States ground combat forces to Kosovo should the President decide to do so. Last March, I voted against authorizing American ground forces to be used as a peacekeeping force in Kosovo. I did so because NATO didn't have a clearly defined mission or strategy to win the conflict. We also didn't have an exit strategy. I said then that I hoped I would be proven wrong. That hasn't been the case.

When feasible, the United States and NATO should take well thought-out steps to stop aggression or in this case the brutal extermination or deportation of an ethnic population. Our actions, if we are to take them, must be swift and taken with overwhelming force. But we have done the opposite in Yugoslavia. If we are to be intellectually honest, we have to admit that an air war cannot stop ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. Air wars alone have never succeeded. If we are to be intellectually honest, we have to admit that the air war is in all likelihood a prelude to a ground war. If we are to be intellectually honest, we have to admit that incrementally increasing our war effort is a losing strategy. Even General Clark, the NATO supreme commander has stated that ''air power alone will not be sufficient to stop the ethnic cleansing''.

Instead of stopping the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo, our strategy seemingly has hastened it. The administration was caught off guard by that. Milosevic has achieved most of his objectives. He has extended his control over Kosovo, and he has successfully expelled a large portion of the ethnic Albanian population. Now he is suggesting to Russian negotiators that he is ready to talk peace. Perhaps this option should be seriously reconsidered, instead of being summarily dismissed, as the Administration has done.

If we resort now to a ground war, we risk far more casualties and an open-ended commitment to Kosovo that could quickly become a long-time quagmire. When we put our troops in Bosnia, the President promised they would be home in a few months. That was four years ago, and 3,000 troops are still there. He's not saying how long our troops would be in Kosovo. And because our mission and exit strategy remain unclear to me, I fear that we would have to send an invasion force into Kosovo at least as large as the one we used in the Persian Gulf and that those forces would be required to remain in Kosovo for a very long time.

Furthermore, we are also asking our military men and women to do a job without supplying them with the necessary tools. Today, there are 265,000 American troops in 135 countries—including 50,000 in Korea and several thousand more in the Persian Gulf. At the same time, since the end of the Gulf War, our military has shrunk by 40 percent. Since 1990, the Air Force has shrunk from 36 active and reserve fighter wings to 20. The Navy is sending warships to sea hundreds of sailors short of a full crew. The Marines and Army are running out of ammunition. If we needed to, we would be hard-pressed to respond elsewhere in the world. Already, we have had to divert planes from their patrol over Iraq to fly Kosovo missions.

As we commit American troops to more hotspots around the world, coupled with the defense cutbacks this Administration has made over this decade, it means our tissue-thin military resources have become even thinner.

My prayers go to the outstanding men and women in U.S. uniforms involved in this confrontation and those facing danger throughout the world. I have the greatest confidence in their commitment, to their honor and in their willingness to fight for freedom. Had we given them the tools, the strategy, and the commitment to win, I know they would prevail in Kosovo. But we haven't. So they should no longer be engaged and certainly should not be committed to a ground war.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to American participation in Operation Allied Force.

This Administration's policy in the Balkans has been completely misguided from the outset. While I feel great sympathy for the innocent people on both sides of this conflict, I firmly believe that American military intervention is not the answer. The divisions that plague Yugoslavia are centuries-old grievances that no external force may ever be able to control.

Mr. Speaker, too many questions remain unanswered regarding our participation in this mission. The Administration's effort to counter Serbian aggression lacks a coherent design, a fixed timetable for engagement, a well-defined exit strategy, and a clear final objective. Administration officials continue to argue that American military intervention is absolutely necessary to end Slobodan Milosevic's brutal ethnic cleansing campaign. But if the purpose in striking Yugoslavia was to end humanitarian abuses, then NATO has surely failed. All indications are that Milosevic has actually accelerated his ethnic cleansing program since air strikes began, and NATO's own military commander today acknowledged that Operation Allied Force has failed to reduce the size of the Serbian force in Kosovo or its operations against Albanians.

Mr. Speaker, this President is now preparing to fully engage our Armed Forces in a conflict that pre-dates Columbus' first trip to the Americas. Despite his continued claims that he has no intention of deploying American ground troops to this bloody conflict, every move this President now makes points to this ever-growing possibility. Just yesterday, the President ordered over 33,000 U.S. reserves back into active duty, the biggest call-up since the Persian Gulf War. In addition, the President has put into effect an order that prevents Air Force pilots and other critical personnel from retiring or leaving the Air Force before the Kosovo air war ends.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience support risking American lives to fight a war that seems to have more to do with ensuring this president's legacy than protecting our national security interests abroad.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, today we debate two concepts—responsibility and planning. Understanding our responsibilities and how we plan to carry them out is the key to determining what America's interest in Kosovo is.

Our responsibility as Americans are limited and crystal clear. We must oppose any threat to our national security. Our interests in the Balkans are limited. We have no direct national interest in the region's politics. Our interests are solely limited to preventing any other outside power from increasing its threat to America by dominating the region. Preventing any conflict in that region from emboldening tyrants elsewhere or becoming a threat to our ties with key allies. Unfortunately, our current policy threatens to do just that.

When we commit American power we have a responsibility to plan. We must have a plan of action that will lead to the achievement of objectives that is consistent with U.S. interests. There must be linkage between our political objectives and military plans if we are to succeed in achieving our goals.

Unfortunately, our mission in Kosovo falls short in both respects. The Balkans are not an area of vital national interest. We have no security interest that remotely justifies the massive commitment of military resources and U.S. credibility that the administration has made. It is both dangerous and irresponsible to place our forces and credibility at risk.

It was very clear to me during any recent visit to the region that there is a clear disconnect between our political objectives and our military actions. A human tragedy is unfolding in the region. Having personally visited the refugee camps I understand the devastation faced by the Albanian people. I also know that our first humanitarian responsibility is to do no additional harm. The administration's actions have fueled this too. To this day it remains unclear what the administration's long term political objectives for the region are. We cannot succeed without objectives.

My colleagues, I fear that our policy du jour places American lives, strategic alliances and credibility at risk. The lack of policy direction

makes success unachievable and threatens to only compound the current humanitarian crisis. This is a political problem which requires a political, not military, solution. Let's escalate our diplomatic efforts to seek a solution to this humanitarian crisis. We still have diplomatic cards to play. Let's not compound the errors of our current policy by military escalation. Let's focus our efforts on achieving a diplomatic triumph.

Going to war is the most profound question we will ever vote on as representatives. We must never risk American lives except to protect our vital national interests.

My colleagues, I ask each and every one of you to look at the facts. The president has failed to outline a plan with achievable objectives. Escalation only promises more political failure despite military successes. Let's stop this ruinous spiral and seek a diplomatic solution. Please join me in voting against the Administration's war policy.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, these four important votes concerning NATO Operation Allied Force in Kosovo cause me tremendous difficulty. We hold this debate today because the mission, the means and the mentality behind this operation are unclear. There are no good options before us, only some less bad than others.

People speak of winning, people speak of losing. People speak of sins of omission and sins of commission. But, we have no agreed definitions for those terms so we stutter and speak similar words with disparate meanings. Look at the history of the Balkans and you can understand one thing—no one's hands are clean and everything is colored in shades of gray. We must look to the President of the United States to lead and give us common definitions and meaning for our involvement, to define the political objectives we seek to achieve, and to determine how we can best achieve them.

On March 11, over a month ago, we debated our interests in Kosovo. At that time I had not heard from the President an unambiguous statement of our interests and goals in Kosovo. Today, we cover some of the same ground and yet still do not have an articulation of the central strategic national interest involved. That suggests at best an unfortunate lack of communication, consultation and evolution, at worst, a complete muddle on the part of the administration.

Given this environment, it is proper that we pass legislation that puts a check on escalation to ground forces.

As one who seeks to maintain our leadership in international trade issues, I understand the arguments of maintaining international stability, NATO credibility, of assisting in the humanitarian relief, and on standing firm against the kind of atrocities that have been taking place in Kosovo. For those reasons I am willing to give the President and NATO leaders the benefit of the doubt on their air campaign strategy. In any event, it is the reality of where we are today, the level at which we are now engaged. That is why I support S. Con. Res. 21 which authorizes the President to conduct military air operations and missile strikes against Yugoslavia.

Following those same arguments, I also stand opposed to the immediate removal of our military forces under section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution as H. Con. Res. 82 would have us do. But, those arguments do not convince me that the situation warrants the United States of America declaring war on the Federal Republic of Serbia; so, I oppose H.J. Res. 44. I trust the President shares this letter view since he himself has not asked Congress for a declaration of war.

Let me also mention that none of the above in any way diminishes the importance of passing an emergency appropriation bill to pay for the cost of what has already been done. The number of missiles and munitions already expended in Operation Allied Force is extraordinary. This action in addition to Desert Fox, Afghanistan and other operations has exceeded all forecasts and expectations. Therefore, we need to replenish the stocks and give the military the resources they need to maintain their equipment through this campaign. But none of us should be under any illusion; if this air war continues, this will not be the last supplemental appropriation bill we will see on this floor.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, sixty years ago Nazi Germany prepared for the invasion of Poland that thrust the world into darkness, despair and death. We put our heads in the sand. It wasn't our problem.

It became our problem, and before it was over more than 50 million people lost their lives. At the heart of Hitler's madness was the conscious decision to kill every Jew in Europe. He almost succeeded.

Sixty years ago we did not have NATO and the United States was not the pre-eminent world leader. But once again we have a European leader whose rise to power is premised on the forced dislocation, rape, torture, and murder of an internal ethnic and religious minority. This time it is the ethnic Albanians, who are for the most part Muslim.

How should we respond to this challenge? We could hide in the sand. Or we could take action in the name of humanity. That is what we have done. We have acted properly by using our military to end the atrocities. We must now complete the job. We must fight to win. Ending our participation would be a horrible disaster—for the United States, for Europe, and for the ethnic Albanians we seek to help. It is not in our character to duck and run. Rather, we should take a stand for democracy, for hope, and for a secure Europe.

We have spent considerable effort trying to reach a peaceful settlement. The ethnic Albanians accepted a compromise. The Serbs rejected it. This is not a new problem and this bombing campaign is not a knee jerk response. President Bush, as he was leaving office, threatened military action against the Milosovic regime, and President Clinton and other world leaders have repeated that threat numerous times.

Sometimes you need to back up a threat with action. And that is precisely what President Clinton has done. He has not acted alone, but with the unanimous consent and widespread participation of our NATO allies. I am proud that we have taken a stand against inhumanity and for basic human rights. We waited to take action in Bosnia, at the cost of many lives, and once we did, we were able to end the daily horrors. As President Clinton observed, if a united force had moved to stop Hitler early, we might have spared the world its darkest hour.

Our military must remain fully ready to respond to traditional threats to our national security. But we must not be afraid or unwilling to take action to stop or prevent genocide where we can make a difference. We cannot solve every world problem, but we also cannot therefore refuse ever to act. A European genocide, as we should have learned, can destabilize the entire world.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this House needs to search clearly for a rational, sustainable policy regarding Yugoslavia. In this process, we need to hear all the voices instead of only those with which we agree. I am inserting an article by Vesna Perio-Zimonjic that provides a valuable insight on the long-term potential ecological damage our bombs could cause:

AFTER BOMBS, ECOLOGICAL DISASTER AND HUNGER

(By Vesna Perio-Zimonjic)

[From IPS Terraviva, Apr. 22, 1999]

BELGRADE.—Apart from the razing of Yugoslav industrial sites and infrastructure, NATO air attacks are causing an ecological disaster that could endanger the Balkans as a whole, Serbian officials and ecological experts warned. Important rivers, lakes and agricultural land are now contaminated with chemicals and depleted uranium, while the country's fertiliser plants have been destroyed at the height of the seeding season. The result, experts say, might be widespread hunger. According to NATO spokesmen, however, the destruction of refineries and chemical industries is just aimed at crippling Belgrade's ability to wage war against ethnic Albanians in the Serbian province of Kosovo, some 374 km from the capital. For days on last week, huge black clouds were hanging over the Yugoslav capital, coming from the industrial town of Pancevo, 20 km to the northeast, where a huge oil refinery, petrochemical complex and fertiliser factory had been hit by NATO planes. For two days, residents of both Pancevo and Belgrade were counselled to use watered handkerchiefs or towels over their faces in case they had burning eyes or sore throat when they came out in the street. Luckily, people thought, the wind quickly swept the clouds and the rain washed residues away. But Yugoslav Development, Science and Environment Minister Jagos Zelenovic told journalists that the damage coming from Pancevo's industrial complex was far from over, causing a cross-border environmental hazard. ''The spreading of harmful, dangerous, inflammable and explosive materials used in this complex has polluted the atmosphere, ground water, rivers, lakes and water supply of the wider region,'' Zelenovic said. ''The effects of this pollution not only go across borders, but these are long-term substances and carcinogens,'' he said.

Local civil defence authorities in Pancevo evacuated two residential districts after April 18—the fiercest NATO attack so far—that led to the release of chlorine, hydrochloric acid and even phosgene in the atmosphere, when petrochemical facilities and a fertiliser factory were destroyed. Residents of two small neighbourhoods close to the complexes had to be taken by buses to nearby schools and a sports centre, where they remain until now. Dragoljub Bjelovic, of the Serbian Ministry of Ecology, told journalists that ''ecological catastrophe'' could hit the entire Balkan Region. ''The whole region is in danger, specially after the fertiliser factory was hit, as highly toxic substances went into the air but also, with rain, into the ground,'' he said. ''All rivers and underwater streams in this part of Serbia and the Balkan region are connected, so the toxins can spread into quite a big zone,'' he added. According to Bjelovic, a 20 km-long oil spill from the Pancevo refinery is travelling down

the Danube river, towards the two huge Djerdap dams and hydro-electric plants on the Yugoslav-Rumanian border. Both dams were built decades ago by Yugoslavia and Rumania, as the Danube marks the border between the two countries in that zone. From Rumania on, the Danube goes through Bulgaria and into the Black Sea. ''Everything that goes into Danube now, will saturate the Black Sea in a short while,'' Bjelovic said. Miralem Dzindo, general manager of the 'Azotara' fertiliser plant in Pancevo, told journalists that besides the threat of bombs and ecological disaster, there is an additional hazard Serbs have to worry about. ''There is no way to produce necessary fertilisers now, as all facilities were burned to ground on April 18,'' he said. ''The seeding of land is in full swing at this time of year and we won't be able to deliver the necessary substances for our fields . . . The rockets that hit the plant also hit the land and we might face hunger as a result.''

Evacuation of residents is also being considered by civil defence authorities in the town of Ohrenovac, 20 km southwest from Belgrade, where a huge chemical complex is located in the neighbourhood of Baric. It is no secret that the Baric complex produces hydrochloric acid for civilian use and even the dangerous and extremely toxic hydrofluoric acid, used as a component for different household detergents. Baric is situated on the Sava river, which meets the Danube in Belgrade. ''If we let all these chemicals into the river—to prevent them from evaporating into the atmosphere in case Baric was hit by NATO—that would be a real catastrophe,'' a plant official told IPS. ''Under normal circumstances, it would take three months to properly shut down the factors, with all necessary precautionary measures. If we're hit now, God knows what could happen,'' he added. The threat is not a mere speculation: a small office building at the Baric complex was already hit twice in NATO air raids last Sunday. Reports about NATO using depleted uranium (DU) weapons have also been printed by the Serbian press, based on a document issued by the New York-based International Action Centre (IAC)—founded by former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark—said that US A–10 ''Warthog'' jets, introduced recently into NATO attacks, carry anti-tank weapons ''that could present a danger to the people and environment of the entire Balkans.'' According to IAC, ''the A–10s were the anti-tank weapon of choice in the 1991 war against Iraq. It carries a GAU–8/A Avenger 30 millimetre seven-barrel cannon capable of firing 4,200 rounds per minute. During that war it fired 30 mm rounds reinforced with DU, a radioactive weapon.'' ''There is solid scientific evidence that the DU residue left in Iraq is responsible for a large increase in stillbirths, children born with defects, and childhood leukemia and other cancers in the area of southern Iraq near Basra, where most of these shells were fired,'' the group says. Many U.S. veterans groups also say that DU residues contributed to the condition called ''Gulf War Syndrome'' that has affected close to 100,000 service people in the U.S. and Britain with chronic sickness,'' IAC added. John Catalinotto, a spokesman for IAC's depleted Uranium Education Project, said the use of DU weapons in Yugoslavia ''adds a new dimension to the crime NATO is perpetrating against the Yugoslav people—including those in Kosovo.'' ''DU is used in alloy form in shells to make them penetrate better. As the shell hits the target, it burns and releases uranium oxide into the air. The poisonous and radioactive uranium is most dangerous when inhaled into the body, where it will release radiation during the entire life of the person who inhaled it,'' Catalinotto said.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, today the House considers legislation regarding U.S. policy toward the crisis in Yugoslavia. Under our Constitution, Congress has an important responsibility to be involved in the conduct of foreign policy, and this is no exception. Today, I will vote for H.R. 1569 and S. Con. Res. 21 and against H. Con. Res. 82 and H. Con. Res. 44.

There are four issues that the House of Representatives must decide today: whether the United States should declare war on Yugoslavia; whether the United States should withdraw its forces from the NATO led strikes; whether Congress must pass legislation to approve any ground troops that may be deployed by the President; and whether the President has the support of the Congress to continue to participate in the NATO led air campaign. These are not easy or simple decisions.

H. Con. Res. 82 would require the President to remove U.S. military forces currently participating in Operation Allied Force. The other proposal, H. Con. Res. 44, would declare a state of war between the United States and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. I intend to oppose both of these proposals.

Passage of either bill would have severe consequences for United States foreign policy. Withdrawing U.S. troops participating in Operation Allied Force would hand Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic a victory and a signal that he was free to continue the policies of ethnic cleansing and genocide. In addition, withdrawing troops would destroy hopes for a positive outcome of current air strikes against Serbia. Finally, the withdraw of U.S. troops may break apart the NATO alliance. Withdrawal of troops could cause Milosevic to question our resolve to achieve the objective of a multi-ethnic, democratic Kovoso in which all can live in peace and security.

Conversely, declaring war would have equally devastating consequences. The situation in Kosovo, though extremely serious, has not developed to the point that the United States as a sovereign country should declare war. Declaring war carries legal consequences that include the nationalization of factories for wartime production, as well as foreign policy consequences such as the military involvement from other countries such as Russia. The United States has only voted to declare war 11 times in its history, and none since World War II. The United States should continue its participation in the NATO led effort, but at this time, there is no compelling reason why we, as a sovereign nation, should independently declare war on Yugoslavia.

I do intend to support H.R. 1569, which would prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the Defense Department for deploying U.S. ground forces in Yugoslavia unless the deployment is authorized by law. This prohibition does not apply to ground missions that deal specifically with rescuing U.S. military personnel or personnel of another NATO country participating in the mission.

Normally, I do not advocate limiting the President's options in his conduct of U.S. foreign policy, and I do have some concerns about this legislation. For example, requiring Congressional approval of ground troops by law could be misinterpreted by both Milosevic and our Allies as a potential step back from the solidarity expressed at the NATO summit. In addition, there could be practical problems in carrying out the intent of this legislation because there are some U.S. ground troops already in the region as part of peacekeeping forces. However, the question of enaging U.S. ground troops in combat in Kosovo is so serious that Congress must take an active role in making that decision. Unfortunately, in initiating the air campaign, the Administration left the impression that it would be over in a matter of days and that Milosevic would immediately capitulate. Initiating the use of ground troops is an even more serious decision and there must be full consultation with Congress if that decision has to be made.

While the potential use of ground forces cannot be completely ruled out, the best scenario would be that a NATO ground force—predominantly made up of European-NATO forces—would escort refuges back to Kosovo after the Yugoslav forces voluntarily withdraw or they are forced to withdraw as a result of the NATO air campaign. The ramifications of the use of ground forces must be fully studied and debated by Congress and conveyed to the American people. Regardless of what steps are necessary and what measures are passed by the House of Representatives today, I would urge the president to make sure he prepares the American people for any role he may ask of our military personnel.

Finally, I also intend to support S. Con. Res. 21 which authorizes the president to conduct military air operations and missile strikes against Yugoslavia. The United States must continue to work to insure that our NATO allies do their part and that our burden does not grow disproportionately. At the same time, we cannot escape the fact that we are the world's only real superpower and thus the only nation that has certain military, logistical and humanitarian capabilities. Each day brings more grim statistics regarding the treatment of ethnic Albanians in Kosovo. Since February of 1998, Milosevic has used force to kill more than 2,000 ethnic Albanians and has displaced at least 400,000. Since NATO's air campaign began, Milosevic has escalated his violence against ethnic Albanians and they have been killed and tortured and driven from their homes and families. The United States, as a member of NATO, has a responsibility to step in to try to stop the killing of innocent civilians.

In our Constitution, the Founding Fathers envisioned full consultation by the President with Congress whenever the U.S. would send troops into a conflict. It is never easy to ask American men and women to leave their family and friends to risk their lives to protect the peace of another country. When the President decides to send U.S. troops into harm's way, he should seek the full backing of Congress and the American public. I am pleased that we have been given this chance to debate the situation in Kosovo today.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in Kosovo, the United States is bearing most of the burden in a region of the world where there are no American security interests at stake.

Our pilots and planes account for at least 80 percent of the air strikes against Yugoslavia. And our taxpayers are picking up the bill for most of the costs of the war. Yet our NATO allies in Europe have almost twice as many men and women in uniform as we do.

The U.S. cannot always be the supercop patrolling the world. Our NATO allies should do more, and America less.

Unlike Iraq, which attacked other countries and where our national security was at risk

because of Iraq's control of our oil supply, Kosovo has no similar claims to American intervention.

America may have a humanitarian responsibility to help bring stability to the region, but we have no obligation to carry the heaviest load. Our NATO allies have more reason to intervene and are capable of doing so. They should shoulder more of the burden.

After five weeks of bombing, we now know that our stated goals in Kosovo have turned to ashes. Our hostile actions against Yugoslavia, we were told by the Administration, would stop the exodus of refugees and bring the surrender of Yugoslavia within days. The Administration has failed in its mission. Our actions likely have made the situation worse.

A realistic solution is to seek a negotiated settlement that protects the rights of Kosovars to remain safely in their homeland. There is much we can do to encourage this without declaring war: provide logistical support to our allies, seize Yugoslavia's assets in foreign banks, and encourage Russia, Yugoslavia's historical ally, to medicate a peace agreement.

For Congress to declare war and give the President a blank check would continue America's level of involvement and even escalate it. In fact, the President announced yesterday he is calling up 32,000 reservists. That's not the direction we should be going.

Based upon numerous conversations with many constituents, I sense a growing unease with putting the lives of Americans at risk, especially when our objections are not being achieved.

Our allies should take responsibility for a greater share of the war effort and the U.S. should do more to bring about a negotiated settlement.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult, and probably inappropriate, for me to publicly express the despair I feel over our policy in the Balkans. With noble motives, we have waded into complex, ancient hatreds, and we have only aggravated the situation. In a place and situation where the United States has no vital national security interests, we have become deeply involved. We have staked the credibility of the United States and NATO on achieving an acceptable solution where none may exist.

I did not believe that the U.S. should participate in a peacekeeping force and voted accordingly on March 11. I did not support U.S. involvement in the air campaign which is now underway. It is very tempting to vote to require that our forces be withdrawn immediately from this conflict.

Yet, whatever differences we may have with past decisions, we are where we are. Where we are today is that we are left with no good options. That is particularly true with the provisions upon which we are forced to vote today.

I believe it would be better not to have these votes today. I do not want the outcome of a vote to be seen as authorizing an escalation in the conflict without clear objectives and the will to carry it through until those objectives are achieved. But neither do I want any vote to be seen as undercutting the efforts of the brave men and women conducting the current air offensive. Nor do I wish for any vote to give comfort to Mr. Milosevic.

Two of the votes today are on resolutions submitted pursuant to the War Powers Act. As I noted during debate related to Bosnia a year ago, I believe that the War Powers Act is unconstitutional.

Section 5(c) of the War Powers Act attempts to give Congress authority to force the President to remove U.S. forces by passing a concurrent resolution. The Supreme Court's 1983 Chada decision struck down a similar provision, and most scholars and observers believe that section 5(c) is also unconstitutional because it would require the President to remove troops by a concurrent resolution, which require the signature of the President.

I believe that the War Powers Act is unconstitutional on broader grounds as well, as I detailed in the debate last year. I will vote against both War Powers Resolutions because I believe that the Act is unconstitutional and because I do not believe it is prudent for Congress to declare war against Yugoslavia or to force the immediate withdrawal of all U.S. forces from an ongoing NATO military operation.

Congress certainly has the constitutional authority to restrict funding for a military operation. While I have real concern about any measure which takes a military option off of the table, I believe that the Administration should get Congressional approval before using ground troops in this conflict. Therefore, I will vote for the provision requiring prior authorization for use of ground forces, although I do so with some hesitation.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to harbor some hopes that a negotiated solution to this conflict can be found through the efforts of Russia and others. Certainly, we should carefully consider the consequences of any U.S. action upon a number of factors, including: U.S. credibility and the effectiveness of our deterrent now and into the future; the reaction of other significant powers, especially Russia; the best interests of the refugees and of the people still in Kosovo; long-term stability in the Balkan region; the effects on the NATO alliance; and the consequences for the military position of the United States around the world.

Today, the United States finds itself in a quagmire which may be only a taste of what's to come. I hope that an honorable solution can be achieved, but I am not sure that any of the measures we consider today will move us any closer to that goal. I also hope that our nation can come to a clear understanding and establish guidelines for the proper role of the United States and of NATO in a complex world and especially for the circumstances under which we are willing to risk the lives of the men and women who defend our nation and our freedoms.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, to close debate, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Southern California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, what we have to understand in debating this is there is a false dichotomy that is being presented. And the American people can understand that. The option is not doing nothing or sending in our U.S. troops to do the fighting. That is not the option.

The American people need no longer bear the burden for maintaining stability throughout the world, especially in Europe's backyard. Our forces right now are flying 9 out of 10 combat missions, and we Americans are paying two-thirds of the cost.

We have done our part in this conflict already. If the Balkans are so important, let the Europeans step forward and finish the job. Let them deploy their troops if they think it is so important.

This operation has been confused since its inception. The Kosovars were willing to fight for their own freedom, for their own stability, for the protection of their families. Helping them do this would have cost us a pittance compared to the tens of billions of dollars this will drain from our coffers.

There goes Social Security reform. There goes our surplus. No, America need not bear this burden itself. People are willing to fight for themselves. Other people can pick up the cost and meet the responsibilities.

We can be the arsenal of democracy, yes, and help others. But we cannot be the policemen of the world or it will break our banks and put us in jeopardy in other places in the world

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, all time for general debate has expired.

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA LIMITATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 151, I call up the bill (H.R. 1569) to prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense from being used for the deployment of ground elements of the United States Armed Forces in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia unless that deployment is specifically authorized by law, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 1569 is as follows:

H.R. 1569

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Military Operations in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Limitation Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FUNDS FOR DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES GROUND FORCES TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA WITHOUT SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION BY LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—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 a law enacted after the enactment of this Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the initiation of missions specifically limited to rescuing United States military personnel or United States citizens in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or rescuing military personnel of another member nation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as a result of operations as a member of an air crew.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution

151, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from San Diego, California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult time for most of us. And I heard my colleague a minute ago say we want to stop ethnic cleansing.

The Pentagon told the President, and I know every one of them by their first names and I have fought in combat with most of them, told the President not to do this, that it would only cause more problems. And that is what we have done.

There was only a little over 2,000 people killed in Kosovo prior to the bombing. NATO and the United States have killed more Albanians than the Serbs had in the year prior. We would not have a million refuges in the outlying countries. We have forced that.

The Pentagon told the President that Milosevic would increase the ethnic cleansing. And when my colleague says that no more will we stand up, Tudjman murdered 10,000 Serbs in 1995, 750,000 refugees, where was he then? There are other ways.

Maybe some of us who have fought in combat and have held our friends in our arms do not want to get in and see this again. Do not let us put ground troops into this thing. And there is a peaceful way to resolve this and we can do that. I went through it just a minute ago.

Russia: Seventy percent of the Russians support the overthrow of Yeltsin. Let them be part of the solution. Let them come in with their peacekeepers and divide this. Serbs will agree to this. The Orthodox Catholic Church agrees with this. The 200,000 Serbian Americans agree with this.

We can get Milosevic's troops out of there and restore some sanity into Kosovo without killing a bunch more and having another Vietnam.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Mississippi for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of those Democrats in 1991 that crossed party lines to support President Bush in the Persian Gulf War. In my estimation, President Bush was right then and President Clinton is right now. And I wish my friends on the other side of the aisle would give President Clinton the same flexibility that we wanted to give President Bush back in 1991.

This bill sends the wrong signal to Milosevic, the absolute wrong signal. I have met with Milosevic. I know what he is all about. I have seen him face to face. The man is a liar and a tyrant. And this will encourage him to hunker down. This will encourage him to hold out. This will encourage him to think that, somehow or the other, the Congress will step in and deny the President the right to win this war.

We hear from our friends on the other side of the aisle that the President, once he moves in, ought to be allowed to win, that our people should not be fighting these wars with their hands tied behind their backs. And I agree.

So why would we want to do this? Why would we want to make it difficult for the President to be the Commander in Chief? Why would we want to tie the hands of the President? Why would we want to hurt our men and women in the area? Because that is what this will do.

Instead of authorizing the way we did with President Bush, this is negative, this places negative restrictions. This is exactly the wrong signal that we should be sending.

I am co-chair of the Albanian Issues Caucus. I have dealt with Kosovo for years and years and years. We hope the bombing will work. But if it does not, in my estimation, all options should remain on the table, including the option of ground troops. If not, if those options do not remain on the table, we tell Milosevic just hunker down, wait us out and he will win, because we are announcing ahead of time what we will not do. This, in my estimation, aids and abets Milosevic. Ethnic cleansing should not be allowed. Ethnic cleansing and genocide should not be allowed on the Continent of Europe or anywhere in the world in 1999.

The previous speaker mentioned that the bombing somehow was responsible for the genocide. This ethnic cleansing was going on for the past 10 years by Milosevic and his people. Oh, it was slower. It was what I call slow ethnic cleansing. But make no mistake about it, my colleagues, it was going on and would continue to go on.

□ 1345

He has accelerated it now because I said on the floor of the House 3 years ago that Milosevic wanted to drive a million Albanians over the border and kill half a million Albanians. I am right about the million Albanians. I hope I am wrong about the half a million. But I think when we finally get into Kosovo, we are going to see mass graves and tens of thousands if not hundreds of thousands of people will have been ethnically cleansed.

I introduced a bill last week with the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) to arm and train the KLA. The KLA is the only counterbalance to the Serbs on the ground. In my estimation if we do not want American troops on the ground for years, we ought to be strengthening them and drop them antitank weaponry. The only solution in my estimation long-range for Kosovo will be independence, because it is clear that ethnic Albanians have no future in Serbia. This is ill-timed, it undermines the President, and it ought to be rejected.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to make sure that everybody understands what the legislation says and what the legislation does.

First of all, it basically very simply says that no DOD funds can be used to send ground forces into battle in Yugoslavia without the approval of the Congress. It does not interfere with our intelligence ability to support our air war, it does not interfere with our ability to rescue downed airmen of our forces or of NATO, it does not restrict ground forces all around Yugoslavia. It just basically says, ''You come to the Congress of the United States if you are going to use DOD funds to send ground forces into Yugoslavia.''

Why did I introduce that legislation? I introduced it primarily because I do not believe the President can conduct a war in Yugoslavia without the consent of Congress. Opposite of what Secretary Cohen and Secretary Albright said in their note, they said H.R. 1569 would unacceptably restrict the President's ability to carry out his responsibility as Commander in Chief. I do not believe he can carry that out with a ground war without the consent of Congress. That is exactly what this legislation says: ''You come to Congress.''

I think we have to be very, very careful when we talk about committing ground troops at this particular time. Where are the ground troops that we are going to commit? If you speak to a college group as I have the last 10 days to three different colleges, the first things I mention is the word ''draft.''

Why do I mention the word ''draft''? Where are we going to get the ground troops? We have 250,000 now spread all over the world. You have to have that draft. We make that decision, not the President of the United States.

So we have to become involved. If we do not become involved, then we are going to see something much worse than what we saw during Vietnam. Members are now getting, I am sure, all sorts of e-mails and letters from senior citizens. They are saying, ''You're taking my Social Security money.'' We are getting e-mails from college students because they are concerned about being drafted. We are getting e-mails from parents of teenagers who have this concern.

Congress just has to be involved. The President cannot carry on this responsibility without our involvement. So we take the time as Congress to make sure that, first of all, we have the troops, that they are well prepared, that they have the material, they have the armaments, they have the equipment, they have the machinery in order to protect them, a decision we have to make because we are going to be responsible for their safety.

I was very disappointed, apparently I did not know the gentleman as well as

I thought I did, who spoke during the rule and made a statement that I did not know what was in my bill, that the leadership put it before me. The leadership did not even know I was introducing the legislation and I do not even know if they support the legislation.

What he asked me was, the last paragraph, and I made it clear to him that I introduced H.R. 1368. The last paragraph became part of H.R. 1569. So again, I call on everyone to make sure that we, the Congress of the United States, gets an opportunity to be involved if we are going to send troops on the ground into Yugoslavia.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard on two or three occasions this morning that the operation in Kosovo will come at the expense of the Social Security trust fund. I find it ironic that many of the people who made that statement just a few weeks ago were advocates of massive tax cuts for hundreds of billions of dollars which they assured the American people would not come at the expense of the Social Security trust fund. Either it is or it is not. And we do have to set priorities.

I do agree with the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) that equipping our troops, that we have as a Nation already sent into this combat, is a higher priority than anything else at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Goodling amendment. I do so despite the fact that I have serious differences with the President on the conduct of this war, specifically the command authority as far as selecting targets and the fact that he took ground troops off the table before the engagement began. But I oppose this amendment because it flies in the face of traditional Republican philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, throughout our history, certainly for the last 50 years, the position of the Republican Party has been to support the constitutional right of the Commander in Chief to deploy ground troops. That is why the overwhelming majority of Republicans oppose the War Powers Act. That is why the overwhelming number of Republicans opposed attempts by the Democrats to require President Bush to seek prior approval before troops went into Saudi Arabia.

It is also important to note, Mr. Speaker, the original commitment in Kosovo was made by President Bush on Christmas of 1992, when he said he would unilaterally send in American troops if Milosevic in any way moved on Kosovo. It is also significant to note that the Republican candidate for President in 1996 supports the action in Kosovo, as did President Reagan's former Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, the powers of the President as Commander in Chief transcend whoever the President is at the moment. I ask that this House vote down this amendment to preserve the constitutional powers of the President as long defined by the Republican Party.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER).

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1569, which is not an amendment, this is a freestanding bill, would make it clear that this body has a vital role in determining whether U.S. military forces should be dispatched to participate in a ground war in Yugoslavia.

Last month the Congress authorized the President to send peacekeeping troops into Kosovo in the context of Rambouillet and a permissive environment. Now, since that time, Rambouillet has collapsed and we have engaged in hostilities, changing the context for any such deployment.

Today our Nation is fighting an air war against Yugoslavia and dictator Slobodan Milosevic. The President commenced U.S. participation in hostilities without any congressional authorization. Today our airmen are in harm's way as a result.

Now, while the President and his national security team have stated that they do not intend to deploy ground forces to Yugoslavia, there is a real possibility that this conflict will escalate to involve them. Administration officials have clearly indicated that contingency planning is proceeding. Heavy armor and several thousand ground troops have been deployed to countries that neighbor Yugoslavia, and could become the nucleus of an invasion force. Meanwhile, questions about the air campaign's efficacy have led several NATO allies to push for ground forces.

The situation in Kosovo is a tragedy. My heart truly aches for the people there, just as it does for so many who are victims of war and hatred around this world. But it simply is not within our power to solve all of the world's problems. We should not compound the tragedy in Kosovo by deploying American ground troops there and subjecting them to virtually certain casualties.

Simply put, I do not believe that our national security interests in Kosovo rise to a level that warrants the commitment of U.S. ground troops.

Moreover, I am deeply concerned that this administration has not articulated an exit strategy for U.S. forces.

I would also note that U.S. ground operations would severely undermine our ability to meet the requirements of the national military strategy which calls for being able to fight and win two major regional wars, in Korea and the Persian Gulf, not in the Balkans. Yesterday the administration authorized the call-up of 33,000 reservists. The Joint Chiefs have apparently formally determined that the air war against Yugoslavia has increased the level of risk associated with meeting these requirements from high to very high. Ground operations there will further erode our ability to meet vital national security commitments.

Now, let me clarify that the intent of this bill is to preclude the deployment of a large-scale invasion ground force unless and until Congress authorizes it. This bill does not tie the President's hands. It simply requires him to come to the Congress first. It will not impair search and rescue missions, the use of Apache helicopters or, hypothetically, small numbers of personnel for intelligence or targeting functions. These are not invasion forces. Also, because our NATO allies have limited search and rescue capabilities, we allow U.S. forces to perform that mission.

Whether one believes that the air operation in Yugoslavia is in the Nation's best interests or not, it is only appropriate that this body exercise its prerogatives with regard to the expansion of this conflict to a full-blown ground war. I urge support for this bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

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

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to H.R. 1569. I believe that this restriction, which is in essence a limitation on spending, is premature. I think the President has conducted this air campaign in a very vigorous, forthright way. I think all of us recognize the problem with ethnic cleansing and what the Serbian forces have been doing in Kosovo. I think to put this restriction, and the language, by the way, I think is very poorly drafted.

I urge my colleagues to look at the second section which talks only about limited rescue opportunities, only in Yugoslavia. What if we need to use ground forces somewhere else? I just think this is premature. I would hope that if the President makes a decision that we are going to have to use ground forces, that in fact Congress would vote on it at that time, but not at this time. This is premature.

And so I urge our colleagues to reject this and to support the Senate resolution that was passed with bipartisan support, carefully worked out, that basically expresses our support for the ongoing air campaign. I have had an opportunity to go over to the Pentagon to see how the air war is doing. It is becoming very effective. And so I think there is a lot of hand wringing here that is premature. I think we ought to give the air war additional time to work. I think we are weakening Mr. Milosevic. I think there is still a prospect that we may achieve our objective.

To have this Congress divided and not have a bipartisan effort here to find common ground I think is extremely disappointing. I think, to the

majority, there was a bipartisan effort in the other body, I think there needs to be a bipartisan effort here to support our troops and to support the air war in Yugoslavia.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the Republican whip.

□ 1400

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to state that no defense funds should be used for ground forces in Kosovo unless authorized by Congress.

The Secretary of Defense last year, just last year, opposed sending troops to Kosovo, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff warned that our military strength has already been compromised.

Since all the whereas clauses have been struck from this resolution, I will add my own whereas clauses:

Whereas fighter planes are being cannibalized for parts to repair other aircraft,

Whereas we are running out of cruise missiles,

Whereas the Navy is undermanned by 18,000 sailors and the Air Force will be 1,300 pilots short within a year,

Whereas to pursue bombing campaigns in Iraq and Serbia, the administration has played musical chairs with aircraft carriers and left the Pacific without a single carrier to defend our allies and our forces there,

Whereas this is the reality of a downsized force, cutting military budgets has direct consequences, and vulnerability and trouble spots are a very real problem today.

Despite these growing military deficiencies, the administration is considering sending ground forces for an open-ended, peacemaking mission that would further erode military readiness.

Bosnia has already cost the United States over $10 billion. The administration has projected that Kosovo will cost $5 billion just this year, but has already admitted that it is impossible to determine how long the NATO mission will take. Considering that two withdrawal deadlines have already been broken in Bosnia, and considering that the President thought this would only take a week or two and now has extended it to open endedness, it is clear that any deployment to Kosovo will similarly drag on and go enormously over budget.

So sending troops and carriers to the Balkans only makes a weakened military even weaker. If nothing else, Kosovo shows us that we have to rebuild our forces and not hollow them out even more. And before sending troops to Yugoslavia, Macedonia or Albania, the President is obligated by law to report to Congress on the cost, and the funding, the schedule and the exit strategy for deployment. He has not done this, and so today we should vote to forbid any deployment without congressional approval.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans in support of Bush were actually consulted and listened to and advised, and President Bush came to Congress for those votes. This President has given us briefings and then gone and done what he wanted to do in the first place.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to bar defense funds from being spent on ground forces in Kosovo unless Congress actually allocates such funding.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I was in Brussels about a month ago as part of the North Atlantic Assembly, now NATO Parliamentary Group, and had a briefing with General Clark who is Supreme Allied Commander in Europe as well as the Commander of Operation Allied Force, and it was his opinion then and it is his opinion now that we are going to have to deal with Milosevic sooner or later; sooner being preferable, speaking militarily, to later. For one to think for a moment that a war in Europe will not engage directly the United States sooner or later is to turn a blind eye to history this century, No. 1.

No. 2, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind everyone that this is a NATO operation. NATO has been the most successful military alliance this country has ever engaged in. Since NATO was formed, no country in Europe has fallen under the Iron Curtain, and this is a part of a much bigger operation than just the United States.

One other thing:

To send a signal to one's enemy that we are not going to do something or take something off the table is a mistake, whether it is this vote, or whether it is a time line, or whether it is any other signal that sends a conflicting message.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure, and I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), a senior member of our committee, for bringing this measure before the House along with the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER).

Those of us who believe that the Congress should have a say in both the actual assignment of U.S. armed forces to conflict overseas as well as the funding of such deployments should join in voting in favor of this measure. Regardless of where our Members stand on our present policy in Kosovo, I believe it is indisputable that the Congress does have a constitutional role where U.S. military personnel are sent abroad into hostilities; and although the President has indicated he has no plan to send our troops into Kosovo on the ground unless there is an agreement from the Yugoslav authorities permitting such a presence, none of us can rule out the possibility that if circumstances do change, if the humanitarian situation worsens, or if the conflict spreads, that the President could decide to send in ground troops.

I believe that it would now be prudent and timely for the administration to seek statutory authorization for the deployment of our armed forces in Yugoslavia. The President and his key officials have thus far, however, not requested the Congress for such an authorization. I think it is incumbent upon the administration to request such an authorization.

This bill, I believe, is a proper response to where we now find ourselves in the terms of asserting our congressional role under the Constitution, under the War Powers Resolution. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge our Members to vote in favor of H.R. 1569.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, let me say that these resolutions always pose problems for me because I believe so strongly in the separation of the branches of our government. I think that 1569 certainly expresses my sentiments with respect to the sending of American land troops into Kosovo, and I am going to vote today in favor of this resolution, but I do it with some reservation. The President informed a group of us this morning that he will not, and I repeat, he will not send Americn land troops into Kosovo until he brings this message to the Congress to allow a full debate by the Congress.

I appreciate the President recognizing the concern of those of us in the legislative branch of government about this endeavor in Kosovo.

My vote today is with hesitation, with some reservation, but simply because of the word ''funds.'' The bill says it prohibits the use of ''funds'' by the President or by the Department of Defense for deploying forces. I think that a more clearer resolution would be an expression of Congress to not deploy U.S. ground forces in Yugoslavia until the deployment is authorized by law.

I have expressed so many times on this floor that I did not vote for Bill Clinton, but the American people did, and in that expression of the American people they gave him express authority to do what he is doing. However, we in the legislative branch have authority also to express our views. I intend to vote for this, and I am going to vote no on the other two House resolutions. But my favorable vote on this amendment is simply an extension of what I have personally already expressed to the President, what I have expressed to the people I represent in south Alabama; that I do not want to send the

first American soldier into any part of Yugoslavia. But I think, in the expression of our views that we should not have use the word ''funds.'' We do not want to give an indication to our soldiers we do not want to pay them when we simply could have said that the Defense Department is not authorized to deploy ground troop into Yugoslavia.

I think we should be very careful. There is always the possibility that this endeavor is on the verge of some type of diplomatic settlement, and we want to be very certain that we do not tie the hands of the President by expressing opinions that could send a message to the enemy that conceivably could be construed by Milosovic that the President will not be able to carry out his threats of military action if a diplomatic resolve is not reached.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, having the power to do something does not mean it is the right thing to do. I have very little doubt that we have the constitutional power to tell the President he may not consider the option of ground troops, but I have even less doubt that that is the wrong thing to do for us in these circumstances.

Decisions that are about life and death are not decisions that lend themselves to decision-making by a committee. As young Americans are put in the line of fire as we speak, the idea that 435 people, each with a separate point of view, each with a separate analysis, is somehow going to weigh into a process that is ongoing, communicate a message to a foreign enemy and make a right decision on behalf of those people in uniform, is to me preposterous.

As someone who speaks with some grave doubt about the initiation of this mission, I have no doubt about its morality, and I have no doubt about the impropriety of the resolution that is before us. We should each of us, Republican and Democrat, oppose it.

Mr. SKELTON. 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?

□ 1415

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. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) to address the statement the gentleman just made.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify the statement made by my good friend from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON). As we all have dealt with the Legislative Counsel, and this is where the language came from, whenever we submit a bill to this body and it goes through that process, the legislative counsel informed us that the term ''ground elements'' has been used for many, many years in this body to refer to our ground forces, just like we used the words ''aviation elements'' of the U.S. Army to refer to the aviation part of the Armed Forces of the U.S. Army.

This language is from the Legislative Counsel. They said this has been used for years and years and years in this body to refer to our ground forces. That is where it came from. That is clearly the intent of this bill, to refer to the ground forces, as opposed to the aviation elements of our U.S. Army. I want to clarify that for the record, that that is clearly the intent and meaning of this bill.

Mr. SKELTON. 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. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I rise in support of this resolution to prohibit the use of funds for the deployment of ground troops in Yugoslavia unless specifically approved by Congress.

Now, this does not prohibit ground troops from ever going into this area for combat, but if the people of America are going to be sent into war, it seems to me the representatives of the people of America should be in a position to approve that. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe we should actually remove our forces from that area that are already there.

In the last 6 years the manner in which this administration has circumvented Congress when it comes to deployment of the U.S. military forces around the world has been unprecedented, so it should come as no surprise that the House is here on the floor pleading to at least have a say in the process.

The President is the commander-in-chief, but Congress should not relax in its role as a consultative partner when it comes to the deployment of our servicemen and women.

So I agree with this measure wholeheartedly, but I want to talk about why I believe that we should not be there at all.

In any military exercise, there should be a clear, succinct mission and exit strategy, similar to our successful efforts in Desert Storm. The Kosovo plan, and I hesitate to even call it that much, does not have a clear mission, clear goals, a way to measure accomplishment standards, or an exit strategy.

For United States ground forces to enter that region, I also believe a more stable environment must be achieved by diplomatic means. This is not a desert. Our technological superiority will only give us so much of an advantage in the rugged terrain of Yugoslavia. It will not take only 4 days, as it did in the Gulf. The Serb army has entrenched itself over hundreds of years, and, unlike in Iraq, they appear to have complete loyalty to their leader, Mr. Milosevic. In other words, if we go into this hostile situation, we will lose American troops.

Look at the history. Hitler had many, many divisions in Yugoslavia during the Second World War, and look how much good that did him.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would all support this measure.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members, Republican and Democratic, to vote against this resolution, and I urge you to do it for three simple reasons: First, the language in this resolution is unnecessary.

I was at a meeting a few minutes ago in the White House. Many of the Members here were in the meeting as well. The President was asked, as I have asked him many times, if as a practical matter he would change the policy and ask for ground troops in this situation without a vote of the Congress. And his unequivocal answer then and every time that I have asked him this was that he would not. He would not as a practical matter ask for an introduction of ground troops without coming here, talking to us and allowing time for a vote.

As minority leader I believe strongly that if there is to be a change in the policy by NATO or the United States and we should be seeking ground troops, that it must be debated in the Congress and a vote must be taken in the Congress. I do not know how I would vote. I would want to hear what they have to say, why they want to do it, how it would be done and what the feasibility of it would be.

So I would say to all Members in both parties, on both sides of the aisle, you have my pledge that if there is a change in the policy, I will be asking the Speaker to put on the floor an authorization, and we will debate it and decide it and vote on it.

Secondly, I think this bill, if it passes, would be harmful to our effort. I say that because you have got to think about who is going to be listening to what we are saying.

Mr. Milosevic will be listening carefully to what we say here today. Over the weekend he got a message of unity and resolve by 19 NATO countries. He is probably having to think today, wow, maybe NATO really means this; maybe they really are going to stay with this air campaign; maybe they really do have their act together.

Do you really want to say to him today that we do not know what we are doing, we probably will not be for ground troops? Do you want to take that option off the table? I do not think so.

Third, and most important, is what the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) said: The language in this resolution is unclear, not as well put as it could be, and it leaves in question what can be done in the prosecution of the air war, which has been going on for 30 days.

There are lots of questions about people going across the border to do this, that and the other thing in cooperation with the air war that has nothing to do with the big ground force going over to try to reclaim all or part of Kosovo that I do not think you want to get into.

I appreciate tremendously and respect the sentiment of the gentlewoman and the gentleman that brought this resolution. I share their view. I do not think there ought to be a ground war, unless we vote on it and debate it. I totally share their view. But I, with all respect, believe this is not the way to do it. I believe that will happen if that is the decision of NATO.

I urge Members to vote against this so that we can send the right message to Mr. Milosevic and to the American public and to the world. I urge Members to vote no on this. Let us keep the right message out there and stand behind our troops, that are out there every day trying to do the right thing to get this done without a ground war.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentlewoman from Florida for bringing this measure forward, and commending them for the care by which they have drawn their language and the willingness that they have to listen to people, to respond to people, and to amend the language to meet the concerns of so many people. Indeed, I would take exception to the previous speaker in that regard. I think they have done a very good job and the language is very clear and precise.

What is the problem here? The problem is we really want to reaffirm our partnership relationship with the administration along the lines of what the President has already, with so many of us, made as a commitment, and we want to reverse something of what has been the discouraging history of this.

The President first began working and talking with NATO on this and made a commitment to NATO. After first saying to NATO we would participate in an air war and we would participate in peacekeeping troops on the ground and having made an agreement with various allied nations in NATO, he then came to Congress and said, ''Will the Congress endorse or reject this? But, if you reject that, understand it hurts our relationship with NATO.'' Well, perhaps he should have talked to us before NATO.

Then later on he says, ''Well, we will threaten the air campaign.'' He agrees with NATO, and then comes to us to confirm or reject. Again, perhaps we should have been consulted first. Now when we begin the bombing, they have already made the commitment with NATO, and then he asks us to reject or accept.

With our troops committed to the field we are facing a fait accompli, where any measure, any statement we make, can be misconstrued as failure to support our troops in the field, misconstrued by Milosevic as a failure of will on the American people, misconstrued by NATO as an unwillingness of this Congress to support this President's ability to make agreements with NATO.

We want to change that cycle. We want to say, Mr. President, your relationship between the executive branch in this government and the Congress of the United States, the legislative branch of this government, comes before your relationship with allied nations; that in order to have a unified American government presence on any position we should take, Mr. President, we should come to agreement within this great government first. Then when we make an agreement with our NATO allies, there can be no doubt about it that we are in agreement.

If Mr. Milosevic should ever see American troops on the ground, he should have no doubt that that has been the product of a unified decision between the presidency and the Congress prior to those troops being present on that soil. In that case, he can have no doubt that we mean business.

But let us not put our young men and women, those brave young men and women that accept this responsibility and put their lives at risk, in the position where they are on the ground, under fire, and the President is consulting with the Congress of the United States after the fact of their being in harm's way.

Let us make this relationship very clear. If you put on the uniform of this great land, if you are willing to risk your life, if you allow your son or daughter to be at risk and take on the horrible, fearful worries that families accept, let the families of America know that these young brave people will not be made as people in a theater of open conflict without first the prior unified agreement between the legislative branch and the executive branch of this government.

Congress and the President together can make a commitment to those troops to define a mission and equip them to complete that mission at the highest possible degree of effectiveness with the lowest conceivable level of personal threat. We can do this if we do it together, Mr. President. We cannot do that for these brave young men and women if you act first and consult with us later. Let us straighten out the cycle.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that if and when the President and our military commanders come to the conclusion that they need to introduce American ground forces into Kosovo, that they should come to the Congress and make the case before us. However, I do believe that the Goodling-Fowler bill, while well-intentioned, is the wrong way to go about this.

The bill before us prevents American troops in NATO from rescuing refugees just across the border into Kosovo,

even if the tragedy and the massacre is occurring right before our soldiers' eyes.

□ 1430

It would prevent the prepositioning of supplies and ammunition in the event we and NATO need to intervene on the ground in the future, and it would prevent our military from providing necessary intelligence assistance to conduct our air campaign. But worst of all, it tells Slobodan Milosevic that he will have plenty of time to do what he wants to do and slaughter and mutilate and rape almost 1 million people in Kosovo, because the United States Congress and my Republican colleagues have decided they are going to tie the President's hands, even in the case of an emergency military intervention, should it be necessary; to require the President to come back to the Congress, convene the Congress, hold a debate in order to rescue people or to take emergency steps.

I think that that is wrong, and I urge my colleagues, let us not decide on the necessity of ground troops until the President and the military commanders of NATO ask us for them. But let us not prevent the President and NATO now from using our ground forces, if necessary, only in the case of an emergency. That would be a wrong message for Milosevic; that would endanger our military men and women, and it is a step we should not take. I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of our Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I guess some could debate the timing of this debate today, but let us not be confused. Our founders really did believe that one man should not have the authority to send our people to war. That is why the Constitution of the United States involves the Congress of the United States, because it is through the Congress of the United States that the people of this country are recognized, their opinions are recognized. So this idea that we are meddling is something our people do not understand if we take that position. The people deserve to be involved in terms of committing our men and women to an armed military conflict.

In addition, one could make the case that we could intervene in a civil war if, in fact, we could be successful. The fact is, the civil war in Kosovo has been raging on since 1389, since the 14th century. That is six centuries' worth of internal fighting, ethnic conflict, religious strife.

The fact is, our intervening in the middle of an ethnic religious civil war that has gone on for six centuries is not likely to be successful. We found this out when we intervened in Somalia. We furthermore found this out when we intervened in Lebanon, even under Ronald Reagan. Being in the middle of civil wars that are not resolvable is a mistake for a major power.

The question is when, then, should we intervene militarily? Well, on three grounds. One, when it is in the direct national interests of the United States. Number two, when there is an absolute achievable goal. And number three, when there is a credible exit strategy. None of these criteria can be met in terms of Kosovo. There is no direct national interest, there is not an achievable goal, and finally, there is no credible exit strategy.

If we continue down this road of open-ended military commitments, what we will do is diminish our power. Some people accuse those who are opposed to Kosovo of being isolationists. It is just the opposite. I am a robust internationalist, but what I do know is there must be a balance between military and diplomatic means when it comes to resolving these international problems. If the United States wants to be the policeman of the world, we will find that we will diminish ourselves over the long run and we will find when it is necessary to act against terrorism or to provide worldwide stability in some part of this world, we will be too spread out, we will be too thin, and we will not be able to be effective. That is the prescription for the eroding of a national power of a superpower status into the 21st century.

So, what do we do now? Well, the first thing we do not do is to step on the accelerator. We should not introduce ground troops; we should not escalate the violence. Dropping bombs in a region of the world where fighting has been going on for six centuries and thinking that by more violence we will impose a solution on people in that region is, I believe, false. In fact, to put troops on the ground reinforces a failed policy that is frankly a sign of arrogance.

What should we do? Mediate. We ought to look for a third party that can help us to be able to restore stability, Democratic institutions, and build an economy in that region. We should not let ego or we should not let reputations stand in the way of reaching an agreement that will send the refugees home, stabilize the world, and be able to continue the superpower status of the United States by making good choices of when we should intervene and when we should not.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as kindly as I can, let me say that Neville Chamberlain rose up and said, let us mediate.

I believe we are doing the right thing with our allies, for the right reason, in the right way to minimize risks to our people. I rise in strong opposition to the two resolutions sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and to this bill sponsored by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING). Unlike the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER), I do not believe that this resolution or this bill has the limited effect that she argues that it does. That perhaps is a legitimate and honest difference of opinion.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen an extraordinary event occur here in Washington last week. Not just 19 NATO nations, but 42 nations came to America and celebrated 50 years of commitment to keeping the peace. We are now confronting, in the midst of Europe, where NATO has pledged to keep the peace, the most egregious violation of human rights, the most egregious disruption of the security of the European region as we have seen since 1968.

The bill that is presently before us says that we shall not use elements. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON); I am not sure of what that definition is. But I do know and believe that our enemies will interpret that as a constriction on our maneuverability and ability to act. That is a dangerous policy. We should not be engaged in this conflict with that constriction on our troops. It is dangerous, in my opinion, for them. It gives to our enemy a false sense that he may act to the detriment of our people. We ought to reject this bill as not only premature, but as unwise policy.

Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues on the Republican side, let me say that we bombed in the Persian Gulf for 44 days. There was no vote on this floor. We deployed over half a million troops in harm's way. There was no vote on this floor. Why? Because President Bush and Secretary Baker talked to Speaker Foley and said, if you have such a vote, it will undermine our position. So Speaker Foley did not allow a vote until yes, President Bush, as he agreed, came to this floor for the authorization of troops to go in to Kuwait. Not to be deployed, to go into Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has said, and as our President said as late as this morning to an assembled group of Members of the House, Republicans and Democrats, Senators and House Members, the Speaker of the House and the minority leader, that he would not, without consulting the House, take this action. Let us be united with our President and with our fighting men and women in this important endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1569.

First, however, I am compelled to express my outrage that we are here today, in this House, engaging in debate about the most serious issues we are ever called upon to consider—the conduct of war and the making of peace—in such a desultory manner.

The Gulf War Resolution was the subject of 16 hours of debate—16 hours, Mr. Speaker. Today we are faced with four separate, conflicting, and mutually exclusive resolutions and we have been limited to 1 hour on each of them.

It is absolutely unconscionable and irresponsible to be considering legislation which requires the arbitrary withdrawal of our forces

participating in the NATO action against Serbia, as does House Concurrent Resolution 82. Such a course would hand Milosevic victory, confirm the genocide he has perpetrated against the Kosovar Albanians, and destroy NATO.

As I have said before, Mr. Speaker, intervention to stop the aggression against civilians in Kosovo is both morally compelling and clearly in our country's national interest. Let us be very clear about what is happening in Kosovo. This is not a civil war.

It is a continuation of the conflict Milosevic instigated in Croatia in 1991 and in Bosnia-Herzegovina from 1991 to 1995. His aim all along has been the consolidation of his own political power within Serbia. Milosevic is a tyrant and a war criminal.

Former President George Bush recognized this fact in 1992 when he warned Milosevic that aggression by his forces against the civilian population of Kosovo would be met by an immediate military response by the United States. President Clinton reiterated that warning in early 1993.

Having made the commitment to our NATO allies, to the people of Kosovo and, indeed, to the world, that we will not stand by and watch ethnic cleansing and butchery in the heart of Europe, it is my firm belief that we must see this action through to the end.

Last week, in a speech before the National Fire and Emergency Services Caucus dinner which I cochair with my good friend CURT WELDON, Senator JOHN MCCAIN called for such a commitment, including the use of ground troops. Senator MCCAIN stated that he did not recommend this course lightly and was prepared to bear responsibility for the outcome. He said:

> I would rather face that sad burden than hide from my conscience because I sought an advantageous political position to seek shelter behind. Nor could I endure the dishonor of having known my country's interests demanded a course of action, but avoided taking it because the costs of defending them were substantial, as were its attendant political risks.

America must lead, Mr. Speaker; we must not equivocate. Such a course would encourage the enemies of peace, the bullies of the world, and would surely endanger our men and women in uniform. As we enter the 21st century, America stands as the beacon of democracy, freedom, and human rights. People around the world look to our country's strength in their struggle for democracy and basic human rights. We must not, Mr. Speaker, stand now in the shadow of weakness and isolationism.

Our cause is just. Let us act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The Chair would advise Members that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH).

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) that it was 4 years ago that the President of the United States also promised a group of assembled Congressmen and Senators over at the White House that the Bosnian operation would last 1 year. Today we find ourselves 4 years and $10 billion into a quagmire, still engaged in a Balkan civil war.

It is all too clear that this administration does not understand what they are getting into. While the gentleman reminds us of lessons learned in 1938 with Chamberlain, I would recommend we also look at 1948. That was the year that Tito told the Soviet Union to get out of the Balkans three short years after the beginning of Soviet control. The Soviet Union got out, because they understood better than us the six century civil war that continues to rage on.

This administration does not understand the delicate dynamics of this Balkan civil war. We have a Secretary of State who had guaranteed on public television that this was going to be a short, clean war. We have a President, mirroring what LBJ did in the 1960s, actually selecting targets in this civil war. They do not understand what they are getting into, and before we accelerate, like the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) said, we better take a long, hard look at what we are doing.

This is constitutionally and practically correct, and as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I emphatically oppose H.R. 1569. This bill is a slap in the face of the commander's ability to use a combined armed force in battle. Conflicts are not won by air, land or sea forces alone. It is a joint nature of a combined arms campaign that provides the flexibility and firepower for a commander to accomplish his or her mission, responding to a changing environment.

This bill is not well crafted or thought out. Passage of this bill would seriously degrade the operational commander's ability to respond to any and all contingencies. It would not allow us to pursue attacking enemy forces across international borders, thus giving Milosevic a safe area. It will not allow us to rapidly introduce ground troops even in a permissive environment. It will hamstring the operational commander's ability to adopt and adapt to the ever-changing situation in the Balkans.

This is not a preemptive strike against the use of ground troops as it is advertised. It is a preemptive strike on the flexibility to respond to emergency conditions. It is a preemptive strike on the safety of our troops. It is a preemptive strike which will make Mr. Milosevic very happy.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there seems to be a consensus building along two lines: timing and trust. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader, took to the microphone and says that he agrees with the idea that this body, this Nation, should debate whether or not we send ground troops. It is a matter of timing. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) that just spoke said that the President has given us his word. That is a matter of trust. I do not have the confidence he does to trust this President without having an engagement in this debate now.

I want more rather than less debate on this issue. I want it sooner rather than later, because I see three big problems for ground troops. The coalition will not hang together; the political stomach is not there for a ground war. The dominance in the air that we have militarily will be lost, and the Russian instability that will come from a U.S.-led NATO invasion would start the Cold War all over again, potentially.

If anybody criticizes this bill on drafting, then they have to look this operation in the face and see if they can find any flaws with it. This bill is properly drafted. Now is the time to speak. More rather than less, sooner rather than later, before we get a lot of people killed for no good reason.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Mr. Milosevic is wrong and that the War Crimes Tribunal will eventually have its course and way with him. I believe that whatever brought us into this situation, whether people agree or disagree with the events, we are not going to be able to undo the past.

I believe that we should and must try to reach a diplomatic solution to this situation which resolves the refugee situation, which resettles people, which leaves Mr. Milosevic subject to the War Crimes Tribunal and which gets us back on track, and I believe that we have to do something about making sure Mr. Milosevic has encouragement to come to the table, which is why the war strikes will continue.

With regard to ground troops, I ask the sponsors of this bill whether or not they might be willing to have a unanimous consent to change the word ''elements'' to ''troops'' and resolve whatever disagreement we have on that. I would hope to get an answer to that.

□ 1445

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I support the Goodling resolution. Some say we must listen to the President, some say we must listen to military leaders. I say we must listen to the now still voices of those Americans who made the ultimate sacrifice more than a generation ago in an undeclared war, in an

unwinnable war, a bright, shining lie of a war where truth was the first casualty.

Now we are engaged in a great humanitarian mission, or so we are told. But humanitarians do not excuse the bombing of Albanians and Serbian civilians. Humanitarians do not bomb passenger trains. Humanitarians do not bomb refugees fleeing the battle. Humanitarians do not bomb residential areas. Humanitarians do not blow up water systems, electric systems, sewage systems, and create an ecological catastrophe in the name of peace. Humanitarians do not leave thousands of bomblets in the ground so refugee children can lose their lives after the battle.

No more bombing the villages to save the village, no more ground troops sacrificed to redeem our failure in the air. All we are saying is to give peace a chance. All we are saying is to give peace a chance through negotiation and mediation and through diplomacy. Give peace a chance.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I am voting against this bill today. Number one, I think it is poorly written. We have already had discussions about the phrase ''ground elements,'' but hey, I think we can get some lawyers to help us command.

I think it is also rushed. We have had ever-changing language. First there was no language to deal with our own downed pilots. Then we had no language to deal with U.S. citizens and pilots. Now we have language to deal with allied crew members. Be wary of an ever-changing bill.

Third, this is the wrong message to our allies. What if we have British or French troops kidnapped like our ground troops were kidnapped in Macedonia, and they come to us and ask us to help, and we say, are they a member of air crew, and they say, no, they are relief workers. We will say, we will file a bill next week and take care of that.

Very poor language. That is what happens when we rush things on through. This is a poorly-worded bill at the wrong time. Please vote no.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has a noble purpose in that it attempts to assert the role of the Congress in any decision to commit American forces to a ground war in Kosovo. It does so, however, in the wrong way and at the wrong time. It prohibits deployment of ground elements unless Congress specifically authorizes deployment by law.

I represent one of the soldiers who is held captive today in Yugoslavia, Stephen Gonzalez, of Huntsville. If this resolution had been the law on March 31 when those three were captured, this resolution would have prevented our forces from pursuing the captors of those three American soldiers. Mr. Speaker, line 24, page 2 of the bill makes it very clear, the only exception is to recover someone who is a member of an air crew.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also approaches this issue not only in the wrong way, but at the wrong time. It prohibits deployment of ground elements in a way that sends a very bad signal to President Milosevic. The threat of the use of ground troops should be on the table, because it sends a message of NATO resolve to Milosevic, a message that he must hear.

Contrary to promoting the congressional interest in bringing a just, diplomatic settlement to the Yugoslavian conflict, this resolution makes diplomatic settlement more difficult and strengthens the hand of President Milosevic. It increases the likelihood of the campaign of ethnic cleansing and suffering being waged against innocent people for a prolonged period of time.

Mr. Speaker, the President said today that he will seek the support of this Congress if he makes the decision to send ground troops into a major deployment in Kosovo. I believe that we need to take him at his word and we need to reject this resolution, which could do harm both to American troops and to our national interests.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution. Europe should be providing the ground troops. We have been propping up Europe much too long.

But I am more concerned about what we are not doing here today. We should be arming the KLA so they can help protect their own citizens. We should be supporting independence, because they will never coexist and there will never be a lasting peace. We should be going after Milosevic for war crimes.

One thing for sure, now I know why the President of the United States has usurped the congressional power to declare war. Congress has no backbone for it. Today is a good debate. It will now separate the powers the way the Constitution determined it should be. Let us let Europe provide the ground troops.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, our problem is not with the idea of authorization. The President legally should seek our authorization before committing ground troops, and politically he would be well advised to get it.

Our problem is with the text of this resolution, because it creates a potential legal quagmire for troops that we have deployed. It uses the word ''ground elements,'' not exactly a word of art, but instead of using ''ground troops'' or ''ground forces,'' it says ''ground elements,'' so as to include not just personnel but materiel, not just troops but equipment and weapons, as well.

So the first casualty of this sweeping ban, this language in this resolution, is going to be foredeployed and prepositioned equipment. Why do we want to preposition? Because if we need M–1 tanks, if we need Bradleys in this theater, we will have to begin today prepositioning those tanks and Bradleys and the other heavy equipment, because we will not have time when the need arises.

That does not mean we may need them for a ground force that will be conducting a ground war. We may need them for a multinational implementation force.

If we have learned anything from Beirut to Mogadishu, it is that when we send in one of these peacekeeping forces, they had better be tough. They had better be imposing. They had better have the equipment, so that nobody dares take them on.

If we read this resolution, it says, don't you dare spend a dime on anything like that for deployment of prepositioning that might be introduced into this theater. Keep on reading and we can come up with all sorts of scenarios that this would potentially prohibit or bar.

Let us assume, for example, that our intelligence told us that Serb troops were massing just outside Macedonia or just outside Albania. This would prohibit us from taking a preemptive first strike.

Let us assume that we did know in advance if they crossed the border of one of these countries and we counterattacked, drove them out of the country, and wanted to pursue them. We would have to stop at the border.

Let us assume, and I hope we have, some on-the-ground military intelligence in Montenegro, in Kosovo. This would bar that, it would prohibit that. Let us assume we have some special forces operations covertly operating at night in one of those countries. This would bar that. It would deny us the kind of information we need to be intelligent.

Mr. Speaker, the authors of the resolution have tried to solve this problem by rewording Subsection B and making an exception for air crews that are shot down. But that limited exception shows us just how strict the language is.

When we go through this we understand, and it is complex for us to understand, and we can certainly conceive of many circumstances this would prohibit. This is going to create a legal quagmire for our troops in this theater. We should not do that to them.

We have the President's assurance he will come and seek our authority before he goes on a ground war, if he does. We should not impose these additional complications.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to simply point out that the right to start a war or declare a war is left to the American people. They get to do that through their elected representatives. The reason the Constitution gives that right to the American people is that we are going to ask them to sacrifice their sons and daughters and our Treasury on behalf of the war that they asked us to start.

This amendment was mentioned earlier, that it takes a lot of the options off the table. It takes only one option off the table, and that is the option of the President to start a war with ground troops without the permission of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, if we need to have a ground war, the President can come to Congress, where he should come, because this is what is known as the balance of power, when the legislative branch has some power and the executive branch does. When the Executive is wrong, and I think they are wrong, they should come to the Congress. I ask Members to support this amendment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. FOWLER

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered and adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. FOWLER: On page 2, Line 12, strike ''elements'' and insert ''troops''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

Mr. SKELTON. 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.

□ 1500

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Objection is heard.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, because this was at the request of several Members of the minority who wanted that word change. I was certainly willing to do that, but I still stand by my previous explanation of the intent of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) has 1 minute remaining.

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

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Members on my side for not being able to recognize them, but we do not have enough time. As a matter of fact, I am revising and extending my own remarks because I have not got the necessary time to deliver what I would like to deliver at this time.

I rise in support of H.R. 1569 to prohibit the use of Department of Defense funds for the deployment of U.S. ground forces in Yugoslavia absent a specific Congressional authorization. Since the initial 1995 deployment of U.S. forces to Bosnia, I have opposed the use of ground troops in the Balkans, and I continue to do so today.

First and foremost, my opposition is based on the recognition that our military forces have been reduced so dramatically over the past decade that an enlarged, open-ended commitment in the Balkans will unquestionably jeopardize our ability to protect U.S. interests in other critical regions of the world where the threat is serious and imminent. Prior to the beginning of Operation ''Allied Force,'' the Joint Chiefs of Staff had assessed the ability of U.S. armed forces to execute our own national military strategy as entailing ''moderate to high risk.'' This risk has grown worse over the past several months as we have poured scarce military resources and assets into the Balkans. Just today I read an article in Jane's Defense Weekly indicating that the Joint Chiefs are on the verge of changing their assessment of this risk from ''high'' to ''very high.'' As General Shelton, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of staff, and every theater commander-in-chief have testified, ''risk'' in this context means longer wars and significantly higher casualties.

Based on planning efforts last fall, defeating the Serb army on the ground in Yugoslavia would require a NATO force of 200,000 ground troops or more. While NATO plans have not specified what percentage of such a force would be Americans, precedent tells me that such a NATO force would include tens of thousands of U.S. ground troops—at least several divisions' worth.

The implications of U.S. ground troops serving even as peacekeepers or as part of an international occupation force would have serious consequences for our broader global interest.

Administration policy-makers are currently discussing a possible NATO occupation force in Kosovo that would be roughly the same size as the force initially deployed to Bosnia. That force included 60,000 NATO troops, about 20,000 of which were American. This size American ground contingent would, directly or indirectly, one way or another, involve much of the active Army. Rotating such a large ground force through Kosovo, with no near-term prospect of withdrawal, combined with the ongoing deployments in Bosnia, would make it all but impossible for the Army to play its essential role in fighting and winning two major regional conflicts in places like Korea and the Persian Gulf—in other words, to be able to execute the national military strategy.

Tying down a large U.S. ground force in the Balkans will cause our friends—and our enemies—to legitimately question our ability to protect and promote our interests and to remain a force for stability in other critical regions of the world. How will Saddam Hussein gauge our ability to defend Kuwait if much of our Army is stuck in the Balkans? Will we be able to rapidly reinforce South Korea in the event of an attack by the North? Would we be able to effectively react to an escalating crisis or conflict in the Taiwan Strait? The answers to these questions are far from reassuring, and should concern us all.

In anticipation of the inevitable and oversimplified response that we surely cannot abandon our commitment to NATO, let me just say that I am not suggesting that the United States would walk away from its responsibilities or should not play a critical role in any NATO combined air and ground campaign if the alliance heads down this controversial path.

While I remain strongly opposed to the commitment of U.S. ground troops in the Balkans, we should not lose sight of the reality that the United States is leading the air war and would continue to do so in the event of a ground campaign. In addition, the United States is currently providing the vast majority of the operation's strategic lift, communications, logistics and intelligence support. Is this shirking our responsibilities to NATO? Can anyone honestly say we are failing to do our fair share? I do not think so.

We simply cannot afford to ignore our interests and the growing threats around the world by allowing ourselves to fall into the trap set

by our allies, as happened in Bosnia, that NATO military operations cannot succeed and the alliance will fall apart unless U.S. ground troops are leading the way. If we continue to view the Balkans in isolation from the rest of what is becoming an increasingly dangerous world, we do so at our own peril.

Mr. Speaker, there's an old adage that says, ''When you're in a hole, stop digging.'' We've already dug ourselves a big hole in Bosnia and we ought to think twice before we dig that hole deeper in Kosovo. Unless some balance is restored between the nation's diplomatic and foreign policy commitments and the ability of U.S. armed forces to underwrite them, history is likely to look back on the post-Cold War world ''peace dividend'' as resulting in a more dangerous world in which America's credibility and resolve were put to the test with alarming frequency.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say simply, in closing, that I support this resolution. I have been opposed to ground troops in Bosnia under any conditions. As a matter of fact, we should not even be in the Balkans. The national security of this country is not at stake. Even for those who think that it is, it does not rise to the level of importance that other areas of this world do, and we are unprepared to defend against the many serious threats we have in other parts of the world today. This further lessens our ability to defend against these threats. And for that reason, I oppose sending ground troops into this area.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1569, a bill to prohibit the funding of ground elements in Yugoslavia without prior Congressional authorization.

Let me be clear. If at some point in the future our military commanders determine that ground troops are necessary to achieve our military objectives in Yugoslavia, I believe Congress ought to vote on their deployment. This bill, however, extends far beyond that simple objective and could seriously jeopardize the security of U.S. forces currently in the region.

This bill does not just prohibit the funding of ground troops prior to Congressional authorization, but rather prohibits the funding of all U.S. ground ''elements'' in Yugoslavia. This ill-defined language would create a legal quagmire for the U.S. forces already deployed in the Balkans. For example, would this bill prohibit the funding of Apache maintenance crews in Albania because the Apache is as an air-to-ground weapon that is deployed in Yugoslavia? It is an open question. There is no question, however, that this bill would legally prohibit U.S. forces in the region from launching a preemptive strike against forces in Yugoslavia even if they received intelligence that they were about to be attacked. If Yugoslavia were to attack beyond its borders, this bill would legally prohibit U.S. forces from carrying the battle into Yugoslavia even if our military commanders considered such action vital to the protection of American troops.

In the name of protecting U.S. troops, Mr. Speaker, this bill actually endangers the brave men and women who are already serving in the region. I support Congressional approval before ground troops are deployed in a hostile environment, but I cannot support legislation that ties the hands of our nation's military commanders. For this reason, I oppose H.R. 1569 and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the decision to go to war is one of the most important decisions that our country can make. As elected representatives, we have to consider our international and domestic obligations, as well as our individual and collective moral beliefs.

There is no question that Slobodan Milosevic has committed horrible atrocities in Kosovo and I do not believe the international community should stand by idly. The votes today though, require us to look at the international context of this conflict and some of the consequences of our response thus far. I believe the evidence leads us to the view that Congress should have a say before any kind of ground troops are deployed and that is why I will support H.R. 1569.

The political process that gauges the appropriateness of humanitarian intervention needs to catch up with the military's ability and willingness to undertake those operations. In that respect, today's debate serves a useful purpose. Regardless of how you intend to vote on today's measures, an open and fair debate on real, credible options is democratically healthy and Constitutionally necessary. I opposed the rule earlier today because I do not think it rose to this standard. It imposed an absurdly small amount of time for debate and took the unprecedented step of precluding further House consideration of any resolutions under the War Powers Resolution dealing with Yugoslavia during the remainder of this Congress.

I also must observe that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have taken an excessively captious approach to the president's strategy in Yugoslavia and the administration's foreign policy generally. Yet I believe this Congress has been derelict in its own duties, happy to sit back and criticize the president. First it avoided action for the first month of the war, limiting itself to a vote on peacekeeping troops after hostilities have ended and a symbolic vote to support the troops. Now the House is voting on a group of four resolutions, none of which present real, credible alternatives to bombing.

I think there are some very difficult questions that should inform a thorough debate on war in Yugoslavia, starting with how we define what we are trying to accomplish.

MILITARY OBJECTIVES AND AMERICAN INTERESTS

The military objectives in Kosovo have been variously described as (1) forcing Milosevic to make peace; (2) severely degrading his capacity to carry out military action in the future; (3) deterring an even bloodier offensive against civilians in Kosovo; and (4) allowing the return of refugees and ensuring their self-governance. What I'm wondering, is what thresholds have been established to determine when we have accomplished these goals? What role do we envision for Congress in determining when the mission objectives have been completed and what criteria will be used to make that determination? I am voting for H.R. 1569 because I believe it will preserve those Congressional prerogatives.

I also do not think we have adequate assurances from regional states such as Russia that they will refrain from participating in the war; we have boxed Mr. Yeltsin into a very tight corner domestically. I know that the Deputy Secretary of State has been working hard on that issue, but the public statements from Russia are nevertheless alarming. For example, earlier this week a high ranking Russian official noted that the NATO embargo on fuel does not apply to Russia, since it is not a member of NATO. And there is strong nationalist momentum in the Duma to supply the Serbs.

I also wonder if the removal of the current regime in Belgrade a prerequisite for a negotiated settlement to the conflict in the Balkans. I've seen what happened with our Iraq policy and I'm afraid we may be headed down the same kind of path, where compliance is unilaterally defined and goals are arbitrarily shifted.

VIGOROUS, MULTILATERAL DIPLOMACY

Regardless of how Congress votes today, I hope we will vigorously pursue diplomatic options. As Admiral Eugene Carroll (ret.) of the Center for Defense Information has suggested, we cannot have a solution to the Yugoslav conflict that is overly reliant on military force. The situation demands a political solution eventually, no matter how you feel about the ongoing bombing. There have been numerous attempts at diplomacy thus far.

United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan's peace proposal on April 9 demanded: ''First, an end immediately to the campaign of intimidation and expulsion of the civilian population; two, to cease all activities of military and paramilitary forces in Kosovo and to withdraw these forces; three, to accept unconditionally the return of refugees and displaced persons to their homes; four, to accept the deployment of an international military force to ensure a secure environment for the return of refugees and unimpeded delivery of humanitarian aid; and finally, to permit the international community to verify compliance with these undertakings.'' In order to make this proposal work, Annan called for a cessation of hostilities as ''a prelude to a lasting political solution to the crisis, which can only be achieved through diplomacy.''

The European Union made a peace proposal placing Kosovo under international protectorship if Yugoslavian forces agreed to withdraw. And of course Russia has been to the bargaining table a number of times. These efforts have gotten scant attention and minimal diplomatic support. Much of this is a result of the deliberate marginalization of the UN.

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

It is inappropriate for NATO to be bombing without specific authorization from the United Nations Security Council. When the Security Council passed Security Council Resolution 1199 on September 23, it called on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to stop repression against civilians and withdraw forces from Kosovo. The Resolution specifically noted that should progress on this and other stated matter be inadequate that the Security Council would ''consider further action and additional measures to maintain or restore peace and stability in the region'' and remained seized of the matter.

Moreover, since Article 53 of the UN Charter specifically states that ''no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council'', I think it was inappropriate for NATO to proceed without specific Security Council authorization. Article 39 of the Charter clearly states that ''The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression.'' The fact of the

matter is that the Security Council should have made any determination regarding the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression in Kosovo. It is also not clear that the Security Council ever made any determination under Article 42 as to whether force could be employed by NATO. I am aware of the Secretary General's public statements, but I think these issues remain unresolved.

The United States should address these issues before the UN Security Council along with the authority for and composition of a post-war peacekeeping force. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State told the Speaker today in a letter that the Administration is ''willing to consider a U.S. contribution to an international security presence,'' but they insist that it must have ''NATO at its core.'' This kind of inflexibility is not justified.

One of the key stumbling blocks from the beginning has not been a restoration of autonomy for Kosovo or the withdrawal of troops, it has been whether the implementation force will be NATO-led or include more of our allies who have an interest in peace. I think the peacekeeping operation must have at its core an international institution broader than NATO, such as the United Nations or the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. The fact of the matter is that NATO has a very limited mandate and limited membership.

THE FUTURE OF NATO

The North Atlantic Treaty clearly limits NATO to acts of self defense. Article Five states that ''The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack on them all. . . .'' NATO does not have any legal authority to engage in military action that is not self-defense such as humanitarian intervention; I'm saying this independent of whether this intervention is morally correct or not.

The escalation of the conflict has had devastating consequences for non-combatants. On April 6, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) took the highly unusual step of asking NATO to take over relief coordination due to the extraordinary demands being placed on their resources. I do not think we have fully studied the propriety of a military alliance making decisions that greatly impact the care, maintenance and legal status of refugees—work that is ordinarily carried out by a non-political relief agency.

There has also been a great many civilian deaths, partly as a consequence of NATO's decision to target non-military facilities such as TV stations. It is also an unintended consequence of flying at high altitudes in the interest of minimizing the risks to pilots. This happened on April 12, when NATO planes struck a civilian train on a bridge over the Juzna Morava River. The pilot fired his missiles before he even saw the target. The next day, 16 patients in a hospital in Banica were wounded by flying glass during a bombing raid. On April 6, dozens of people were hurt or killed in an attack on Aleksinac when bombs went 1500 yards astray. When the Pentagon admitted that a bomb went astray, the *New York Times* reported the next day that in fact more than one missile was used. The *Washington Post* reported on April 13 that NATO had acknowledged bombing residential areas of Kosovo, Pristina and the Southern Serbian town of Aleksinac where at least 20 people were killed. For exactly these reasons, the head of the International Red Cross, Cornelio Sommaruga, called this week for an end to bombing civilian targets by NATO.

I know it is extremely difficult to avoid civilian casualties during war. I mention these incidents because I think we need to be cognizant of the fact that the more frequently they occur, the more difficult it is going to be to build a political solution on the ground after the war.

EXIT STRATEGY AND WAR BY PROXY

I do not think that I have adequate assurances that neither the U.S. nor any third party country will arm (or has armed) the KLA as part its war-fighting or exit strategy. We are all already aware of the atrocities that have been committed by Milosevic's forces but I was appalled by some information I received just today about the KLA. According to Human Rights Watch, the KLA began its first major offensive, an attack on the town of Orahovac on July 18, 1998. ''At least forty-two people were killed in the fighting, and on estimate, another forty remain unaccounted for. Reports of mass graves and summary executions surfaced, but remain unconfirmed.'' The press release also notes that on August 27, 1998, ''twenty-two civilians were reportedly executed by KLA members in the village of Kle ka'' and on September 9, 1998, ''the bodies of thirty-five people, including both ethnic Serbs and Albanians, were found in an artificial lake near the village of Glodjane. The evidence strongly suggests that they were killed by the KLA.'' The Associated Press notes that the KLA publicly claimed responsibility for bombing government targets in 1996.

Some of my colleagues are in favor of arming the KLA. I think we need to be concerned about the KLA not just because they may be perpetrators of the same kind of violence that NATO is supposedly trying to stop but also because there is such strong potential for mission blowback.

HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTION AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

Let me repeat that I do not think we should have looked the other way. There is an obvious tension in international law between the obligation to respect the sovereignty of nations versus the duty to intervene to stop genocide and crimes against humanity. The UN Charter begins by stating its purpose is to ''save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind.'' The Charter condemns violations of sovereignty and states that ''All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. . . .'' At the same time, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights guarantees the rights of individuals against oppressive states, and the parties of the Genocide Convention are committed to prevent and punish the crime of genocide.

The answer is that both U.S. and international law need to be a part of determining when atrocities warrant humanitarian intervention. This combination ensures multilateralism, helps to share the costs of operations and takes into consideration the opinions of our allies, which in this case should include countries who are not NATO members and who could contribute to a peaceful resolution of this crisis.

When I learned that an F–117 had been shot down and that troops were being held in captivity, it brought home the horrors of war even sooner than I feared. Congressional oversight and involvement must stay in sync with this rapidly unfolding war. I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1569 and to not abandon the path to peace.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share my remarks today on the current situation in Kosovo with my colleagues and the American public. The systematic campaign of brutality by Slobodan Milosevic has forced the United States and NATO to take forceful action. As the human tragedies mount—a growing number of refugees existing in desperate conditions, families being ripped apart, torture, rape and murder—the House considered important measures about how the United States should proceed.

I joined my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in supporting H.R. 1569 to assert the constitutional authority of Congress. We made it clear that the President cannot commit the United States military to a ground war without the explicit consent of Congress. The House today made it clear that the President must first receive the approval of Congress should the nature of the mission require a shift in military operations. At this time, the President and his military advisors have not signaled a change in the current strategy of air strikes, but if and when they do, I want the opportunity to vote on whether or not it is in fact necessary to deploy ground troops to end the genocide.

I cast a vote in favor of Resolution 21 explicitly authorizing the President to conduct military air operations and missile strikes in Yugoslavia. By doing so, I put myself firmly on record in support of the United States and our NATO allies in this moral struggle to rescue the victims of ethnic cleansing and to put an end to such atrocities. As an American who believes in freedom and a Jew who remembers the lessons of the Holocaust, I could do no less.

Even as we engage in these air strikes, the United States must place the highest priority on exploring and implementing all diplomatic options to end the conflict and to redouble our commitment to humanitarian relief.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, let me say this Congress is unified in its support for our military when involved in operations around the world. The men and women in uniform have our full and unequivocal support. With that said, I have deep reservations about the foreign policy of this administration that is now being conducted by the military in Operation Allied Force.

Two weeks ago, Defense Secretary Bill Cohen and Joint Chiefs Chairman General Hugh Shelton testified before the House Armed Services Committee to try to explain the Clinton Administration's policy and objectives in Kosovo. Specifically, why this Balkan civil war is vital to America's national security interests and to define the end game. I regret to say they were not convincing. Moreover, it is very apparent that there is no end game—no exit strategy. I voted against sending our troops into this internal conflict, and unless a compelling case is made, I will continue to oppose sending in U.S. ground forces into Kosovo.

It is clear that the President chose to ignore the professional advice of the military leadership, and sided with his foreign policy team who made this into a humanitarian plea. Frankly, I think the air campaign may have

precipitated the ethnic cleansing and suffering in Kosovo.

We have interjected ourselves into a centuries-old conflict, where both the Serbs and Albanians have each been the aggressor over Kosovo. By virtue of Operation Allied Force targeting Serbia assets, we are siding with the KLA (Kosovo Liberation Army) which has strong ties to organized crime, gun running, drug trafficking and international terrorist groups like Bin Laden. With the Administration's mishandling of the Balkan crisis, I can only think of the old saying that ''those who fail to remember the lessons of history, are destined to repeat its mistakes.''

To compound matters, this is the first time in NATO's history, a defensive coalition by charter, that military action has been conducted against a sovereign nation over internal strife. While there is consensus among the 19 member nations of NATO for the Air Campaign, there is no consensus about a ground campaign. It's evident that Milosevic has not been deterred by only an air campaign. An assessment has been made that more than 200,000 troops would be needed to invade Serbia, yet no ground plan even exists. President Clinton is leading our nation down the path of ''mission creep'' that will suck our military into a quagmire that resembles Vietnam—a situation that America has vowed never to repeat.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to prevent Operation Allied Force from becoming a full blown war if we act now. The European Union must step up to the plate and assert its responsibility for its own region. If the EU determines that the strife between the Serbs and Kosovar Albanians warrants military intervention, so be it; they can proved the forces.

Diplomacy is still an option. Russian efforts to broker a settlement in Kosovo were never allowed to succeed; these effort should be vigorously pursued. We must re-examine all of these options before we go down this path of no return; support the resolution HR 1569.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. This resolution would prohibit funds to deploy ground elements without prior authorization. Mr. Speaker, this resolution goes far beyond the concerns of many who believe Congress should express its will before a ground invasion of Yugoslavia is contemplated.

I do believe that Congress should express the views of our constituents as we proceed with action in the Balkan region. I however do not want to limit the flexibility of our military in their efforts to make Slobodan Milosevic comply with international norms. Mr. Speaker, I find it ironic that this body is even considering this resolution in light of past precedent. When President Bush asked this body to authorize action in Kuwait, this body had sufficient time to debate the matter. Secondly, this body did not attempt to block our commanders' flexibility and ability to respond to emergency situations.

I believe that NATO's operations are making a difference in the region both militarily and in providing comfort to thousands and thousands of refugees. But it is important for us to remember that when conducting operations like this one that it is going to take time. I want to ensure that Milosevic pays a heavy price for his present policy of repression against the Kosovar Albanians, to alter his calculation about continuing on this course, and to seriously diminish his military capacity to exert his will over Kosovo.

In addition, Mr. Speaker there are thousands and thousands of ethnic Albanians who have received the full brunt of the Yugoslavian army and police force in Kosovo. These people have lost their homes and possessions. They have lost countless loved ones to unspeakable atrocities. We may never know the full extent of the horrors committed by the Yugoslavian army. We are left with the words of refugees fleeing this country. Their eyes have witnessed and their words speak of men and boys who have been led off to die.

The 37,000 refugees in Montenegro, the 262,000 refugees in Albania, and the 120,000 in Macedonia; place the responsibility for the Kosovo tragedy squarely on the shoulders of Slobodan Milosevic. Mr. Speaker, we cannot deny the evidence of mass graves nor the humanitarian crisis ongoing in Montenegro, Macedonia, and Albania.

Mr. Speaker, we must be patient in this endeavor, for the stability of Europe is at risk. I believe that we must stay the course, for this is a battle that Milosevic cannot be allowed to win and that NATO must not lose.

There is a great deal at stake in this operation including the stability of Europe. We cannot lose sight of the fact that on two occasions we have sent young men and women to fight and die in order to restore the stability of Europe. Mr. Speaker, if Milosevic is allowed to succeed then we will be establishing a dangerous precedent for the next century. NATO must succeed in its endeavor to restore order to Kosovo and to establish a lasting peace based on fairness and justice.

Although I do not support the use of ground forces, I feel that this resolution goes too far. This sweeping resolution threatens to severely restrict the ability of our military commanders to conduct operations in the Balkans. There are situations, which could arise that require the deployment of ground troops. I cannot support H.R. 1569 because it imposes a risk to both our forces and those of our allies.

Mr. Speaker, this effort is in our national interest, our current policy best represents our interests. We must prevail in this struggle because the interests and the values, which embody our nation and those of our allies, are at stake.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution, which would prohibit funding for ground forces unless deployment is specifically authorized. The only narrow exception provided in this measure is for rescuing US service personnel.

This resolution would undermine our ability to achieve NATO objectives in Kosovo and, more importantly, would send the wrong signal to President Milosevic about our resolve in the Balkans.

I encourage my colleagues to consider the ramifications of this resolution, which limits our country's military leaders. If we are to ensure a stable Europe and stop the atrocities, then we must destroy Milosevic's ability to wage his campaigns of ethnic cleansing.

I believe that the United States should continue to support the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) efforts in the Balkans. NATO has been principally responsible for the relative stability and economic prosperity that Europe has enjoyed over the last fifty years. Our experience in two world wars clearly demonstrates that a stable Europe is in the national interest of the United States.

By putting unwise restrictions on our armed forces, this resolution could ultimately jeopardize our involvement in the 19-nation NATO operation.

In attempting to make a political statement, the Republican leadership hastily put this resolution together without involving the minority and has circumvented the committee process.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, which could do more to harm our national security interests and jeopardize our men and women in uniform involved with this operation.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1569, a bill that would prohibit the appropriated funds of the Department of Defense from being used to deploy ground troops to Yugoslavia without the consent of Congress.

I still have grave concerns about NATO actions in Kosovo because I see no direct U.S. interests at stake, no clearly defined mission and no exit strategy. After five weeks of bombing, there is no evidence that our actions are either convincing Slobodan Milosevic to agree to a peace treaty or protecting the thousands of ethnic Albanians who are fleeing Kosovo. The recent deployment of Apache helicopters, tanks, artillery and armored personnel carriers to the Balkans, and the Monday's call up of 33,000 reservists, is clear evidence that President Clinton intends to introduce ground forces to Kosovo itself sometime in the near future. H.R. 1569 simply requires the President to consult Congress before he does so.

While I abhor the ethnic violence and the forced eviction of ethnic Albanians from Kosovo, I am still not convinced that this situation merits sending in U.S. ground troops. With that said Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this bill because it sends a clear and concise message to President Clinton—that Congress has a constitutional role to play and that the President must get the authorization of the Congress before he can commit ground troops to Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 1569.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, if you don't believe we should send troops into the Balkans—then there is a clear pattern of how you should vote today.

If you believe that the War Powers Resolution offers the best means for preventing the president from taking us to war—then you know the course to follow.

What we are discussing today is the war in the Balkans. This region is a tapestry of overlapping ethnic rivalries where medieval and modern history are intertwined. As with the Middle East, the situation is very complicated. But where the Middle East resembles a game of checkers, the Balkan region is more like three dimensional chess.

The central point is that the Balkans represent a process of history and memory which has created a multiplier effect for violence. It is not a phenomenon of ''modern hate,'' but a monstrous creation partially wrought by the collapse of the multinational Hapsburg and Ottoman empires. It is not a situation open to easy solutions. We are dealing with a primitive ferocity there.

Today, we must decide if the President can take the United States further into the Balkan conflict without the approval of Congress. After all, the Constitution invests Congress with the power to make war.

To my knowledge, no substantial war with the accompanying carnage has ever been

fought solely on the basis of human rights. If they were, then surely we would be fighting around the globe in many countries. Yes, human rights are among the noblest of causes, but wars are fought over national interests.

If the President had started this campaign in the right way, by using the full measure of our airpower, this conflict might have been resolved by now. However, this gradual approach has not worked. In fact, this approach has been a common strategic flaw in most of this Administration's military excursions.

Who in America would willingly send their son or daughter to die in the Balkans based upon the President's explanation of the events? President Clinton has put our troops in precarious positions over and over again. We should say today that not one service man or woman should be placed in harm's way based upon the President's empty threats or hollow promises.

Vote yes to prevent ground troops from being sent into the Balkans. Vote for the Goodling/Fowler Bill. When you find yourself in a hole, it makes sense to stop digging. We need a better policy in the Balkans than we now have, we need to stop digging.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, today, Congress is faced with one of its most important and difficult constitutional duties. Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution clearly states that Congress shall have the power to declare war and to raise and support armies. Today, our Armed Forces are engaged in a NATO-led bombing campaign designed to force Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic to the negotiating table. The choices we must make are what actions we must take, declaring war, continuing on our current course or removing our troops, and what are our international responsibilities in the region.

We face a stark reality and a difficult decision. The reality is that Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic and the Serbian military forces are engaged in ethnic cleansing—attempting to systematically exterminate the Kosovar citizens. Reports have confirmed this and the atrocities have intensified since the NATO bombing campaign began on March 24, 1999.

Since the bombing campaign began, hundreds of thousands of Kosovars have fled the fighting. The pictures and stories of their escape are both tragic and disturbing. The decision facing Congress today is how to put an end to Slobodan Milosevic's organized efforts to harm these innocent people, how to return the refugees to their homeland and how to restore stability to the region.

President Clinton has put our Armed Forces on an unfamiliar and unclear path. His stated goals are to end the ethnic cleansing and to restore stability to the region. As news reports have shown, the bombing campaign is having little impact on the Serbian military's infrastructure. More importantly, it is doing little to prevent his systematic extermination of the Kosovar people. It can be argued that far from restoring peace and stability to the region, the bombing campaign is causing further disruption and intensifying Milosevic's ethnic cleansing efforts.

President Clinton has expressed concern about the introduction of ground troops into the region. I agree with his assessment. However, President Clinton recently authorized the mobilization of up to 33,000 reservists for deployment to the region—an act that could be interpreted as the first move toward the introduction of ground troops.

I question the efficacy of the bombing campaign and our current course of action. No military action can be won by limiting military options and creating a convoluted and confusing decisionmaking process. President Clinton's poll-driven policies ignore his military advisor's advice, endanger our servicemen and women and may involve the U.S. in a long-term military occupation with an ever increasing escalation reminiscent of Vietnam.

Our decision today is among the most important votes I've cast. Declaring war should be the last act of the Congress and the Administration after all diplomatic efforts have been exhausted and every avenue possible to resolve the conflict has been pursued. I don't believe we've exhausted these options at this time and that's why I will vote against declaring war.

The introduction of ground troops escalates our involvement to an unnecessary level at this time. I'm not prepared to put our servicemen and women in a hostile situation and will vote to remove our troops. The situation in Kosovo is the result of centuries of conflict and will not and cannot be quickly resolved using military force.

Any military victory will be offset by the fact that U.S. troops will remain a part of a long-term occupation force. As any neighboring nation should, the European nations have a responsibility to take a leadership role in working toward a permanent solution instead of temporary answers to this regional dispute.

Finally, the U.S. Constitution is clear that Congress has the ability to declare war and raise and provide funding for our nation's Armed Forces. That's why I will support the Fowler Resolution, which clarifies the role of Congress and which outlines that no U.S. ground troops will be deployed unless such deployment is authorized by law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 151, the bill is considered read for amendment, and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 249, noes 180, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

AYES—249

Abercrombie
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Bonilla
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Markey
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stark
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Young (AK)

NOES—180

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dreier
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez

Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Klink
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scott
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—5

Aderholt
Slaughter
Tauzin
Wynn
Young (FL)

□ 1521

Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. DEUTSCH changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1569.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 151, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 82) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces from their positions in connection with the present operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of H. Con. Res. 82 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 82

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA.

Pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)), the Congress hereby directs the President to remove United States Armed Forces from their positions in connection with the present operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia within 30 days after the passage of this resolution or within such longer period as may be necessary to effectuate their safe withdrawal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 151, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.Con.Res. 82.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) that I fully respect and appreciate his diligent efforts to ensure that the Congress is appropriately involved in any decisions on war and peace, and we highly commend him for his efforts in that respect.

As I stated to Secretary Albright at our Committee on International Relations hearing last week, I believe that the administration had made a serious mistake in trying to prosecute a war against Yugoslavia without full involvement of the Congress.

The gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) is earnestly trying to rectify that situation, and I believe he should be commended for taking pains to ensure that the prerogatives of the Congress are respected.

At the same time, however, I cannot support this measure that the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) introduced in April and which is before us today, House Concurrent Resolution 82. This is a concurrent resolution directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove our armed forces from Yugoslavia.

□ 1530

With regard to the merits of the Campbell resolution, we all know that Operation Allied Force has not been as successful as we would have liked, but now is certainly not the time to suspend our military operations in Yugoslavia. Doing that would only compound the humanitarian tragedy that has been unfolding before our eyes. It would reward President Milosevic for his murderous strategy of depopulating Kosovo of its ethnic Albanian majority and remove all pressure on him to agree to any diplomatic settlement that would protect the rights of the people of Kosovo.

The NATO military air operation now taking place over Serbia is a response, belatedly in my opinion, to more than a year of the most callous and brutal acts of repression aimed at innocent men, women and children in Kosovo whose only crime has been that they are Albanians.

The architect of these policies is Slobodan Milosevic, a man who has already accumulated a horrendous record in the former Yugoslavia and who should be indicted by the War Crimes Tribunal at The Hague.

The cost of Milosevic's aggressive nationalism has been the uprooting of hundreds of thousands of people. While the Serbs have used NATO bombing as a pretext to escalate their hideous policy of ethnic cleansing, it is clear that they had prepared to embark on this course for Kosovo when the spring weather permitted better conditions for their military operations. There are alarming reports that in addition to the mass expulsions that we see on our television, there have been numerous atrocities and even mass killings perpetrated by the Serb forces, including civilian paramilitary groups notorious for their crimes that were committed in Bosnia and in Croatia.

In addition to these compelling humanitarian concerns that have led to our involvement, there is a threat to neighboring countries like Albania and Macedonia that could create a much wider conflict in Europe that could even result in the involvement of our NATO allies Greece and Turkey on opposite sides.

To prevent that kind of destabilization and escalation, our Nation has decided to act now. We have learned in two previous occasions this century that wars in Europe inevitably involve our own national interest, and that we pay a higher price by pretending that they do not and by delaying our involvement.

For these reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to oppose this resolution, H. Con. Res. 82, and indicate to the government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia that we will not cut and run when the going gets tough.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I find considerable irony in the question of what is our national interest in Kosovo, for I thought we unequivocally answered that question with American blood and American tax dollars.

If we have no national interest in Kosovo, why did we lose so many lives in Europe in two World Wars? If we have no national interest in Kosovo, why did we spend billions of tax dollars

on the reconstruction of Europe through the Marshall Plan in the aftermath of World War II? It seems that we have forgotten that the Balkans are an integral part of Europe, and that Kosovo, as President Bush first enunciated, is critical to the peace and stability in the Balkans.

Senator Dole got it right when he testified before the Committee on International Relations advocating our engagement and involvement in Kosovo. I am quoting Senator Dole: ''It is in America's interest to have a stable, democratic and prosperous Europe.''

As did Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, who served so well as our U.N. Ambassador under President Reagan. She stated at that same hearing, and again I am quoting: ''I think that peace and security and the human rights of the people in the region and the future of NATO and a democratic, peaceful, prosperous Europe are all in the balance in Kosovo.''

We should be proud that it was the United States that helped nurture prosperity and democratic institutions in Europe in the latter part of this century, for that investment truly changed the course of history and has not just benefited Europe, but our Nation and our people.

The prosperity that we have enjoyed in this decade can be partially traced to the reality of a Europe increasingly democratic in terms of its political institutions, with economies based on free market principles. We are joined at the hip, let us be clear about that, but it is to our mutual advantage. An expanded European Union represents a future of unprecedented peace and prosperity for a continent that has been ravaged by war throughout recorded history, and the genocidal ethnic cleansing of Milosevic is perhaps the final challenge, hopefully, to achieving that vision.

So when we ask what our national interest is in Kosovo, it is not simply Kosovo, it is more, much more. It is about Europe and beyond Europe.

In the so-called Christmas warning of 1992, it was President Bush that warned Milosevic if he attacked Kosovo, that the U.S. would support a military intervention, if necessary. Early in his administration, President Clinton confirmed the Bush warning. It was the conclusion of both administrations that conflict in Kosovo would destabilize the entire region and potentially threaten all of Europe.

It would indeed be tragic at this point in time to have defeated fascism in the 1930s and the 1940s, to have prevailed over communism in the 1980s, only to lose the peace at the end of the century. We may do just that by a unilateral withdrawal at this point in time.

I submit that the action would be irresponsible. Dictators worldwide would cheer. Milosevic would have won. We will have crafted a much more frightening and troubled future. The Kosovar Albanians would be condemned to permanent exile or death and genocide.

Again, Senator Dole was particularly eloquent when he spoke to what was occurring in Kosovo and to the evils of genocide. Again, let me quote the Senator: ''Now I don't know how many people it takes before you call it genocide. And I'm reminded of the book, 'The Greatest Generation,' by Tom Brokaw, and I'm proud to be a part of that generation, and one of the things we failed to do in that generation was to nip genocide in the bud. It happened, we let it happen, and we stood back and we did nothing.''

Let us not sometime in the future reflect back on this day with the same regrets expressed so eloquently by Senator Dole. An earlier speaker, my friend from Ohio, on the floor stated, ''Let's give peace a chance.'' I respect him. I respect that sentiment. However, let me conclude by saying, let us not give genocide a chance. Let us not give genocide a chance.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), our distinguished whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult speech for me to give, because I normally, and I still do, support our military and the fine work that they are doing. But I cannot support a failed foreign policy. History teaches us that it is often easier to make war than peace. This administration is just learning that lesson right now.

But before we get deeper embroiled into this Balkan quagmire, I think that an assessment has to be made of the Kosovo policy so far. President Clinton has never explained to the American people why he was involving the U.S. military in a civil war in a sovereign nation, other than to say it is for humanitarian reasons, a new military/foreign policy precedent.

The President began this mission with very vague objectives and lots of unanswered questions. A month later, these questions are still unanswered. There are no clarified rules of engagement. There is no timetable. There is no legitimate definition of victory. There is no contingency plan for mission creep. There is no clear funding program. There is no agenda to bolster our overextended military. There is no explanation defining what vital national interests are at stake. There was no strategic plan for war when the President started this thing, and there still is no plan today.

Instead of sending in ground troops, we should pull out the forces we now have in the region. Many who argue we cannot pull out say we should stay to save face, if for no other reason. I would like to ask these people, was it worth to stay in Vietnam just to save face?

The root of this crisis is centuries old, and no occupation by foreigners can craft a peace where no desire for it exists. Unless you are willing to commit your sons and daughters into a war indefinitely, you should not vote to keep troops overseas simply because we do not know what else to do.

The President said that if we did nothing, there would be instability in the region, there would be a flood of refugees, Kosovars would die and the credibility of NATO would be undermined. Well, Clinton's bombing campaign has caused all of these problems to explode; in addition, has made the Russians jittery, and has harmed NATO's standing in the world.

In Lebanon, Ronald Reagan cut his losses and withdrew our troops. We should do the same thing before the body bags start coming home. After all, what good has been accomplished so far? Absolutely nothing. What long-term good will be accomplished by keeping our troops there? None, unless you are willing to occupy all of Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we should send ground troops to Kosovo, and I do not think we should be bombing in the Balkans, and I do not think that NATO should be destroyed by changing its mission into a humanitarian invasion force. I support the Campbell resolution.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Let me be really clear. This is not a civil war that has been raging. This is nothing more than state violence and state terrorism against a class of citizens who are unarmed, for the purpose of forming a pure enclave, a mini-state, if you will. I daresay the statement that this is a civil war does a disservice to what occurred before the ascendancy of Milosevic. There were 1.9 million Albanians and about 200,000 Serbs. As again Senator Dole testified before the House Committee on International Relations, they had been living peacefully together until Milosevic stirred things up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), a respected member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HOEFFEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the unilateral withdrawal of American forces from Yugoslavia. This is a wrong idea at a wrong time. This effort represents a modern day isolationism that would be wrong for America, just as wrong as isolationism was at the First World War and the time of the Second World War.

A unilateral withdrawal of our troops would devastate NATO just at a time when it is showing great resolve and great unity. The role for NATO in the future is to keep the peace in Europe. No one else will be able to do that. This is not the time to destroy NATO's resolve.

A unilateral withdrawal would also reward Milosevic for his barbaric activity. It would allow him to win this conflict. He is engaging in genocide. Genocide is systematic barbarity and murder of innocent, defenseless civilians because of ethnic and religious differences. That is what is happening in Yugoslavia and Kosovo today. That is what we must stop. To withdraw our troops today would undercut everything this country stands for and would remove America as one of the leaders, perhaps the only great leader, in this world today. We should oppose this resolution.

□ 1545

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the resolution.

When American troops are deployed on the field of battle it is the duty of every American offer them our clear support and prayers for their safe return home. That is why I will vote for a supplemental appropriations bill that not only pays today's bills in Kosovo, but also begins to meet the national security emergency caused by 7 years of neglect of our military forces by this administration.

It is an emergency that we have troops fighting in Bosnia whose families are asked to survive on food stamps. It is an emergency the Air Force now has less cruise missiles than they have bombers to fire them. It is an emergency that as we call up 2,000 Air Force reservists for Kosovo, the Air Force still faces a shortage of over 2,000 pilots. And it is a grave emergency, that while we have gotten bogged down in a tiny country on the periphery of our vital interests, the Joints Chiefs of Staff have now confirmed that we face a ''very high risk'' of not being able to respond to our vital national interests in major theaters such as the Persian Gulf or the Korean Peninsula.

Support for our troops means more than a ''photo op'' for the Commander-in-Chief. It means providing them all of the resources they need to safely and successfully complete their mission.

Support for our troops also means not putting them in harm's way without a clear goal, which can be achieved by military means, and which supports our vital national interests.

While all of our hearts and prayers go out to the innocent Kosovar civilians, it is painfully clear that 6 weeks of bombings have not prevented a single Kosovar from being raped, murdered or expelled from their home. Simply put, our military strategy of degrading and diminishing the Serbian military infrastructure can never achieve our stated political goal of peacefully reintegrating the Kosovar Albanians into Serbia.

Replacing Vietnam era ''body counts'' with high technology ''bomb damage assessments'' of empty Serbian barracks will not make this war a success.

If this tiny and troubled region truly were a threat to our vital interests, the only proper strategy would be full scale invasion of Kosovo, defeat of the Yugoslav Army, unconditional surrender of the war criminal, Slobodon Milosovic, and the occupation of Kosovo for the decades it will likely take to rebuild this region. This strategy, of full scale war, and the deployment of thousands of U.S. ground troops, surely must have the support of the American people as expressed through the approval of the Congress. For this reason, I support the resolution by the gentlewoman from Florida.

But if our security interests are not at stake, however deep the humanitarian crisis, we must consider more appropriate means of response than our current round of ''therapeutic airstrikes.''

When American service men and women know that what they are fighting for is important to their fellow Americans, and achievable through military means, they would do it for free.

We owe them an answer to these fundamental questions. Are we fighting for the independence of Kosovo? Not according to the President. Are we fighting to defeat Milosovic and bring him to justice as a war criminal? Not according to the Secretary of State. Are we fighting to defeat the Yugoslav army? Not according to the Secretary of Defense. So far it appears we are fighting because we can. We have replaced ''power projection'' with ''sympathy projection.'' Blind support for this nonpolicy of wishful thinking must never become the measure of our support for American troops.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there is a strange dichotomy at play in this event. Those from the left attempt to use a vehicle they neither support, understand or even loathe at times. They attempt to spin the White House language that we attempt to stop ethnic cleansing, when the issue has actually exacerbated the problem that the Pentagon predicted, and warned and told the President not to get involved in.

The actual killing and removal of over 1 million refugees would not have happened, not to the degree if NATO had not intervened.

The Jane Fondas, the Ramsey Clarks, the Strobe Talbotts of this world find themselves inept in attempting to conduct military operations or even foreign policy.

Take a look at NATO today: France, Socialist/Communist coalition; Italy, former Communist.

It is not somebody that we trust.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), a member of the House Committee on International Relations.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days I have asked myself, because I was against the conflict in Kosovo, I asked myself why, and I kept coming up with the answer that I was upset with the administration because it did not do the right thing in regards to the genocide that took place in Rwanda, Uganda, Sierra Leone and the Sudan. And then I thought again, and I said, and came to the conclusion that 1, 2, 3 or even 4 wrongs do not equal a right. Therefore, I changed my opinion and said we should stay the course in Kosovo and correct our policy in Africa, for genocide is, indeed, genocide wherever we may find it.

I believe we should follow the lead of the administration and NATO in preserving humanity, for we cannot sit idly by as thousands of innocent people are raped, murdered, stripped of their identities and forced from their homelands like what occurred in Rwanda, Uganda, Sierra Leone and the Sudan.

We must not allow evil to take over, and ethnic cleansing is indeed an evil. We should not sit on the fence between right and wrong. We should be firmly on the side of the fence that is right.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. once said war can never be a positive or absolute good, but it could serve as a negative good in the sense of preventing the growth of an evil force. I believe that Mr. Milosevic is an evil force that must be stopped.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, there is a tragic war unfolding in the Balkans. The United States military has been playing a significant role in this war for several weeks. There is every indication that the war will expand and so will the United States' role. And yet, it is an undeclared war bearing an eerie resemblance to the beginning of the Vietnam War albeit that this one involves our NATO allies.

As a part of a NATO policy, the United States military began bombing in Yugoslavia in response to that government's refusal to go along with a plan for NATO ''peacekeeping'' forces to occupy the Yugoslav province of Kosovo in an effort to stop a civil war and ''ethnic cleansing.'' It appears that President Clinton and other NATO leaders mistakenly thought that bombing specified military targets in Serbia and Kosovo would send a message to Yugoslav President Milosevic that would cause him to quickly embrace the NATO peace plan. It is obvious this was a gross miscalculation. Instead, Serbian forces immediately swept through Kosovo burning homes and driving out thousands and thousands of Kosovars who have become refugees in neighboring states. In the process, many human rights atrocities against the Kosovars in Kosovo have been reported.

The response of the United States and its allies has been to step up the bombing program. This has united the Serbian population behind President Milosevic, steeled their determination to prevail no matter what and alienated the general public in Russia who have a strong historical relationship with the Serbs. So far there is no sign that absent the introduction of ground forces, the intensified bombing campaign will cause President Milosevic and the Serbs to agree to the terms regarding Kosovo, demanded by NATO.

It is well known that the Yugoslav army has long prepared for a defensive struggle against any invading force by constructing underground facilities in rugged territory, by storing

weapons and other supplies in these facilities and by training its military to engage in guerrilla tactics. While the extent of damage done by the bombing to date has been significant, it is probable that no amount of bombing will degrade the Yugoslav military sufficiently enough to prevent large numbers of casualties if U.S. ground troops are inserted or even if attack helicopters and other low flying aircraft are utilized to destroy Yugoslav ground forces because of the passion of the Serbian people to drive the Albanian Kosovars out of Kosovo and regain this territory which historically, several hundred years ago, was part of greater Serbia. It is unrealistic to expect the government of Yugoslavia to yield to NATO and its demands short of a total military defeat, and even then it appears likely that guerrilla warfare would continue to exist for a long, long time against any occupying force.

President Clinton has never asked Congress to declare war on Yugoslavia or Serbia. He has never even requested the type of resolution President Bush requested and was granted in advance of Desert Storm. Instead, he has made statements to the general public and conferred behind closed doors with congressional ''leaders'' putting forth a rationale for the bombings without a full explanation of what will likely be required to achieve the presumed NATO foreign policy objectives. At no time has he spelled out to the American public, let alone Congress, a consistent, coherent foreign policy that demonstrates a compelling United States national security interest in waging war against the forces of the government of Yugoslavia. Has the United States embraced a new NATO policy as described by British Prime Minister Tony Blair that NATO will not permit ever in the future human rights atrocities and ''ethnic cleansing'' or a dictatorship anywhere on the continent of Europe? If President Clinton embraces this policy, does this mean he is committing United States military forces to enforce such a policy not just in this instance in Yugoslavia, but at any point in what the world defines as Europe? Does this mean that whatever force is necessary, including the use of ground troops of the United States military, will be engaged to ensure this policy? And if indeed this is a new policy of NATO to which the United States is in agreement, what is the national security interest rationale to support such a policy, and why specifically would we engage in such a policy with regard to Europe and nowhere else in the world? If it is not the United States policy, then the President needs to say so and come before Congress requesting some authority for engaging in the war that we're now undertaking together with a detailed rationale for it and an explanation of what we're prepared to do to win it. If it is a new policy, then that too must be explained together with a request for Congress to formally support the ongoing war as well as whatever treaty alterations within NATO need to be made and approved by the U.S. Senate.

I'm just as moved as anyone else by the atrocities being reported in Kosovo. There is no doubt in my mind that Albanian Kosovars have been brutally mistreated. No doubt, an appropriate response by the United States and its NATO allies to this action is justified. But I am deeply troubled by our engagement in an undeclared war that appears to be incrementally deepening with each passing day. It reminds me a great deal of how we got engaged in Vietnam and allowed that engagement to progress to a major war with a no-win policy that lost the support of the American public and cost thousands of American lives. If the United States is going to engage in war, the commitment must be made to let the military use the force necessary to win the war which means paying whatever price in lives of American soldiers is required to do this. And if America's national security interests are not great enough to justify such a price, then there should be no war.

To date, President Clinton has not demonstrated to my satisfaction that America's national security interest in the Kosovo matter is great enough to justify paying the price that I foresee will be necessary to win the undeclared war in which we are now engaged. For this reason, I am voting today for Mr. CAMPBELL's resolution to withdraw American forces from this war effort and for the Fowler/Goodling bill which would require a vote of Congress before the introduction of United States ground forces in Kosovo or Serbia. In doing so I keep an open mind to any presentation the President may make in the future to Congress seeking a declaration of war for this cause or a resolution similar to the one that was sought and given to President Bush. However, I will not be a party to sending American men and women in uniform to die in an ill conceived, ill planned and undeclared war.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am a hawk. I believe in a military so strong that we never have to use it. When we use our military might, it should be with clear objectives after considering our national interests and the limits of our influence.

Mr. Speaker, imagine Serbia before we started bombing. The threat of ethnic cleansing clearly existed. About 2,000 innocent people have been killed, and more ominously, 40,000, a manned force, has been built up in Kosovo. Imagine again the White House seeing this threat, recalling the glory of the 1-day wars in Grenada and Panama and, without considering the ramifications, decided to go to war against Yugoslavia.

But Mr. Milosevic does not play by our rules. He does not turn on his anti-aircraft radar so that we can detect it and destroy it. He uses the bombings as a cover to really do ethnic cleansing and to suppress local domestic opposition.

The war drags on. The President and his advisers plead for patience, all the while hoping a cruel, cold winter without electricity and fuel oil will force guilty and innocent Serbs to their knees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), another Member of the House Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 82 which would direct the President to remove our armed forces from their positions in connection with the present operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, a congressional vote to withdraw U.S. forces from the mission in Kosovo would severely undermine the entire NATO effort to stem President Milosevic's brutal campaign of ethnic cleansing against the Kosovar Albanian population.

Mr. Speaker, the withdrawal of U.S. troops right now would also undermine our other stated objectives in the conflict.

One of the reasons we decided to act in the first place was to prevent a wider conflict in the region from erupting. That was and still remains our goal. A withdrawal right now would greatly undermine that objective by putting the stability of the Balkans in grave jeopardy and, more broadly, the security of southern Europe.

We would also leave hundreds of thousands of refugees homeless and over 1.2 million displaced persons exposed to continued ethnic cleansing in Kosovo, a situation we will not tolerate. Just last weekend, leaders of the NATO alliance meeting here in Washington reaffirmed their commitment and resolve to maintain the air campaign against Yugoslavia until several key conditions were met. A vote now for unilateral U.S. withdrawal flies in the face of the NATO show of resolve.

Mr. Speaker, over the years many voices in this Chamber have called for greater burden-sharing by our allies. Our allies now are shouldering a great deal of the responsibility in this conflict. A unilateral troop withdrawal at this time would send the wrong signal to them that we are not willing to hold up our fair share of the burden. Mr. Milosevic must not doubt our resolve to achieve the objective of a multi-ethnic, democratic Kosovo in which all can live in peace and security. Mr. Milosevic alone has the power to end this conflict by immediately stopping the violence and bloodshed, withdrawing his military police and paramilitary forces from Kosovo and allowing all refugees to return under an international security presence.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake. A vote withdrawing our troops is a vote against our troops and the vital mission they are currently undertaking. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE).

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I urge a yes vote on H. Con. Res. 82.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. Almost 7 weeks ago I voted to authorize the

President to deploy American military forces as part of a peacekeeping force in Kosovo if the peace talks then underway produced a settlement.

Mr. Speaker, no peace agreement was reached, no vital U.S. interest in Kosovo was articulated, no mission defined, no exit strategy put forward. Without a vote of this House, the planes were launched and air strikes began. Never before have I been as concerned about the lack of definition and direction in our Nation's foreign policy. We are in where we should not be, and no one seems to know the way out.

It appears that the President hoped that the threat of air strikes would force a peace agreement. It did not. He hoped that the air strikes alone would detour Mr. Milosevic from continuing his attacks on Kosovo. They did not. He hopes that the American people are willing to risk the lives of their sons and daughters in Kosovo. They are not.

Mr. Speaker, hope is not a method. The President has yet to make a case for our involvement in Kosovo.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¾ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution is very clear. It is the United States Congress which has the power to determine issues of war and peace and to decide whether our young men and women are put in harm's way. It is the President who is the Commander in Chief of the military; it is the Congress which determines whether we use that military.

I have heard today that some people think that the U.S. participation in Kosovo now is unconstitutional. They are right. But the U.S. participation in Vietnam, Grenada, Panama and many other conflicts which took place without congressional authorization were also unconstitutional.

The time is now for this Congress to stop abrogating its constitutional responsibility to the White House and to start seriously addressing the issues of war and peace.

Frankly, I am extremely concerned about the process that has taken place today on an issue of such enormous consequence and at a time when Congress has an inactive schedule. It is an outrage that we only have a few hours to discuss the issues of war, the expenditure of billions, and the potential loss of life of American military personnel, and I hope we rectify this situation in the coming days and weeks. This should not be the last debate on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, my assessment of this situation at the present moment is that Mr. Milosevic is a war criminal and that ethnic cleansing, mass murder, rape and the forced evacuation of hundreds of thousands of innocent people from their homes is unacceptable and cannot be ignored. Sadly, because Mr. Milosevic has negotiated agreements which he has then ignored, I have supported the NATO bombings of military targets. I believe that the Serb military and police must be withdrawn from Kosovo, that the hundreds of thousands of people uprooted from their homes must be allowed to return, that Kosovo must be given some kind of self-rule and that an international peacekeeping force should be established to maintain order.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must strive as hard as we possibly can to find an alternative between doing nothing and allowing ethnic cleansing and mass murder to continue and the continuation of a war which will certainly result in terrible destruction, large numbers of casualties and the expenditure of great sums of money. I believe that the United States must be as active as we possibly can in finding a road to peace.

I believe that Germany and the United Nations have brought forth proposals which might be able to form the basis of a negotiated peace. I believe that Russia, a long-term ally of Serbia, should be asked to play a more active role in the process and to supply troops for an international peacekeeping force.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of our committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I have believed from the outset that our involvement in this European conflict is wrong. It has become painfully apparent that the Clinton administration committed American air power without a clearly-defined mission and without a credible exit strategy.

Make no mistake about it. Slobodan Milosevic is a war criminal. His treatment of the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo has been deplorable, and his prosecution as a international war criminal could not come fast enough. But I do not believe that the commitment of American military forces to a potentially long, expensive and perhaps tragic effort can be the proper means to achieve that end.

Mr. Speaker, our military involvement in the Balkans is unwise. This administration's miscues have led to a disjointed strategy of gradual escalation that puts the lives of American men and women at risk.

Let us work for peace. Let us help the Kosovar refugees with humanitarian aid. But let us take our service men and women out of harm's way.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COYNE).

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the difficult issues that are before us relative to U.S. involvement in the ongoing NATO military action in Yugoslavia. The United States, in consultation with its NATO allies, has determined that the instability caused by the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo is a threat to the security of Europe.

□ 1600

Governments of NATO agreed unanimously on joint military action over a month ago, with the intention of forcing the government of Slobodan Milosevic to end its policy of ethnic cleansing and to allow safe restoration of the refugees to their homes. The one thing that I think Americans have learned is that it is wrong to stand idly by while such atrocities take place before our eyes. History.

Has also taught us that it is better to head off a problem than to wait until the problem has spread. Today NATO remains committed to continuing its military operations until its three objectives, safe return and self-government of the refugees, withdrawal of the Yugoslavian troops from Kosovo and the insertion of peacekeeping troops to protect the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo are met. I support these objectives, and I support U.S. military action in order to achieve them.

How long this action will last, I do not know, but I do know two things: First, the power to end hostilities lies today with Slobodan Milosevic. All he has to do is stop the killing and pull his troops back.

Second, the chances that Mr. Milosevic will meet NATO's demand are dramatically reduced if Congress enacts legislation that requires the withdrawal of U.S. forces or ties the administration's hands regarding NATO's military options.

This is no time to go weak-kneed on our troops in Europe.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), a member of our committee.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I have four questions to ask my colleagues and the American public: Is a ground war in Kosovo imminent? We are being pushed towards a ground war that is not in our national interests. Tony Blair, the Prime Minister of Britain, the Secretary General of NATO, Javier Solana, and our own President with his recent headlines, ''Clinton edges closer to backing the use of ground troops,'' and the President has called up 33,000 reservists.

The second question, what does a ground war mean? It means between 150,000 and 300,000 troops, with American forces making up 65 percent of the troops in rugged terrain that 25 German divisions in World War II could barely occupy, with expected casualties of between 7 and 12 percent, thousands of Americans wounded and killed.

Three, is it worth it? Every Member of Congress must ask himself or herself this question: Is it worth the life of my child, and, if you cannot answer that in the affirmative, then why should you force others' children to go to war, while the Clinton Administration refuses to allow the Kosovars to arm themselves and fight their own civil war.

The fourth question, why vote for the Campbell bill to halt U.S. combat mission in Yugoslavia? Because this is the only way to keep ground troops from savage guerrilla warfare, and this is the only way to stop thousands of U.S. soldiers from being killed in battle.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Campbell resolution. As I stand here today, it pains me deeply to know that right now there are over 500,000 innocent victims from Kosovo who are running for their lives. These men, women and children have been driven out of their homes and villages, have been subjected to organized assaults, brutal rapes, and even assassinations. Some are living in makeshift camps, sheltered only by blankets and plastic covering. Some even hide and wait in the forests. Many of their villages have been burned.

These victims have been terrorized and seen death in the worst extreme. They are experiencing hunger, sickness, cold temperatures and terror on many fronts. Some have seen their loved ones viciously executed. We cannot allow this horror to continue for these innocent people, without trying to stop it.

Let me be clear: I strongly believe that any kind of physical confrontation is troublesome and undesirable. However, to simply stand by, after one has exhausted diplomatic solutions, is even more unbearable. We have been as reasonable as we can possibly be with the Milosevic regime, yet he continues these atrocities and continues to launch a well-executed ethnic cleansing campaign and continues to commit genocide upon the men and women and children of Kosovo.

I have been told that injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere, and there can be no justice in America as long as there is injustice in Kosovo.

We have no alternative, we have no recourse, we have no choice, except to demonstrate that we believe in peace, and, not only do we believe in it, but we will work for it.

Therefore, I oppose the Campbell resolution, and urge that we vote against it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise not to declare war, but to support our Constitution.

Right now President Clinton is prosecuting a war he was never authorized to start. President Clinton asked many nations to agree to attack Yugoslavia, but he failed to get permission from one crucial country, America. Our Constitution requires that Congress must declare war, not the President. It also states that Congress, not the President, defines and punishes offenses against the law of nations. And the NATO treaty, approved 50 years ago, says nothing about launching an attack.

It is not the American way to let one man drag us into a bloody quagmire. I took an oath to honor our Constitution, and I will not stand idle while the President, again, runs rough-shod over that Constitution.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor with an overwhelming sense of sadness that we be debating constraints on America's ability to lead in this world on a most profound issue of human rights. We are a people and a Nation whose very creation was to protect life and liberty against imperial sovereignty.

In my view, whatever constrains the 19 nations that comprise NATO from successfully prosecuting this war and successfully degrading the military capacity of the Milosevic regime to conduct ethnic cleansing and successfully returning ethnic Albanian citizens of Kosova to the homes they've lived in for generations is bad policy. It is tough enough to achieve consensus among those 19 nations, from France, Britain, and Italy to Hungary, Luxemburg and Iceland. But a broad consensus exists, a remarkable agreement, that the consummate evil in Europe today is represented by the Milosevic regime's execution of his belief that it has every right to repress, to terrorize, to intimidate, to expel, and, if those fail, to massacre whoever is left, of nearly 2 million citizens of Kosovo, whose only crime is that their religion is Islam.

I believe that if NATO had said ''no'' when Milosevic attacked eastern Croatia in 1991, an attack that ended when the defenses of Vukovar were overrun and the people remaining in the hospital were taken from their beds and slaughtered, we would not have witnessed the agony of Bosnia with 200,000 killed and 2 million—fully 50% of the population—displaced from their homes. That agony culminated at Srebrenica where 8,000 men and boys were separated out and slaughtered. And if NATO had said ''no'' when the Milosevic regime killed 200,000 Bosnians and sent 2 million more into exile and into displacement from their homes, then the agony of Kosovo would not have occurred.

I believe equally fervently that if NATO is not equally successful in its resolve on Kosovo, that the anti-Milosevic freely-elected government, and, in fact, the very republic status of Montenegro within the rump of federal Yugoslavia, is as good as dead, and that the Milosevic regime will then adopt the destabilization of Macedonia as its next expansionist project.

NATO must succeed in this effort, before all the Kosovar males between the ages of 15 and 50 are murdered by the Milosevic regime.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, war is a serious undertaking. It should not be used for political reasons, ever. War is a last resort and only used to protect America, her citizens and our vital interests.

Despite the humanitarian atrocities in Kosovo, the loss of even one life for a cause that has yet to be articulated or defined for the people of the United States is one too many. The plight of the refugees is tragic, and America should help them. We are a country that can provide relief and direction, ease pain and suffering, and we should provide help.

Mr. Speaker, I fought in a war where politicians were afraid to win because of the political fallout. That fear caused me to spend nearly 7 years of my life as a prisoner of war. I would fight again tomorrow for America's vital interests, but the answer in Kosovo is not to waste American lives. The answer is stop the bombing and provide relief for the refugees.

Mr. Speaker, there is a wall among the trees near the Lincoln Memorial that is engraved with the names of many brave soldiers, many of whom were my friends. Families go there to grieve and remember their fathers, their mothers, their sons and daughters. Stop the bombing. We do not need another wall.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that Congress has the duty and responsibility to decide the question whether the United States of America uses its military power against another country. No matter how this Congress feels about the evil actions of the leaders of Yugoslavia against its own people, words of revulsion and opposition do not justify bombing without a declaration of war.

If the majority of this Congress feels that the air bombardment is justified, then it must vote to declare war. An explanation of why we are bombing Yugoslavia is not enough. We need to explicitly state that we do so in an act of war. Without that declaration of war, we make a mockery of the Constitution and of the War Powers Act.

Just because we are not acting alone and because the countries of NATO are in full support of the air attack does not absolve us of our responsibility to abide by our Constitution. If we believe that the President is correct in sending

our military forces to bomb Yugoslavia, then it follows that we must vote to declare war.

I voted to allow troops into Yugoslavia to enforce the peace agreement. I did not vote to allow military intervention to force an agreement. I do not support the use of military power to beat the Yugoslavian government into submission to our will.

I fervently believe we should be debating a resolution to urge the President to declare a moratorium on the bombing while an all-out effort is made to reach a settlement. There are various proposals on the table. We could discuss the Russian proposal, the UN proposal, the German proposal. The Kosovar people have fled from their homes. Dangers to them now of a moratorium are very small compared to what has already been heaped upon them, so why not declare a halt on the bombing and let Russia, Germany and the UN broker a settlement? I want an end to the bombing. I want the Constitution of the United States to prevail.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), a member of our committee.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, there are many murky things about the situation we now face in Kosovo. One, however, is not murky. What is not even remotely unclear is the fact that we are not there for the often heard cause of stopping ethnic cleansing. That is the one thing about which I am absolutely sure. That is not the reason we are there.

We can debate, and we will debate at length, the variety of reasons we may be there. It may have something to do with legacies and all the rest of that, but it has nothing to do with ethnic cleansing, else we would be in at least a dozen countries around this world where the situation is 10 times worse. Certainly we can start naming them now. At the top of the list is the Sudan.

□ 1615

There were 2,000 people dead when we went into Kosovo to begin with, a third of them Serbs. We have already ruined too many lives there in Kosovo, we have done too much damage; too many people are dead as a result of the actions we have taken. It is time to withdraw our forces. When we have dug ourselves a pit, the best thing to do now is stop digging and get out.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues that as a result of the atrocities and the crimes against humanity committed by Slobodan Milosevic, there are over 300,000 men, women and children that are dead in the former Yugoslavia now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), my friend and colleague.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I believe we should withdraw our troops and resubmit this matter to the United Nations Security Council and make this tragedy the entire world's burden and not primarily that of the people of the United States of America.

It is understandable that this House should be conflicted here, because this mission is itself at conflict between the U.N. charter, which bans force, violating State sovereignty and the universal declaration of human rights, which guarantees the rights of individuals against oppressive States. NATO's action fails the test of humanitarian intervention, if only because of the damage NATO has inflicted on civilian populations. Humanitarian bombing is an Orwellian attack on logic.

If the United States continues as the chief sponsor of this war, we have, in effect, decided that the United Nations is no longer relevant. This places upon America the awesome responsibility of policing the entire world.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support for this resolution.

I share the concerns of many Third District residents regarding ethnic cleansing in Kosovo and current North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) attacks on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY). Having recently traveled to Tirana, Albania, and Skopje, Macedonia, I have witnessed firsthand the humanitarian crisis facing Europe—a crisis that has intensified since the beginning of the allied bombing campaign. There is no question that the situation is grim.

Slobodan Milosevic is a shrewd and experienced military commander who has used military power to expel Kosovar Albanians from their homes and to put extensive defenses in place in Kosovo, significantly enhancing his military position on the ground.

The President and the other 18 NATO leaders have, on the other hand, allowed political considerations to govern military decisions, resulting in NATO's failure to accomplish the goals established by the President at the outset of the air war. Ethnic cleansing has accelerated and the FRY military has now fortified its southern defenses, presenting a greater threat to a potential invasion force today than was present when NATO bombing began.

Because NATO air strikes have little chance of accomplishing their stated goals, and because the human and economic costs of launching a ground campaign far outweigh the potential benefits of such an action, I believe that the NATO air campaign must stop immediately. It is time for NATO to seek a negotiated settlement that will stop this expensive and counterproductive bombing campaign and allow the Kosovar Albanians to begin to rebuild their lives.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), a most distinguished member of the House Committee on International Relations and a long-term Member of this body.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the voices of appeasement and isolationism are reverberating in these halls. For 40 years NATO stood against the Soviet Union, the mighty superpower, and NATO apparently, in the view of some of our colleagues, cannot stand up to Slobodan Milosevic.

This past weekend at the NATO summit, 19 nations stood together determined and united to see to it that the ethnic cleansing comes to an end, that the persecution, mass rape, mass murder of the Kosovars comes to a halt. And it is painful indeed to listen to some of my colleagues who forget that for the whole period since the end of the Second World War, NATO provided a shield behind which Europe could be safe and free and secure and prosperous.

This is a historic moment. For the first time, Hitler's first victims, the Czechs, the Poles, the Danes, the Norweigans, the Dutch and the Belgians stand shoulder-to-shoulder with the newly democratic Germany and 11 other nations, including Canada and ourselves, in saying ''no'' to the perpetrators of genocide. This is not the time to cut and run.

It is important for all of us to realize that when the dust settles, this will prove to be NATO's finest hour. We are in it not for oil, not for glory, not for territory, but for the principles on which this country was founded, the principles that NATO has succeeded in taking root throughout western Europe and now throughout central Europe.

If anybody really believes that behind a new Iron Curtain in Yugoslavia there can be a dictatorship while the rest of Europe will be safe, stable and secure, it better wake up. We need to understand that if we allow Slobodan Milosevic to continue his evil deeds, he started the war against Slovenia, he lost it. He started the war against Croatia, he lost it. He started the war against Bosnia Herzegovina, he lost it. The last war he now starts, it is against the people of Kosovo. These people have done nothing, nothing to hurt the Yugoslav nation. They just want to live in peace and decency, and it is the responsibility of NATO to stand up as it has for half a century.

I strongly urge rejection of the resolution.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, especially with the advances knowledge that I intend to vote against his resolution.

I must warn my colleagues that we should be very cautious about what we do and what we say here and the messages that we send. Just last weekend, the NATO nations were here; they were unanimous in every respect in saying that they are going to stop the atrocities that have been taking place in Yugoslavia.

At this time and place in history, when we are involved, whether we like it or not, in Kosovo and debating

whether or not we should send American land troops, I think that the message of passing a resolution soon as this would be a serious mistake on the part of this Congress.

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

To my colleagues on the other side, I just want to provide a statement made by the former Secretary of State, Mr. Kissinger, who testified and expressed his reservations about this policy. But now that we have initiated this policy, let me quote from Mr. Kissinger who made this statement this past Thursday:

''What we need to do now is maintain the principle that ethnic cleansing does not pay, and therefore, those refugees must be given the right to return. Secondly, if all of NATO is defeated by Serbia, and that is what occurs if you have unilateral withdrawal, what will this mean for the Gulf, for North Korea, and for any other area where rogue States are held in check by American and, in some cases, NATO military power? That is the issue now.''

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

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

I am rising in support of this resolution, although I do it with great reluctance, because it is always difficult not to give the benefit of the doubt to the executive in foreign policy. But 7 weeks ago, I voted against authorizing U.S. intervention in Yugoslavia because I could discern no national interest in taking sides in a civil war, no approach that would lead to a diminution of violence, and no credible exit strategy.

I would like to stress, above all, one thing. Historical analogies are extremely difficult to derive. I personally believe there are a whole lot that apply in the Balkans, but many of them are contradictory. One that the majority side in support of the war falls back on is the Holocaust. I believe that there are Holocaustal analogies. But I also believe that Milosevic is a sui generis war criminal, one for whom Holocaustal acts are not unknown, but one where leadership is more analogous to, say, a Ho Chi Minh or possibly even a Pol Pot than to a Hitler.

I raise this because if we exclusively make Hitlerite analogies, we have no choice whatsoever than to follow a kind strategy that could lead in and of itself to greater losses of life to innocents than a negotiated settlement.

With each decision, it appears that this administration and NATO are moving into a circumstance where the problems are more difficult, not less; more likely to lead to outrageously violent results. Now is the time to stress negotiations, the time to recognize that we are not likely to have a great victory.

Senator Aiken once suggested in Vietnam in the late 1960s that we should declare victory and get out. That prescription does not fit the Balkans, but I would urge that we put in place a process of negotiations, and with that process recognize we have a greater chance for a successful resolution than any other possibility.

Little is more difficult than to apply perspective to the events of the day.

The Administration's Kosovo policy is open to question from two contrasting perspectives: should we militarily engage the government of Yugoslavia and, if so, what form should this engagement take? The first question involves fundamental Constitutional issues on war powers and the role of Congress in legitimizing military action and enhancing the participation of the American people in decisions related to war and peace. The second involves the unchallenged role of the President as commander-in-chief and doctrines of warfare.

Seven weeks ago, I voted against authorizing U.S. intervention in Yugoslavia because I could discern no national interest in taking sides in a civil war in the Balkans, no approach that would lead to a diminution of violence and no credible exit strategy.

The Administration, through its acts and statements, has broken with the military doctrine of the last several Administrations, particularly the Reaganite reliance on peace-time military preparedness and the Bush espousal of the Powell Doctrine, which calls for the establishment and enunciation of clear objectives with the use of overwhelming force to achieve these objectives.

In this context, I recently reviewed a 1984 speech of the former Secretary of Defense, Casper Weinberger. Weinberger suggested that six major tests should be applied when we are weighing the use of U.S. combat forces abroad:

(1) First, the United States should not commit forces to combat overseas unless the particular engagement or occasion is deemed vital to our national interest or that of our allies. . . .

(2) Second, if we decide it is necessary to put combat troops into a given situation, we should do so wholeheartedly, and with the clear intention of winning. If we are unwilling to commit the forces or resources necessary to achieve our objectives, we should not commit them at all. . . .

(3) Third, if we do decide to commit forces to combat overseas, we should have clearly defined political and military objectives. And we should know precisely how our forces can accomplish those clearly defined objectives. And we should have and send the forces needed to do just that. As Clausewitz wrote, ''No one starts a war—or rather, no one in his senses ought to do so—without first being clear in his mind what he intends to achieve by that war, and how he intends to conduct it.'' . . .

(4) Fourth, the relationship between our objectives and the forces we have committed—their size, composition and disposition—must be continually reassessed and adjusted if necessary. Conditions and objectives invariably change during the course of a conflict. When they do change, then so must our combat requirements. We must continuously keep as a beacon light before us the basic questions: ''Is this conflict in our national interest?'' ''Does our national interest require us to fight, to use force of arms?'' If the answers are ''Yes'', then we must win. If the answers are ''No'', then we should not be in combat.

(5) Fifth, before the U.S. commits combat forces abroad, there must be some reasonable assurance we will have the support of the American people and their elected representatives in Congress. . . .

(6) Finally, the commitment of U.S. forces to combat should be a last resort.

Americans are obligated to assess whether U.S. policy in Kosovo today meet the above tests.

In terms of implementation the Grenada intervention—as minor an issue as it may have been—and the Gulf War, which involved far greater geo-economic stakes than the Kosovo conflict, stand in stark contrast with the new Clinton military doctrine, which can be described as:

(1) Reliance on aircraft and missiles to rain destruction from thousands of feet and in some cases hundreds of miles in such far-flung parts of the globe as East Africa, Afghanistan and now Serbia. From an American perspective this use of air power is star-wars like, but from the perspective of targeted populations such as in Belgrade the effect bears more resemblance to the bombings of World War II.

(2) The declared renunciation of the use of ground troops amounts to the articulation that the United States intends to engage in Kosovo with one hand tied behind its back.

(3) The determination that murderous potentates should be held in check through the destruction of significant civilian as well as military targets, including electric utilities, water systems, political headquarters, TV stations and residencies of heads of states.

(4) The use of a defensive alliance for intervention in a civil war.

(5) Placing the prestige and might of the United States on the line through the commitment of air power while multi-lateralizing the decision-making and control in the NATO structure, which functions by consensus.

The lessons of history have been widely invoked both to justify and to decry our military intervention in Kosovo. Unfortunately history does not provide easy answers, either with regard to the meaning of contemporary events or to what actions should be taken in response to them.

For instance, in the wake of World War I historians and political scientists rightly concluded the European system had been too inflexible in 1914. A misapplication of this lesson, however, led a generation later to Munich. Too much rigidity precipitated the First World War; too little backbone encouraged Hitler's aggression in the Second.

World War II involved a conflagration between nation states; it also involved a conflagration within—the Holocaust—and challenged civilized society not to allow a replication of such inhumanity to man.

The background of both World Wars bears on American decision-making today.

Clearly, the onslaught against the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo that Milosevic has unleashed has Holocaust parallels. On the other hand, the ethnic cleansing the Serbs have undertaken also has analogs with what Croats, Bosnians and, to a much lesser extent, Kosovars have attempted in the region. Milosevic's barbarity would appear to lie somewhere between Ho Chi Minh's assault on South Vietnamese Catholics and Pol Pot's attempt to exterminate intellectuals.

The problem with equating Milosevic exclusively with Hitler, instead of recognizing him as a sui generis war criminal, is that it makes a negotiated settlement morally untenable and renders it impossible for the U.S. to consider anything less than unconditional victory. This is particularly dangerous when it is self-evident that a negotiated settlement is preferable to all sides over a protracted conflict. Hence, it is key to understand that at this point Kosovo is more a civil war with holocaustal elements than vice-versa. But if the war continues, a complicating factor for maintaining NATO unity in the face of Serbian atrocities will in all likelihood be the West's ability to stomach Kosovar counter-measures and the implications of ratcheting up air power. The line between a terrorist and a nationalist freedom fighter is narrow, as is the line between using force to stand up to atrocity and applying force in such a way that greater violence is precipitated.

Yet another lesson of history regards the effectiveness of air power and strategic bombing. As John Kenneth Galbraith, who led a team that assessed the impact of allied air power in World War II, has noted, bombing in coordination with the use of ground troops has generally proved effective, but strategic bombing of cities often causes populaces to rally to domestic leadership, no matter how malevolent.

Here it must be noted that air power is different from what it was earlier in the century. Our arsenal now includes nuclear weapons of enormous destructive power as well as so-called smart bombs and missiles that can strike with surgical accuracy, which greatly enhances our ability to limit danger to our armed forces and collateral damage to civilian areas.

The development of smart weapons, however, may have caused political leaders to be too tempted to use them without recognizing that the use of force anywhere at any time has ramifications which are not easily predictable and which not infrequently are counter-productive.

For instance, our goal in using force against Milosevic may be to undermine his political support, but it would appear that, to date, we have ensconced his political strength while weakening the democracy movement, which was profoundly pro-American in Serbia and damaging the lives and livelihoods of ordinary Serbs.

Much of the world is not enamored of America's ability to rain destruction from afar. We simply have no idea how deep and how long the effects of our air strikes and the targets we have chosen will last. What we do know is that Serbs point to a 14th century defeat as a rallying cry for their actions today. What we do know is that the Armenians believe that in 1919 they suffered the first holocaust of the century and Turkish embassies to this day are susceptible to terrorist attacks because of the atrocities of the now defunct Ottoman Empire.

In the background of the predicament we are in is failed diplomacy. Where Theodore Roosevelt invoked a doctrine of ''speak softly, but carry a big stick,'' this Administration has propounded a policy of threatening vigorously while refusing to make timely military deployments that might have averted conflict. We have been backed into using air power, not out of considerations of national interest but to ensure that the credibility of U.S. political leadership was kept in tact. We told Milosevic we would use it if he did not agree to our preferred negotiating plan and he in effect called our hand.

In the background was a peace agreement which had the doubtful support of one side and no support from the more powerful party.

While the Rambouillet accord might have met standards of American sensibility, it clearly proved untenable for the activist parties in the region. This fact should give pause to NATO, America in particular.

In this regard I have become increasingly Frostian in my geopolitics. Good fences sometimes make good, or at least better, neighbors. It would appear that, despite the multi-heritage example of Sarajevo, the people of the Balkans will have to learn to live apart without war before they can live together in peace.

A century and three-quarters ago, an American President, James Monroe, asserted a doctrine that carries his name which established that the United States would object to further European colonization in this hemisphere and give succor to independence movements in Latin America. Implicit in the Monroe Doctrine was the assumption, growing from the concerns of our first President, George Washington, a military man, that the United States should not become entangled in the quarrels of Europe.

With the exception of two World Wars in this century and a commitment made in the context of the Cold War of a defensive alliance, historical U.S. foreign policy has been governed by the precept that we would give umbrella protection to independence movements in the Americas but refrain from military intervention in the internal affairs of nation states on the continent. Our country was formed by dissidents and opportunity seekers reacting to the repression and civil wars in Europe. It now appears that our fore fathers better understood the Balkans and like European problems than the State Department does today.

At this point we are being asked to support NATO action for the sake of the viability and credibility of the alliance, rather than for the purposes for which the alliance was formed. We appear to be putting the alliance ahead of our objectives and allowing our mutual strategy to test the alliance itself, which it is doing. One poll has found that 95 percent of Greeks object to the NATO bombing of Yugoslavia and there are significant percentages, albeit smaller, opposed in every country of the alliance, including the United States.

A decade or so ago, I participated in a forum at the Library of Congress with former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger at which I asked him about an observation he made in one of his autobiographical works. Kissinger had written that between the 1968 election and the inauguration, he had sat down with President-elect Nixon and the two of them had decided to get the United States out of Vietnam. I asked why they had not just gone ahead and done that immediately upon taking office and Kissinger responded, ''Congressman, we meant we would get out with honor.'' Asked if that meant further escalation of troop numbers and bombing, Kissinger responded, ''Absolutely.''

It is my sense that NATO is in a similar position today with regard to Belgrade. For the honor of NATO, it appears that we are about to escalate the war. The question is whether we are not better off seeking the earliest possible settlement.

History is a source of lessons and perspectives, but issues of the moment must also be approached in a manner which calculates their future implications.

NATO's strategic rationale appears to have broken down on the issue of numbers. There are 19 states versus one with that one being much smaller than most of the 19. But another way of looking at this strategic conundrum is that 19 countries are allied against the forces of nationalism and sub-nationalism in a part of the world where historical and ethnic tensions provide little basis for compromise.

Nationalism led to dramatic changes in the world's map in the 19th century and has been repeatedly underestimated as a force in the 20th century. The question is will NATO, despite its might, find itself in the same position in the Balkans as the United States did in Vietnam and as the Soviet Union did in Afghanistan?

Returning to history, the first great chronicle of the Western World relates to a land mass adjoining the Balkans, ancient Greece. Thucydides wrote that early in the Peloponnesian Wars which pitted the quasi-democratic and enormously uplifting culture of ancient Athens against the more militaristic Sparta, the Athenian Assembly voted to send a naval fleet to conquer the neutral island of Melos. Several days later the decision was reconsidered and a faster ship was sent to overtake the fleet and call off the invasion.

Later in the war, however, the Athenian Assembly again decided to invade Melos and sent out a force which killed all the men and enslaved the women on the island. Thucydides' chronicles were intended to show how the world's most civilized city-state at the time had lost its way, and indeed from that point on Athens never again recovered its prior status.

An aspect of the bombing today is what targets are left in Serbia after so much damage has already been inflicted. Clearly at this point, the Serbs have lost virtually everything except the war, while the West has won nothing, particularly a peace.

A case can be made that whatever mistakes have been made to date, it is morally questionable to stand by and do nothing and an even greater mistake to pull the rug out from under the executive branch. The reason I cannot support America's continuing military role is that each of the choices for NATO in the future gets more untenable. There is the prospect of sending in troops with losses potentially equivalent to or greater than Vietnam. There is also the prospect of ratcheting up the air war. One can always strike again at military sites, but it appears that on the civilian side, Yugoslavia has already been bombed back to the 18th century.

Military historians counsel two principles when devising strategic doctrine: put on the shoes of opponents and do not back them hopelessly into a corner. In the case of Kosovo, we clearly have not put on the shoes of the Serbs and we have done everything to back Milosevic into a corner. We have made a martyr out of a murderer and allowed a war criminal to stand up to NATO, which includes Serbia's ancient enemy, Turkey. Milosevic's martyrdom increases with each degree of the suffering of his people.

Every society has an historian or philosopher who points out that the road to Hell is paved with good intentions. Despite the good intentions of the West, our policies appear to be counterproductive. Ratcheting up the war

could well signify a ratcheting-down of the moral high ground of NATO.

The prerequisite of policy must always be good intentions, but good intentions are insufficient grounds for action. Policy must match intentions with practical capacities to carry out defined objectives. Just War doctrines, after all, require that responses be proportional and effective. The only alternatives to a bombs only policy are the introduction of ground troops or the isolation of Serbia, the reliance on a humanitarian response to a humanitarian crisis. In either case the legal and moral imperative to indict Serb leadership for war crimes is overwhelming.

In the late 1960s Senator Aiken suggested we simply declare victory and get out of Vietnam. This prescription does not fit today's dilemma in the Balkans, but our first obligation should be to put in place a process of negotiations with the understanding that an imperfectly negotiated settlement may be the closest thing to victory that is likely to be possible without the loss of an incalculable number of innocents.

Escalating the war, on the other hand, puts U.S. interests at risk, in the Balkans and in other parts of the world. The earlier we reconsider the better.

The vote on this resolution and the others we will take today are necessitated by law. That law, the War Powers Resolution, may be unconstitutional and today's votes may serve as a basis for the courts to rule to this effect. Nonetheless, the War Powers Resolution is at this moment the law of the land. Ironically, we are finding, compliance may be more difficult for the legislative than, as has generally been perceived, for the executive branch because it forces congressional accountability for or against executive actions.

More importantly, the timing as well as the fact of consideration of these resolutions is awkward for the national interest because legislative decision-making is required by dates certain—i.e., within a prescribed period from the time troops are deployed in hostile circumstances.

The public interest may not be well served by such a review of executive action in such a timeframe, but it would be less well served if Congress avoided its legal and constitutional responsibilities. Hence, what in effect is a legislative/executive confrontation is legally, at this time, unavoidable, and as an individual Member of Congress I have no option except to take a stand. This stand is one of dissent to what I consider to be a foreign policy that lacks intellectual rigor and misserves the national interest.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is available on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has 10½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, last week in the Committee on International Relations we listened to Secretary of State Albright explain the administration's policy. I expressed my concerns to the Secretary about the difficulty of our objectives, especially given the limited means we are committing.

Looking back over time at our Nation's wars, and this is a war, we have been successful when we have had as an objective the destruction of a regime or when we have had clearly-defined territorial objectives such as expelling Iraq from Kuwait. In both of these scenarios, though, in order to accomplish our goals, we used rather massive force, including ground troops. But in Kosovo we are committing American resources and prestige and risking American lives, employing what must be called a very calibrated use of force in order to achieve a very complex objective: restructuring Kosovo's society.

Given that, my question to the Secretary was: What precedent for success in our history are we looking at? Are we practicing a theory here in Kosovo without an historical basis for success? The response from her: no cases were cited from the real world. Instead, we heard that the air war is working, when most observers do not believe it to be the case, and that we need to be patient. Well, patience is what we had in Vietnam.

Another thing that struck me while listening to the Secretary was that when there was a difficult question, when our strategy was being challenged, we'd hear that she'd rather be answering such difficult questions then answering why we're doing nothing. This response is backwards. The Secretary of State and the President she works for are responsible for the resources of the United States of America, and the lives of our servicemen. I'd rather have the Administration struggle with answering questions about the tragedy in Kosovo than struggle, and that is what it's doing, with explaining why we're committing America's treasure and risking American lives there. Yesterday, and throughout this crisis, I've heard too much struggling with our basic strategy.

So, faced with this decision today, I cannot sanction the current policy. Good intentions, and the tragedy in Kosovo is great, cannot mask flawed policy.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution that is before us today. It is not an easy vote for me, but it is one that I must cast. I do so because failure to support this resolution, by failing to vote for this resolution, we are in effect saying that what has happened over the last 30 days in the Balkans is okay; that the administration's failure to define what we are trying to accomplish or to change that definition practically on a day-to-day basis, that that activity is okay; that the administration's failure to define the military means that we should use to achieve that as-of-yet undefined objective is okay.

We started in the air. We then went to close-in air. Now we are bombing civilian infrastructure, and unfortunately, I think that we are going to be looking at the introduction of ground troops in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, absent some control of Congress, I am certain that this war will escalate to a point where we will no longer be dealing with $4 billion, $6 billion or $8 billion, but $10 billion, $20 billion, $30 billion, $40 billion or $50 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the pending resolution.

□ 1630

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY).

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

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and for his leadership on this important issue.

I do rise in support of the removal of the armed forces of the United States from the present hostilities against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Our forces should be removed from these hostilities because the vital national interests of the United States are not at stake in the Balkans.

I also want to state my great concern about the commencement of this war without the authorization of the Congress. The President does not have the constitutional authority unilaterally to decide that the United States will wage war on a sovereign Nation which has not attacked or threatened the United States. Absent truly exigent circumstances, the armed forces of the United States should be sent into conflict only when duly authorized by this Congress.

I would like to quote what James Wilson said in the debate over ratification of our constitution. He said, ''This new system will not hurry us into war. It is calculated to guard against it. It will not be in the power of a single man or a single body of men to involve us in such distress, for the important power of declaring war is vested in the legislature at large.'' That power should be exercised as intended by the Constitution and not usurped by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the removal of the Armed Forces of the United States from the present hostilities against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Our forces should be removed from these hostilities because the vital national interests of the United States are not at stake in the Balkans. Although our interests are not threatened by Yugoslavia, we are waging war against Yugoslavia in a conflict that is but the prelude to a protracted, costly, and dangerous entanglement in the Balkans.

Events to date sadly demonstrate that the Administration has not adequately assessed the consequences of its present policy and the costs of the course on which it has embarked. From the start, the policy has been ill-conceived. Stating the obvious, to persist in folly is not wisdom. The longer we follow the misguided and dangerous course set by the Administration, the greater the risk of serious harm to the real interests of the United States.

I also want to state my great concern about the commencement of this war without authorization by the Congress. As Commander-in-

Chief, the President does, in my view, have the inherent Constitutional authority to use military force to respond to attacks on United States territory and interests. The President does not, however, have the Constitutional authority unilaterally to decide that the United States will wage war on a sovereign nation which has not attacked or threatened the United States. Absent truly exigent circumstances, the Armed Forces of the United States should be sent into conflict only when duly authorized by the Congress. Otherwise, the power to declare war vested by the Constitution in the Congress is rendered meaningless.

In the debate over ratification of the Constitution, James Wilson summed up the meaning of the pertinent Constitutional provisions. Wilson said: This [new] system will not hurry us into war; it is calculated to guard against it. It will not be in the power of a single man, or a single body of men, to involve us in such distress; for the important power of declaring war is vested in the legislature at large; . . . from this circumstance we may draw a certain conclusion that nothing but our national interests can draw us into war.

The decision of a single man has taken the United States into this war against Yugoslavia. That decision was neither wise nor constitutional.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution today. In March the House passed a resolution that authorized the deployment of peacekeeping troops in Kosovo.

In that resolution we asked some very reasonable things of the President. We asked him to clarify the national security interests in Kosovo, to state the goal of the mission, to estimate its costs, to develop an exit strategy, and to report on the mission's impact on our ability elsewhere in the world to respond to threats to our national security. To date we have not received a satisfactory response on any of these. Yet, they remain precisely the questions we are dealing with today.

The mission in Kosovo is draining valuable military resources and limiting our ability to deal with rogue states elsewhere in the world. Kosovo detracts from our ability to be a superpower. I support this resolution because Kosovo is no more in our national interest than was Rwanda, Algeria, Congo, East Timor, or a host of other places.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JOHNSON), our distinguished colleague who spent almost 7 years as a prisoner of war in Vietnam.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the President when he pushed NATO to attack the sovereign Nation of Yugoslavia, and I oppose the deployment of ground troops in that region. The atrocities that Slobodan Milosevic has committed are heinous, but the President's decision to use military force was hastily decided and has been poorly implemented.

This war brings back strong and painful memories of another war, Vietnam, in which I was called to fight in and where I spent nearly 7 years as a prisoner of war. We might have succeeded in Vietnam except that what we did there we are doing here, we are allowing the politicians instead of the seasoned military officers to fight the war.

The President has never established a defined military objective. No one can tell us why we are there, what are we fighting for, and what is our end objective. Simply put, there is no defined mission. We must end this devastation. It is up to this Congress to save lives, not take them.

Mr. Speaker, I opposed the President when he pushed NATO to attack the sovereign nation of Yugoslavia. I also oppose the deployment of any U.S. ground troops in this region.

The atrocities that Slobodan Milosevic has committed are heinous. But the President's decision to use military force was hastily decided and has been poorly implemented.

This war brings back strong and painful memories of another war—Vietnam, which I was called to fight in and where I spent nearly 7 years of my life as a prisoner of war. There was a reason for fighting in Vietnam. It was to prevent the spread of communism. We might have succeeded, except that we did there, what we are doing here. We are allowing politicians instead of seasoned military officers, to fight the war.

The President has never established a defined military objective in Kosovo. No one can tell us why we are there, what we are fighting for, and what our end objective is. Simply put, there is no defined mission. We must end this devastation and save lives, not take them.

When waging war, the President should ask several questions—are you willing to win at any cost? Is this in America's best interest? Is there a goal, and is there a plan to achieve that goal? To all of these questions, the answer is a resounding no.

And what about NATO? We have seen over and over again, the President and his aides scrambling to defend NATO and NATO's credibility. What about our fighting men and women, who will be the ones to give their lives? Are their lives worth the credibility of NATO?

When I was flying bombing missions over North Vietnam, the politicians were picking my targets. Twenty-five years later, here we go again, we're in the same situation.

When our allied commander must submit every target to 18 other countries for permission to bomb, the only result is chaos. And what will we say if American soldiers start coming home in flag-draped coffins?

I have listened to the reasons the President, his administration, and Members of both houses of Congress have given for supporting this war.

But I keep asking the same question. Is this war worth the death of one single U.S. soldier? The answer keeps coming up no.

Let me tell you something, as an Air Force veteran, I can tell you that air power alone cannot win a war. And history confirms it.

Our pilots face many difficulties in the former Yogoslavia—difficult terrain, constant bad weather, and a quickly disappearing arsenal of our own weapons.

Furthermore, we are pulling ships and planes from other spots around the globe to fight this war. We are even stripping our aircraft for spare parts to keep our combat planes in the air.

And, today, the President called up 33,000 reservists to help meet our current shortfalls.

War is a serious undertaking. It should not be used for political reasons—ever. War is a last resort and should only be used to protect America, her citizens and our vital interests.

Despite the humanitarian atrocities in Kosovo, the loss of even one life for a cause that has yet to be articulated or defined for the people of the United States, is one too many.

Everyone of you must ask yourselves this question—would you send your own son or your own daughter to die to resolve a centuries old civil war between two peoples in a sovereign nation? Would you send them to die when you yourself could not answer the question "why"?

The plight of the refugees is tragic and America should help them. We are a country that can provide relief and direction, ease pain and suffering. We should provide help to end the refugee crisis.

I fought in a war where politicians were afraid to win because of the political fallout. That fear caused me to spend nearly 7 years of my life in a prisoner of war camp. I would fight again tomorrow for America's vital interests, but the answer in Kosovo is not to waste American lives.

The answer is—stop the bombing and provide relief to the refugees.

Please think about your vote today.

You know, there is a wall among the trees near the Lincoln Memorial that is engraved with the names of brave soldiers. Many, of whom, were my friends. Families go there to grieve and remember their fathers, their mothers, their sons and daughters, sisters and brothers.

Stop the bombing today. America does not need another wall.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support. We are all repelled by the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo, at the crimes against humanity. That is why we should take this crisis to the U.N. Security Council, instead of taking international law into our own hands and bombing without a declaration of war.

We should take the opportunity to go to the Russians, our brothers and sisters struggling to hold onto a democracy, and ask them to help negotiate peace. This would be true internationalism in search of peace, and a fitting beginning to a new millennium.

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

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the ranking member.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am frankly somewhat astounded by the debate today.

One, Members may differ with the President's goals. Do not continue to fabricate that there are no defined goals. The goals are simple: Stop Mr. Milosevic from murdering civilians. It

is not much more complicated than that.

We have just passed a proposal to pull the President's ability to engage ground forces. Half of the members on this side of the aisle in the last several weeks criticized the President for not leaving ground forces on the table. Now they are trying to put that in statute. Then we come here.

This is not academic discussion. If we pass this proposal, Mr. Milosevic will see a bright green light to continue the work of his role models, Hitler and Stalin. We can dream about lots of other options. The option before us is whether NATO, all 19 countries, continue on this campaign, or we sit back and wring our hands about victims of crime.

Mr. Milosevic knows his role models in history, Hitler and Stalin, did it bigger and better, but Mr. Milosevic has the same goal. He is not going to stop in Kosovo.

I do not know if this military program works. I do not know what works. I know that while we risk our young every day, we have been incredibly blessed, lucky, and well-trained that we have no casualties.

Do not pass this proposal. Do not send a message to a murderer that America will sit by as children are being murdered and people are chased from their homes. This is no place for academic discussions. We are here on a matter of life and death. Join with me, reject this proposal.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California on his resolution, and I am proud to be a cosponsor.

Mr. Speaker, we can go back even further than the several hundred years that these ethnic conflicts in Yugoslavia go for guidance here. We can go back 2,500 years to Sun Tzu, who said 2,500 years ago that victorious warriors win first and then go to war, while defeated warriors go to war first and then seek to win.

George Bush in Desert Storm understood it: First you prepare for victory, you win first, and then you go to war. Winston Churchill understood that in World War II: You prepare first, you win first, and then you defeat your enemy.

The philosophy, though, of the Clinton administration, which we must assert our responsibility and rectify as leaders of this country, is that defeated warriors go to war first and then seek to win; or perhaps, as the Secretary of State might put it in her eloquence, let us mix it up and then see what happens.

That is a recipe for disaster, it is irresponsible, and I urge the adoption of this important constitutional resolution.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Speaker, the moment we never had in Vietnam we now have. This is a remarkable moment for the history of our country and for the history of our Congress. We have the chance to say no. We have the chance to stop it before we get in too deep. We have a chance to say that we can do more good for those refugees who are at risk by helping them where they are now than by commencing a ground war.

Mr. Speaker, think about this, pause, reflect, I say to my colleagues. We do not have to do this war. We do not have to commit the United States to this war. How many of us wished we had some opportunity through some courage on the part of our colleagues who preceded us when Vietnam was the war!

Instead, we went in step-by-step, gradually, and then a number of us asked, how did we get here? Did no one have the courage to stand up and say, this is not a war in which we should be involved; this is a civil war in which we will be drawn deeper and deeper until, in that case, 58,000 Americans were dead?

This is the moment. We did not have it before. Seize this moment now.

As to the concern which motivated our entry into this war, I recognize the importance and the depth of feeling of compassion for those who have suffered so much in Kosovo and in Serbia. If we are concerned, we should show that concern by helping them where they are, in those refugee camps.

The alternative is a ground war, it is not simply bombing. The bombing will soon lead to a ground war. In that ground war, as United States and NATO troops go in, the Serbian forces will be resisting. It is the Albanian Kosovars who will be used as human shields, and what few are left who are not, will be driven out of Kosovo into the refugee camps so many of their brothers and sisters already populate. The choice really is a ground war or stopping the involvement now.

The President of the United States this day sent us a letter. He assures us that, indeed, he would ask for congressional support before introducing U.S. ground forces into Kosovo into a ''nonpermissive environment.'' That is not saying he will not introduce ground troops. He is saying he will not introduce them into a nonpermissive environment, without asking some members of Congress. He does not say he will ask for a vote.

By ''permissive environment,'' he might mean if we have bombed enough so that he believes it is no longer a nonpermissive environment, he will then put ground troops in. Secretary Albright and Secretary Cohen said on this same day, in their letter, that the President has authority to authorize the use of force in the national interest, without the approval of Congress.

So those are our choices: Shall we commence a ground war, at risk of the very people we are attempting to save, or shall we stop the war? This is our moment. Let us not let it pass.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this concurrent resolution. This resolution would direct the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces from their positions in connection with the present operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Adopting this resolution, Mr. Speaker, would certainly not be in America's best interest.

My opposition to this resolution is threefold. First, I understand that several of my colleagues oppose the use of United States Armed Forces in the Balkans. My colleagues refer to terms like mission creep and quagmire when discussing this region and our current involvement. I understand their reluctance for we all can remember Vietnam and the pain that our nation endured. In fact it was in part because of Korea and Vietnam that in 1973 Congress enacted the War Powers Resolution.

The War Powers Resolution is a remnant of the Vietnam War and of the cold war era. This resolution is not suited for the new-world situation in which U.S. involvement in hostilities may often be part of a multilateral effort. As examples of the post cold war era, we saw in the Persian Gulf War and now in Yugoslavia the need for greater flexibility. The time in which we now live the President must have the ability to make rapid decisions that may entail the use of force in new and varied ways.

Secondly, I object to this resolution because I am wary of beginning a constitutional struggle between the Office of the President and Congress when our troops are currently involved in an armed conflict. With military operations underway we cannot afford to send mixed signals about our commitment to the region. We cannot afford to risk that one American soldier, sailor, or airman would doubt that this nation fully supports their mission nor can we risk that Slobodan Milosevic or any future adversary doubts our resolve.

I am mindful that the Constitution, the lifeline of our Republic, grants Congress the power to declare war and to make all laws necessary for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the Government. However, I am also mindful that the War Powers Resolution as well as H. Con. Res 82 take from the President authority that the President has exercised for nearly 200 years. This resolution would remove from the President's arsenal flexibility and decisiveness in times of crisis.

If this resolution were to pass today, it would certainly begin a constitutional struggle. The constitutionality of the War Powers Act has been debated since 1973. As a concurrent resolution does not require presentation to the President for his signature, then it is almost certain that this legislative veto will trigger a quagmire of its own. In *INS* v. *Chadha,* the Supreme Court declared legislative vetoes to be unconstitutional.

American foreign policy cannot be micromanaged by this body nor dictated by the President, it instead requires a balance based on consultation and cooperation. If we are to establish NATO's goal for the Balkans, of a durable peace that prevents further repression and provides for democratic self-government for the Kosovar people, then this Body must work with the President.

Finally, I oppose this resolution because in my judgment America has an important interest in the stability of Europe. I would hope that if nothing else we would have learned that to

ignore European instability is in fact a mistake. Within this century we have twice ignored instability in Europe, counting on their political savvy and experience to restore peace. And twice within this century we have sent young men and women to restore the peace that Europeans could not capture.

Kosovo shows us that the Europeans by themselves are incapable of restoring this peace. However, we are fortunate that NATO provides us with a vehicle to restore peace to the Balkans. After fifty years of investment in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization we are finally enjoying the rewards of our collective investment.

Our commitment to NATO and to Kosovo is the best means to achieve a lasting peace. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and let us proceed together with the President and our NATO allies with the business of providing stability and peace in Europe.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution by Representative CAMPBELL to remove our troops from action in the Balkans. I'm opposed to applying American military force on behalf of Kosovo because our goals are unclear and the risks are too great without any fundamental strategic American interest.

Introduction of ground forces onto what we still recognize as Yugoslavian soil is a muddled policy. Are we joining a Kosovar war of liberation, or are we demanding the Yugoslavian national government delegate an arbitrary level of power to the provincial Kosovo government?

It is difficult to imagine Kosovars and the Serbs reconciling and co-existing peacefully and on equal terms after such massive intervention by the United States. Alternatively if Kosovo or a part of Kosovo were indeed to gain independence, we don't have any assurance that they wouldn't try to join a Greater Albania.

I am wary of the side we picked in this Yugoslavian civil war. I do feel the United States should be a friend to freedom movements throughout the world. But our support for the Kosovars doesn't seem to be rooted in any affinity of theirs for freedom or for the United States. The Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) has links to very suspect groups, among them heroin smugglers and Middle East terrorists. Should we be strengthening a group that is supported by Osama bin Laden and other very dangerous people who hate America?

A strengthened radical Muslim presence in Europe would pose a serious threat to the interests of the United States and our allies. A predominately Muslim country is not always hostile to American interests. Turkey is a longtime and solid ally of the United States. Several other predominately Muslim countries have also been friends of the United States. And that is precisely because they have rejected radical anti-Western elements. The KLA hasn't done that to my satisfaction.

For these reasons, I urge adoption of the Campbell resolution.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution is very clear. It is the United States Congress, which has the power to determine issues of war and peace and to decide whether our young men and women are asked to put their lives in harms way. It is the President who is the Commander and Chief of the military. It is the Congress who determines whether we use the military. I have heard today that some people think that the U.S. participation in Kosovo is unconstitutional. They are right—but the U.S. participation in Vietnam, Granada, Panama, and many other conflicts which took place without congressional authorization were also unconstitutional.

The time is now for this Congress, which represents the American people, to stop abrogating its Constitutional responsibility to the White House and start seriously addressing the issues of war and peace.

Frankly, I am extremely concerned about the process that has taken place today. On an issue of such enormous consequence, and at a time when Congress has a very inactive schedule, it is an outrage that we have only a few hours to discuss the issue of war, the expenditure of billions, and the potential loss of life of American military personnel—and I hope we rectify this situation in the coming days and weeks. This should not be the last debate on this issue.

Frankly, at a time when American pilots have been undertaking massive air attacks in Yugoslavia, when three members of the United States military are being held prisoner, and when we have spent billions of taxpayer dollars it is an outrage that the President of the United States has not come before the Congress to tell us and the nation what the goals of his policy are—and to ask this institution for support of those proposals.

It is an outrage that a terrible rule passed this afternoon on an almost totally partisan basis limiting the time of debate, limiting amendments and severely limiting the role that Congress should be playing in determining this country's course of action. We should not be acting in a partisan way on issues like this.

Mr. Speaker, my assessment of the situation at the present moment is that Mr. Milosevic is a war criminal, and that ethnic cleansing, mass murder, rape and the forced evacuation of hundreds of thousands of innocent people from their homes is unacceptable and cannot be ignored. Sadly, because Mr. Milosevic has negotiated agreements which he has then ignored, I have supported the NATO bombing of military targets—not civilian targets. I believe that the Serb military and police must be withdrawn from Kosovo, that the hundreds of thousands of people uprooted from their homes must be allowed to return, that Kosovo must be given some kind of self-rule, and that an international peace keeping force should be established to maintain order.

I believe that we must strive as hard as we possibly can to find an alternative between doing nothing, and allowing ethnic cleansing and mass murder to continue, and the continuation of a war which will certainly result in terrible destruction, large numbers of casualties, and the expenditure of great sums of money.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the United States must be as active as we possibly can in finding a road to peace. I believe that Germany and the United Nations have brought forth proposals which might be able to form the basis of a negotiated peace. I believe that Russia, a long time ally of Serbia, should be asked to play a more active role in the process and to supply troops for an international peace keeping force.

And finally, I believe that Congress must not duck its constitutional responsibilities—about developing a short and long policy with regard to Kosovo. Let's not just blame the President. That's too easy. Let us have the courage to seriously confront this issue.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am a hawk. I believe in a military so strong that we never have to use it. When we use our military might, it should be with clear objectives, after considering our national interests and the limits of our influence.

Mr. Speaker, imagine Serbia before we started bombing. The threat of ethnic cleansing clearly existed. About 2,000 innocent people had been killed and, more ominously, a 40,000-man force had been built up in Kosovo. Again, imagine the White House, seeing this threat, recalling the glory of the one-day wars in Granada and Panama, and without considering the ramifications, decides to wage war against Yugoslavia.

In the process, they demonize a man, Mr. Milosevic, who likely deserves the characterization, to give a face to the American people. But, Milosevic doesn't play by our rules. He doesn't turn on his anti-aircraft radar so we can detect and destroy it; He uses the bombing as cover to really carry out ethnic cleansing and suppress his domestic opposition.

The war drags on. The President and his advisors plead for patience all the while hoping that a cruel winter, without electricity and fuel-oil, will force guilty and innocent Serbians to their knees. And we continue to deplete what remains of our military capability.

We see the difficulty of integrating our moral sensibilities, the relations between nations, the use of military force and politics. The argument is made that our failure to support this sentimental adventure would undermine NATO and U.S. credibility. That is: Our enemies, petty dictators, and terrorists, will see our weakness and be tempted to exploit it. We have already made our weakness clear with indecisive leadership. Our enemies now see the limits of our strength which we have unwisely used. Their intelligence services have evaluated our actions. They will weigh their options. We must deter them from wrongful action by showing the strength our Constitutional system.

This body should constrain the fatuous thinking and unconsidered actions by the Executive Branch, requiring the President to unleash the dogs of war only in extremity and without artificial political constraints. When we make war it should be quick, efficient, brutal, and to be avoided at all costs by the Milosevics of this world. This still leaves the President with wide latitude as he deals with new threats. In fact, eliminating this drain on our resources, will dramatically strengthen our ability to face our enemies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). All time has expired.

Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 151, the concurrent resolution is considered as read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 139, nays 290, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

YEAS—139

Archer
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blunt
Bonilla
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Dickey
Doolittle
Duncan
English
Everett
Ewing
Foley
Fowler
Gallegly
Ganske
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kingston
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Leach
Lee
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mink
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rivers
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Terry
Thomas
Thune
Upton
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Wilson
Young (AK)

NAYS—290

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baird
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntosh
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Northup
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Aderholt
Slaughter
Tauzin
Wynn

□ 1703

Messrs. KLINK, WALSH, CONDIT, and GARY MILLER of California changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the concurrent resolution was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DECLARING STATE OF WAR BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND GOVERNMENT OF FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 151, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 44) declaring a state of war between the United States and the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of H.J. Res. 44 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 44

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That pursuant to section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(b)), and article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution, a state of war is declared to exist between the United States and the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 151, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 44.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, when our Committee on International Relations considered this measure yesterday, I was sorely tempted to vote for this resolution. This is not because I am eager for a fight and a war with Yugoslavia, because I am not. But I am eager for our Nation and the NATO alliance to avoid a humiliating defeat in the Balkans, which is where we could end up if we continue down the path of halfway measures.

After the successful conclusion of Operation Desert Storm, many of us were relieved that our Nation finally appeared to have learned from the bitter experiences in Vietnam how not to fight a war. But everything we have seen to date in Operation Allied Force suggests that the lessons of Desert Storm may have been forgotten and that we are at risk of repeating in the Balkans the very same mistakes we made in Vietnam.

We do have an interest in preventing ethnic cleansing, the forcible relocation of hundreds of thousands of refuges, and the destabilization of Albania, Macedonia, and the other countries in that region. I believe the President was right to try to stop President Milosevic from doing these things. And now that we are involved, I believe that we must do everything within our power to restore peace to the region. That is a coherent position.

But what is not coherent, however, is the in-between position that we have enough of a national interest to become involved in an armed conflict with President Milosevic but not enough of a national interest to do what is required to prevail in that conflict. That certainly is a prescription for defeat. And this is what brought us the agony of Vietnam. This is where we may end up in the Balkans if we forget the very first lesson of Vietnam, that we have no business getting into wars that we are not determined to win.

I oppose the Campbell joint resolution declaring war on Yugoslavia, because I do not think Congress should declare wars if we are not determined to prosecute them.

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

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution that is on the floor before us to declare the United States at war with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. In doing so, I want to make three points.

First of all, this is deadly serious business that we are talking about. This is not an academic discussion about when war should be declared, and what Congress's role is. As one who was a party to the suit that was sent to the Supreme Court under the leadership of Ron Dellums, I firmly believe in Congress's prerogative to declare war. So on that, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and I agree. But on the timing of this resolution and the substance of it I disagree.

I think that there is a tremendous need for us to do something to stop what is happening in the former Yugoslavia. I was there myself last week. I held those babies in my arms. I spoke to 95-year-old women who had walked across the woods and the mountains to get to the camps.

We do not need any reiteration of all of the suffering, and we all stipulate that we all want to end the suffering there. So this vote is not about how serious we are about ending the suffering.

The other point I want to make is that the United States is the greatest democracy in the world. People look to us as they aspire to be stronger democracies, especially the emerging democracies throughout the world. When they see us play games with something as serious as the declaration of war, it sends a very strange message to them.

Now, I know playing games is not the intent of the gentleman, but that is what the appearance of this is. Again, this is not an academic discussion. It is a debate about as serious as it gets in this body. And we have to be very clear about what our goals are. We have to be very clear about the timing of our actions. And we have to be very clear about what it means to other countries when they see us engage in a debate at a time when the prospect for war, sending ground troops, is not a lively one.

When I was in the Balkan region last week, and at the end of last week, talking to the representatives of NATO who were here for the 50th anniversary, there was no will for sending in ground troops. So there is no urgency to this resolution today. The timing is very bad. The lesson that we send to other democracies is very poor.

I urge my colleagues, for the sake of the seriousness of the war and the example that we set as a democracy, to vote ''no'' on the Campbell resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) a member of our committee.

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

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to applaud the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for having the courage to stand up in a very tumultuous time and risk I think some very, very nasty accusations about playing games and trying to create this academic discussion in the face of a very, very tumultuous time.

I congratulate him, because he understands that our duty as Congressmen of the United States of America is to uphold the law of the land and the law of the land, as passed in 1973, under the War Powers Act requires this kind of action.

Many of us believe this very strongly. It is not just an academic discussion. It is the law of the land. And we take that very seriously.

□ 1715

I opposed this mission from the getgo for three very important reasons. Number one, I believed that there were no national security interests at risk, there was no clear objective, and finally, there was no clearly delineated exit strategy. While I do believe that the intentions are good, to stop the ethnic cleansing or to try to stop the ethnic cleansing, to try to stop war crimes from occurring in that region of the world, the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

When the President stood up the day before the bombing campaign began, he said one of the goals was to stop Milosevic's ability to prosecute atrocities against the ethnic Albanians, and another goal was that every ethnic Albanian be allowed to return to their home. What we have seen since the bombing began painfully shows us that the objectives have not been met. In fact they have been exacerbated. While there were 1.6 million ethnic Albanians in Kosovo before the bombing, now there are somewhere between 500,000 and 700,000. Anywhere from 100,000 to 500,000 are missing and may be dead. We have not achieved these goals by any stretch of the imagination.

I have to look at this from a father's perspective. I have a son who is 17. If I am not comfortable sending my son over there with such an ill-defined mission, how could I be comfortable sending other sons and other daughters of my constituents into harm's way?

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise to speak out against House Joint Resolution 44 to declare war on Yugoslavia. The U.S. and our NATO allies do not consider themselves at war with Yugoslavia or its people. NATO is acting to deter unlawful violence in Kosovo that endangers the stability of the Balkans and threatens wider conflict in Europe.

Yesterday, the Committee on International Relations reported this resolution with a negative recommendation by a unanimous vote. This was a right vote. Today, I hope my colleagues will follow suit and vote unanimously against this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion a declaration of war is a very serious step. Congress has declared war in only five conflicts: the War of 1812; the war with Mexico in 1846; the war with Spain in 1898; and the first and Second World Wars. In the 20th century, without exception, presidential requests for a formal declaration of war by Congress have been on findings by the President that U.S. territory or sovereign rights had been attacked or threatened by foreign nations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, the votes today are extraordinarily difficult ones for each of us. The difficulty arises not because we are afraid to face up to these decisions, but because we must find a way to support freedom and democracy for the people of Kosovo and for the people of Serbia without writing a blank check for more fatal blunders on the part of the Clinton administration.

I do not agree with our bombing campaign, but the present ''bombing only'' policy appears to have been based on the tragic miscalculation by President Clinton that Milosevic would back down if we bombed Serbia for a week or maybe two. This seems to have been based on an even more fundamental miscalculation, that Milosevic cares more about Serbia than he does for Milosevic.

Former Governor George Allen of Virginia pointed out recently, and it was a very good and apt analogy when he said it was the equivalent of being in a football game and you say you are going to pass on every play. You have really given away your options. We did the same thing when we told Milosevic there would be no ground troops. That permitted him to anticipate and adjust to NATO moves. Another miscalculation.

Whatever happened to ''loose lips sink ships''? U.S. and NATO spokesmen—including the President, babble on and on. Such carelessness puts the lives of our servicemen at risk and its wrong.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say a couple of things. I have had more than a dozen hearings on the Baltics in my subcommittee, the International Operations and Human Rights Committee and in the Helsinki Commission. I chair them both. We have looked again

and again at the problems, first with Bosnia and Croatia and now with Kosovo and sought to understand and react prudently to mitigate the suffering. We've looked at the war crimes that have been committed by Slobodan Milosevic's military, police and hoods.

I find it incredible that the Clinton administration for the last 6 or more years has not sought to bring action against Slobodan Milosevic at the War Crimes Tribunal at the Hague. In public and private I have asked repeatedly, where is the dossier, the documents, the evidence, why are we not trying to bring this war criminal to trial. To my shock, I am informed that the administration has collected nothing on this tyrant. Thus, last year virtually every Member of this Chamber voted in favor of my resolution that petitioned, admonished, and encouraged the administration to begin the effort to bring Milosevic to justice.

Mr. Speaker, just let me also say that I do not believe voting for this declaration of war is the right thing to do. Our fight is not with the Serbian or Yugoslav people. It is with a cunning madman, and a very small number of very dedicated terrorists who surround him.

I ask for a ''no'' vote on the declaration of war.

Mr. Speaker, the votes today will be extraordinarily difficult ones for many Members of Congress. The difficulty arises not because we are afraid to face up to these decisions, but because we must find a way to support freedom and democracy for the people of Kosovo—and for the people of Serbia—without writing a blank check for more fatal blunders on the part of the Clinton Administration.

I don't agree with NATO's bombing campaign but the present ''bombing only'' policy appears to have been based on the tragic miscalculation, by President Clinton and his top advisors that Slobodan Milosevic would back down if we bombed Serbia for a week or so. This seems to have been based on an even more fundamental miscalculation—that Milosevic cares more about Serbia than he does about Milosevic.

Former Governor George Allen of Virginia has pointed out that to announce in advance that we would only use bombs and missiles and never use ground troops is the equivalent of announcing at the beginning of a football game that you intend to pass on every play. Even if we had no intention of using ground troops, it was yet another miscalculation to tell Milosevic about this plan. In war, you don't put your plan on CNN. In effect, we were telling him that we would punish the Serbian people for his regime's crimes, but that we would do nothing to prevent them. The campaign of murder, rape, and ethnic cleansing in Kosovo was already under way—there were over 150,000 displaced persons there even before Rambouillet, and as early as June of last year Physicians for Human Rights issued a report that found ''intensive, systematic destruction and ethnic cleansing''—but when we announced that we would bomb and do nothing else, Milosevic knew he could get away with intensifying this campaign, and that is exactly what he did.

So our options now are stark indeed:

We cannot turn the clock back to a time when it might have been possible to persuade the people of Kosovo to accept some kind of autonomy within Serbia. The mass rapes and mass murders, the beatings and tortures, the burning of villages and clearing of cities, have made this next to impossible. Nor can the Muslim population of Kosovo forget the Dayton agreement, in which the Clinton Administration brokered the dismemberment of Bosnia. Instead of arresting Milosevic on the spot and bringing him before the War Crimes Tribunal, our diplomats exchanged toasts and compliments with him and turned over half of Bosnia to his murderous cronies.

Speaking of the War Crimes Tribunal, I have tried for years, Mr. Speaker, to get this Administration to turn over all relevant evidence of Milosevic's responsibility for crimes against humanity. Last September, the House passed my resolution admonishing the Clinton Administration to work to bring Milosevic to justice at the Hague, sadly, nothing was done. This begs the question as to why the Clinton Administration has, in essence, given one of the most brutal dictators on the face of the earth defacto immunity from prosecution.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot simply continue the bombing forever, in the face of mounting collateral deaths and injuries of men, women, and children—Serbs, Montenegrins, and Kosovars alike—and mounting evidence that the campaign is not likely to succeed in bringing down the Milosevic regime or in bringing peace and freedom to Kosovo.

Nor can we simply consign the Kosovars to their fate. For the hundreds of thousands outside Kosovo, this would mean being refugees forever. For those still inside, it would mean more murders, more rapes, more tortures. for those of us who are lucky enough to live in safety and freedom, it would almost certainly mean in the last analysis that we stood by and watched yet another genocide.

So our only real choice is to come up with a plan—perhaps a new diplomatic initiative along the lines suggested by CURT WELDON of Pennsylvania.

Unfortunately, there is no sign that the Administration has such a plan or is trying very hard to come up with one. So Congress today must vote in a way that signals clear support for a just solution to the crisis in Kosovo, without inviting the Administration to blunder its way into further non-solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I will not vote for the declaration of war, because our fight is not with Yugoslavia—and our fight is most certainly not with the peoples whose governments might come in on the side of Yugoslavia in an all out war. Our fight is with Milosevic.

Mr. Speaker, I also will not vote for an absolute and inflexible legal requirement that all U.S. forces be removed from the zone of hostilities within 30 days, because this would be yet another gratuitous decision to tie our own hands in advance, without knowing what may happen in the next day or week or month. To announce in advance that we will withdraw our forces no matter what Milosevic does would be eerily reminiscent of President Clinton's decision to announce in advance that we would use only bombs and never ground troops. Its most likely effect would be to spur Milosevic on to further atrocities. It would also probably have the effect of depriving the humanitarian campaign on behalf of the refugees in Albania and Macedonia of the invaluable assistance of the U.S. military. I want to make clear that my criticisms of the Administration's military policy are not intended to reflect on the humanitarian campaign. All indications are that everyone involved—UNHCR, the non-governmental organizations, and government agencies emphatically including our armed forces—are doing the Lord's work and doing it as well as can be expected under the circumstances. My only suggestion is that we urgently need even more resources for this humanitarian campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the Goodling bill, which will require Congressional authorization for the use of ground troops.

At the beginning of the decade, President Bush persuasively made his case—to Congress and the American people—for ground troops for the Persian Gulf War.

Mr. Clinton, it seems to me, has no less of a responsibility to explain why he might be willing to risk the lives of Americans in a ground action.

It's bad enough the President initiated the misguided bombing with its disastrous consequences to Kosovar Albanians without prior Congressional approval. Any potential, new, escalation must include clear authorization from the Congress.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for bringing this issue to a head. We have cast and will cast momentous votes for today.

I think it is important that we clarify the record. We voted for the Goodling-Fowler bill. I should point out that distributed to virtually every Member of this House by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) was a statement in writing that should be part of the record, that says in part that this bill does not prevent the use of Apache helicopters and does not preclude the introduction of small numbers of personnel for intelligence or targeting functions.

I think that our adoption of that resolution, at least by this House, made sense. I know there are those who argue that Congress should not be involved in the momentous decision that lies ahead, but as I have said before, those who say that our enemies should tremble in fear because one man should be allowed to deploy 100,000 American soldiers, should be answered that Americans should tremble in fear if one man without congressional approval can deploy 100,000 men and women into battle.

I should point out that the President of the United States distributed to all Members of Congress today a letter stating, in part, that he would ask for congressional support before introducing U.S. ground forces into Kosovo, into a nonpermissive environment.

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) will be bringing up a matter later today. It has been interpreted by some as more than a mere authorization of the air campaign but

it states, and I interpret it, as providing only support for the air campaign and not a legal authorization for more.

I would hope that any wise court would look at the record today. A letter from the President saying he will not put in ground troops, a vote by this House not to put in ground troops. Under those circumstances, a wise court should interpret the Gejdenson resolution as nothing more than what it states.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), a member of our committee.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the timing and consideration of this bill because ultimately I think that this is a constitutional question. It is one that the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has raised because he knows what our Founding Fathers knew, and that is that when body bags come back from some foreign deployment, they do not stop within the Beltway. They go across America. They go to Charleston, South Carolina; they go to Knoxville, Tennessee; they go to Los Angeles, California.

It is for this reason, and it came up yesterday in debate, that in contrast to the English system, the Framers did not want the wealth and blood of the Nation committed by the decision of a single individual, which was just pointed out by my colleague from California.

So, one, I rise in support of the timing of this because of the constitutional element. I will ultimately vote ''no'' because of the foreign policy element of this decision.

Now, all of us would like to solve every ill in this world, but both individually and collectively it is something we do not have the resources to do, so for foreign policy to be effective, it has got to be limited and it has got to be focused. Part of focus means consistency. If we stay in Kosovo, we are going to create a very inconsistent foreign policy.

In fact, I do not even want to be part of a government that would ever signal to people around the world that if you are of European ancestry, we care about your human rights, but if you happen to be unlucky enough to be born in Africa, well, then, good luck. Because in January 3,000 people were killed in Sierra Leone, and if we are going to stay in Kosovo, we owe it to them to go to Sierra Leone. 300,000 people were killed in Angola since 1992. 500,000 people were killed in Rwanda in the genocide there. 1.9 million people have been killed in the south of Sudan basically over the last 15 years. It is important for our foreign policy to be effective that we be consistent and that, I think, is what this bill is all about.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this resolution because I believe that a declaration of war will only increase instability in the region and exacerbate the atrocities against ethnic Albanians. My support and prayers go out to the brave men and women of the United States Armed Forces who have been dispatched to Yugoslavia. We must take every measure to ensure their safe and expeditious return home.

While I will vote against this resolution, it is my belief that this debate and these votes should have been taken before a single bomb was dropped and before any U.S. troops were sent. Our inaction prior to military strikes abdicated our constitutional responsibility and, furthermore, prevented the voice of the people I represent, who are overwhelmingly against air strikes, from being heard. I agree that we have a moral imperative to bring an end to the horrific genocide and suffering in the Balkans. However, violent means have only and will only escalate the crisis.

As a person who strongly believes in the teachings and the work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. I profoundly subscribe to the principles of nonviolence. If peace is our objective, then I implore us to consider the words of Dr. King, not only on his birthday but each and every day of the year. In his last book, ''The Trumpet of Conscience,'' he wrote about United States policy in North Vietnam. He said, ''They are talking about peace as a distant goal, as an end we seek. But one day we must come to see that peace is not merely a distant goal we seek, but that it is a means by which we arrive at that goal; destructive means cannot bring about constructive ends.''

I am convinced that our best hope for peace and stability is the negotiation of an immediate cease-fire, and a strong belief that the United States and NATO must reach out to Russia, the United Nations, China and others to develop an internationally negotiated political settlement. Our actions must set an example for our young people that violence should never be an option. I ask for a ''no'' vote.

I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 44, which would declare a state of war between the United States and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. I oppose this resolution because I believe that a declaration of war, like the NATO air strikes, will only increase instability in the region and exacerbate the atrocities against ethnic Albanians.

At this very volatile time, my support and prayers go out to the brave men and women of the United States Armed Forces who have been dispatched to Yugoslavia. We must take every measure possible to bring an end to this crisis to ensure their safe and expeditious return home.

While I will vote against the declaration of war, I would like to commend my colleague from California, Congressman CAMPBELL, for introducing this resolution into the House of Representatives and bringing forward Congressional action on the US involvement in Kosovo. It is my belief that these debates should have taken place six weeks ago, before a single bomb was dropped and before any US troops were sent into the hostile situation in the Balkans.

By failing to vote on the air strikes before their commencement, and instead debating authorization now, when we are already heavily involved, the Administration is conducting a war without Congressional consent as required by the Constitution. A vote to authorize the President to conduct military air strikes at this juncture is nothing more than a rubber stamp from Congress for an action that has already begun. I my opinion, our inaction prior to military strikes abdicated our Constitutional responsibility and furthermore, prevented the voice of the people I represent, who are overwhelmingly against the air strikes, from being heard.

There are those who rise today in support of the Administration's action in order to end the genocide of the ethnic Albanians. I agree, in the strongest terms possible, that we have a moral imperative to intervene and to bring an end to the horrific suffering. However, whether air strikes, ground forces, or a declaration of war—these violent means as a method to bring peace and stability to the Balkans have only, and will only escalate the crisis.

As a person who strongly believes in the teachings and work of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., not just on his birthday, but throughout the year, I profoundly subscribe to the principles of nonviolence. Our policies, and our actions, must set an example for our young people that violence should never be an option. If peace is our objective, and I am certain that this is a goal upon which all in this chamber can agree, then I implore us to consider the words of Dr. King. In his last book, The Trumpet of Conscience, A Christmas Sermon on Peace, Dr. King discusses bombing in North Vietnam, and the rhetoric of peace that was connected to those war making acts.

He wrote, ''What is the problem? They are talking about peace as a distant goal, as an end we seek. But one day we must come to see that peace is not merely a distant goal we seek, but that it is a means by which we arrive at that goal. We must pursue peaceful ends through peaceful means. All of this is saying that, in the final analysis, means and ends must cohere because the end is pre-existent in the means and ultimately destructive means cannot bring about constructive ends.''

The Administration's policy and the NATO campaign in Kosovo to date have produced only counterproductive and destructive results: a mass exodus of over half a million ethnic Albanians, significant civilian deaths, an escalation of Milosevic's campaign of racial hatred and terror, and greater instability in the region. The results are just the opposite of what we want to achieve. Our goal is to prevent innocent people from being killed. In the name of saving Kosovars, we are destroying Kosovo.

At this juncture, I am convinced that our best hope for peace and stability in the region is the negotiation of an immediate cease fire. It is my strong belief that the United States and NATO must reach out to the United Nations, Russia China, and others to work together to develop a new, internationally negotiated peace agreement and to secure Serbian compliance to its terms. In order to end the suffering in the Balkans and to achieve long term stability, support of a diplomatic political settlement is the only action we can employ.

As we today speak of a policy to end genocide in the Balkans, I am also greatly disturbed to think of the people in many countries in Africa and all over the world, who have also suffered unthinkable atrocities, beyond our worst nightmare. As a result of ethnic conflict in Africa, over 150,000 have been killed in Burundi; 800,000 in Rwanda; and 1.5 million in Sudan. More than 200,000 Kurds have died in Iraq and Turkey, and hundreds of thousands in Burma, and over 1 million in Cambodia.

It is my hope that our nation can develop a foreign policy framework to address suffering and killing all over the world, without the use of force, ground troops, air strikes and other violent means.

I urge a "no" vote on the declaration of war.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues who express grave doubts about the conduct of Operation Allied Force in Yugoslavia. I am deeply troubled that the administration has started our country down the path of only bad options.

The debate before us illustrates the inability of the War Powers Resolution to effectively deal with post-Cold War realities. In many respects, the War Powers Resolution is a tool of a bygone era.

Mr. Speaker, there are numerous Kosovo type operations in this country's future. These operations require significant military resources and challenge our country's ability to meet the primary objective of our national security strategy. This is nothing new. Congress has not formally declared war since World War II, and yet American troops have since fought and died around the world in numerous hostilities. The framework of the War Powers Resolution has not allowed Congress a voice in the commitment of troops in these engagements.

While the United States may be the world's superpower, we cannot be the world's police force. Our military is simply not prepared to do so. If anything, this fumbling foreign policy escapade should alert this body that we must reflect upon the failings of the current process by which we are forced to deal with these types of military operations. In the near future Congress should work to improve the process by which we consider and debate these critical issues to our national security.

Today, I would ask my colleagues to pay close attention to this debate and to keep in mind the state of our military. Congress's role is not limited simply to the declaration of war. It is imperative that we look closely at where we commit our troops and ensure that our military is prepared for such commitments.

I do not believe that Kosovo is the kind of conflict where we should be committing our troops. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution to declare war.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

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

□ 1730

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Joint Resolution 44 which asks our colleagues for a declaration of war by the United States against the Government of the Republic of Yugoslavia. Although I have the greatest respect for the author of the resolution, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and certainly a dear friend, I must respectfully oppose the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, America's Founding Fathers, in their wisdom, deliberately drafted the Constitution to provide flexibility in the use of U.S. armed forces abroad. The President, as Commander in Chief, clearly has the authority to send our forces into potentially hostile situations without a declaration of war. In fact, since 1798 in our conflict with France over the Dominican Republic, to our air strikes in Afghanistan and Sudan against Bin Laden in 1998, CRS, the Congressional Research Service, has documented over 270 instances where America's Presidents have sent U.S. armed forces abroad into hostile situations. Over two centuries, and only five of these instances has the Congress actually declared war.

Mr. Speaker, a declaration of war is neither necessary nor appropriate for our actions in Kosovo and Serbia. Our Nation and NATO are not at war with Yugoslavia. We are there to stop a sociopathic criminal from committing genocide against his Albanian citizens, actions which threatened to destabilize the Balkan nations, as well as Europe. A unilateral U.S. declaration of war would irresponsibly escalate the conflict, undermine our alliance with our NATO partners, and needlessly jeopardize our already tense relations with Russia.

As a Vietnam veteran, Mr. Speaker, I have seen the violence of conflict, and it is not pretty. However, there are certain times when America must act because no other country can provide the leadership that we can. Almost a quarter of a million innocent people died from Milosevic's handiwork in Bosnia which Europe could not stop alone.

Mr. Speaker, the call to action has come again, and America cannot stand idly by and let this madman continue with his genocidal campaign in Kosovo. The stakes are too high to play political games. I strongly urge our colleagues to defeat the resolution before us and support our armed forces in Kosovo and Serbia that are fighting to protect against these evil forces that Milosevic provides.

Mr. Speaker, are we willing to allow China and Russia perhaps to take the lead in providing the leadership in global issues that affect all human beings on this planet? I dare not say, Mr. Speaker. Let America become the leader of the world as it should be in this issue affecting the Balkan area.

Mr. Speaker, there have been only five instances in our nation's history that formal declarations of war were made by the Congress—the War of 1812 against England; the War of 1846 against Mexico; the War of 1898 against Spain; World War I and World War II. Mr. Speaker, there are ample precedents set not only by this President but by previous administrations as well, whereby acts of war have been always been part and parcel of U.S. foreign policies and security interests—I believe the Founding Fathers of this nation purposely placed the critical issues of war as a political and public policy matter rightfully as a matter to be decided by both the Administration and the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the crisis in Yugoslavia is not an American issue—it is a serious matter taken collectively with our Nation Allies. It is a matter that history has given all those European countries to seriously consider the alternative, if Milosevic is allowed to continue his policy of ethnic cleansing and atrocities by murdering and killing well over 300,000 human beings in that country, and the displacement of some 3.5 million persons now as refugees because of Milosevic's military activities in Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, am I to believe now that the most powerful nation on this planet is telling the world that the crisis in Yugoslavia is not in our national interest? If so, then why did the Congress allow our President to intervene and for which he provided a negotiated settlement on the Bosnia matter? Our President did his best to negotiate a settlement with Milosevic, but Milosevic refused and the bombing of Milosevic's military resources and related facilities was the only option left—simply to prevent more reckless killings and atrocities committed by Milosevic and his military forces.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to tell the world and our NATO allies that we have now Americanized this conflict by officially declaring a war against Yugoslavia. Vote this resolution down.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, there is a tragic war in the Balkans. There is every indication that this war will expand, and so will the role of the United States. So far, there is no sign that absent the introduction of ground forces the intensified bombing campaign will cause President Milosevic and the Serbs to agree to the terms regarding Kosovo demanded by NATO. President Clinton has never asked Congress to declare war on Yugoslavia or Serbia. He has never even requested the type of resolution President Bush requested and was granted in advance of Desert Storm. At no time has he spelled out to the American public, let alone Congress, a consistent, coherent foreign policy that demonstrates a compelling United States' national security interest in waging war against the forces of the Government of Yugoslavia.

I am just as moved as anyone else by the atrocities reported in Kosovo, but I

am deeply troubled by our continued engagement. If the United States is going to engage in war, the commitment must be made to let the military use whatever force is necessary, which means paying whatever price in lives of American soldiers is required, and if the American national security interests are not great enough to justify such a price, then there should be no war.

To date, President Clinton has not demonstrated to my satisfaction America's national security interest in the Kosovo matter is great enough to justify paying such a price. For this reason I voted for the resolution offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) to withdraw American forces, and it is for this reason that I will not be a party to sending American men and women in uniform to die in an ill-conceived, ill-planned war and I am strongly against this resolution declaring war.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), a senior member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, it is important to put this resolution by my good friend from California in proper perspective.

When yesterday a deeply divided Committee on International Relations debated and then voted on this matter, we voted unanimously to reject this proposal.

As a matter of fact, my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), himself voted against his own resolution.

So I think it is sort of important to realize that what we are dealing with here is an academic legalistic exercise, the purpose of which is to take this issue to the courts. No one seriously believes, fortunately, that the United States should declare war against Yugoslavia.

Now there are many reasons why we should not do that. The first and perhaps the most important is that this is not an American engagement, this is a NATO engagement, and not one of the other of the 18 NATO countries has declared war on Yugoslavia. Were we to do so, this would be an Americanization of a war with all the negative consequence that implies. It would divide the alliance. It would indicate that we are determined, as we were during the Second World War, to move on until there is an unconditional surrender.

Those are not our goals. Our goals are limited, clearly defined and specific. We wish to see the 700,000 individuals who were driven out of Kosovo to return there in peace and security. That is the goal we seek. Therefore, a declaration of war under these circumstances would be ill-advised, ill-timed and clearly contrary to U.S. national interests.

I urge all of my colleagues to reject this resolution.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the United States has been blessed in so many ways, and not the least of which is the good sense that our Founding Fathers had in keeping us out of foreign entanglements and military engagements overseas. George Washington threatened us of these foreign entanglements that would drain our Treasury and drain our national will. So it has been written into our Constitution that we have such limitations on foreign commitments. We have not obviously declared war. This administration is unwilling to declare war even though it is clearly written into our Constitution that we need to come to Congress.

Now, realizing that during the Cold War we gave certain powers to the executive branch for the security of our country and during this four decades of Cold War we felt we needed to centralize this power and give the President a little more authority. The Cold War is over. What we are engaging in now is a process of evolving back. That is what we are doing this very moment, evolving back the power as defined in our Constitution, what our Founding Fathers wanted us to have, and that is the legislative branch must have a check and a balance to the decisions of the Federal branch when it comes to foreign commitments and military operations, and this is something that is part of our Constitution. We are demanding that the Constitution be followed. We are demanding that the War Powers Act, which of course came about after the Vietnam debacle, the War Powers Act is still part of our law, we demand that that part of the law be followed.

Obviously the President of the United States and those people in this body that agree with him do not believe that that part of our law and that part of our Constitution need to be followed. Well, this is what the debate is about. The American people should understand that no one person, as our Founding Fathers so demanded it in writing the Constitution, no one person, whether he be or she be the President of the United States or any other officeholder, should be able to get us into war and cause the deaths of tens of thousands of people. We all must be part of that process.

That is what our Constitution is about. That is why I support the efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) to ensure this type of congressional participation.

I rise in support of Mr. CAMPBELL's position on this resolution. Seriously, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. CAMPBELL for giving us this opportunity to discuss, through this declaration of war resolution, the legal ramifications of the Balkan conflict.

Here in the United States we have been blessed in so many ways, not the least of which was a product of the good sense of our founding fathers and mothers in keeping us out of foreign conflicts and entanglements.

George Washington warned of the threat of military alliances that would lead to foreign adventures that would drain our treasury and undermine our national will to meet the serious challenges to our own security. Written into our Constitution are limitations on power and hurdles that must be dealt with in order to engage the United States in war.

In World War One and the Second World War we followed those constitutional requirements. During that second great conflagration that engulfed this planet we permitted, for the safety of our country and the cause of peace, power to be centralized in the hands of the executive branch as never before. Then, during the decades of, what John Kennedy described as the twilight struggle, Congress acquiesced and endorsed the policy of a strong executive in order to deal with the dangers of the cold war.

My friends and colleagues, the cold war is over. What we do today is part of the process in evolving back to the constitutional system that served our country so well in the past. First and foremost we must reestablish the checks and balances in our federal system, checks and balances that apply to foreign and military commitments as well as domestic policy.

There is no doubt that the intent of our Constitution was to assure that one person, whatever his or her office, could not get our country into war. We had revolted against the power of a king to rule. Congress must declare war, or it is illegal for our President or military commanders to spend our treasure and spill the blood of our defenders in fighting a war.

Yes, during the cold war, which was an uncommon and unique period in our history, the legal necessity of such declarations of war was intentionally by consensus, overlooked. The frustrations of Korea and Vietnam, perhaps, call into question that strategy. And in the aftermath of Vietnam, the War Powers Act was enacted into law to prevent the very kind of questionable foreign military commitments that we debate today.

So in this debate let us as law makers admit that the law is not being followed and that it should be. The Constitutional requirements for conducting war have not been met because the majority of this Congress and more importantly, the President, are unwilling to declare war.

The legal requirements to an extended military operation, as mandated by the War Powers Act, have not been met, because this President and his allies, who represent a majority in this Congress, are not concerned with this law.

Mr. Speaker, the crisis of the cold war is over and the Constitution and the law, as reflected in the body of the Constitution and in the War Powers Act, should be obeyed. If it cannot be obeyed, it should be changed. As it stands, we are making a mockery of the law, which is evident when the Secretary of State testified at the International Relations Committee. Secretary Albright has to speak in convoluted rhetoric, twisting and turning like a semantical acrobat, in order to prevent a legal case that can be easily made against her. There is something wrong if a Secretary of State cannot speak directly to the congressional body which has the constitutional mandate of overseeing American foreign policy.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

We in Congress are in a position we should never be in. We are confronted with a failed law, failed leadership and a military action that failed to meet its initially stated objectives. Here we are, finally having a belated and truncated debate because of the War Powers Act, but a War Powers Act which is totally defective, and for 8 years I have been introducing legislation to fix the War Powers Act. We need to reclaim our constitutional authority and require prior authorization before Presidents engage in wars or warlike activities using our armed forces.

This is not unique to President Clinton. President Reagan, President Bush went down the same path, as did Presidents before them and as they will continue to do until this body has the guts to change the law and require that not a penny be spent except in defense of our country against immediate attack or armed forces overseas or as a citizen without the authority of Congress in a war or warlike action.

We have a failed congressional leadership. They were engaged in duck-and-cover and get everybody out of town before the bombing began. They did not allow us to have a debate. Even with the defective law, we could have had a vigorous debate here, and if we had that debate, I believe we could have had a better policy.

Did not everybody know that it rained in that area at this time of year? Did not our intelligence forces perhaps know that bombing and removal of the OSCE observers would lead to increased, accelerated ethnic cleansing and slaughter? And what if, what if Slobodan was not going to come to the bargaining table after a few bombs fell? Those questions were not asked by this Congress, and they were not answered by this administration, and now we are in the midst of a failed policy.

I believe we need to go forward from here with productive ideas, but this debate is not going to allow us to talk about productive ideas. What about the idea of a temporary cease-fire, working with our allies to try and force productive negotiations? What about having enough time to talk about this issue? It is not allowed under this absurd rule.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, probably in 8 years this is the first time I have agreed with the gentleman from Oregon, or second time.

If not, what? I am trying to do everything I can to keep us out of war. Then what? First of all, the Pentagon said not to bomb. Rambouillet, according to Kissinger and Larry Eagleburger, said it was to fail. NATO and General Clark told me, face to face, that NATO only wanted to bomb 1 day and quit. The President called Mr. Blair and the German Chancellor and forced this. So what? Halt the bombing, get our POWs back.

Seventy percent of the Russians support the overthrow of Yeltsin. That is why they are so squirrelly on us. Let us use Russian, let us Greek troops that are petrified about the Albanian expansion. Instead of having Russia be the problem, let us make them part of the solution. The President has got to look the President of Albania in the face and say we want the Mujaheddin and Hamas out of the KLA and deported within 30 days. He has got to do the same thing with Izetbegovic.

Kosovo can be cantonized, but it has got to go off the table, that resolve.

The gentleman from Oregon is right. There is not enough time to talk about a very important issue.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the truth is war is being waged and will continue to be waged without declaration. But such violence is neither redemptive nor justified in law or morality. Hope is redemptive, love is redemptive, peace is redemptive, but the violence of this conflict stirs our most primitive instincts. When we respond to such instincts, we enact the law of an eye for an eye, and we at last become blind and spend our remaining days groping to regain that light we had once enjoyed.

He only understands force, it is said of Mr. Milosevic, but we must understand more than force.

□ 1745

Otherwise, war is inescapable. We must make peace as inexorable as the instinct to breed, as inevitable as the sunrise, as predictable as the next day. With this vote, let us release ourselves from the logic of war and energize a consciousness of peace, peace through implied strength, peace through express diplomacy, peace through a belief that through nonviolent human interaction, we can still control our destiny.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF).

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have opposed U.S. military action in the Balkans without a declaration of war. There are no vital U.S. interests now being threatened anywhere in Europe, certainly not in the Balkans, worthy of a declaration of war. We really have no business there militarily. We should not be committing acts of war there. Yes, bombing is an act of war.

This whole military intervention is truly illegal under international law, and I urge a no vote on this resolution. We do need to revise our War Powers Act. Congress should reclaim the power to decide to take this Nation to war.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership, and I thank my colleague from California for giving us the opportunity to discuss a very important issue as to whether or not we stand for war or peace. I must acknowledge that the gentleman who proposed this particular resolution himself voted against it.

I grappled today and struggled with the vote on the Goodling amendment, because I have concern about whether or not we are forcing ourselves into war, or looking for ways of peace.

I want peace. I have indicated over and over again that we must have peace, but we must have peace with justice. We must have peace for the 37,000 refugees in Montenegro, the 260,000 refugees in Albania and the 120,000 in Macedonia. We must have peace for those in the former Yugoslavia.

So a declaration of war is not, I believe, in the best interests of the United States of America, the best interests of those refugees who are looking to go home, and the best interests of us trying to force or bring about a real peace.

We have only declared war in not more than 5 conflicts in our history: The War of 1812, the war with Mexico in 1846, the war with Spain in 1898, the First World War and the Second World War.

I do believe that the President's hands must not be tied. We must have the ability to send peacekeeping troops in. We must get back our POWs, two of whom are from the State of Texas, but all of them are Americans. We must not be weak in the eyes of the former Yugoslavia and Mr. Milosevic. We must stand united.

And to my friends who have mentioned where were we in Rwanda, and maybe where were we in Ireland, we must not stand while there is ethnic cleansing and killing and murdering in any part of the world.

I want to stand with an America that has principles. I want to stand with an America that believes in human life and human dignity, against the murder of children and women and raping.

I hope we will never stand by against a Rwanda. I hope no matter what race of people are in trouble, or being attacked or being murdered, we will stand up against it. Declaring war, however, is not the way that we should go.

I want us to have a sustained air strike, but, most of all, I want Mr. Milosevic to come to the peace table. I want a negotiated settlement. And for us to declare war today, we will not get that.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, I want to stand on behalf of the refugees returning to their home, I want peace to come in the Balkans, and I stand by the vote that I took some years ago for

the Dayton peace treaty. Yes, our troops are still in Bosnia, but there is peace there, there is a united peace there, the United Nations peacekeeping troops, and I do not see why America has to step away from providing for peace around the world.

We are not police officers, no, but we have a conscience and we believe in humanity and dignity.

So I would offer to my colleagues as they vote against this declaration to declare war, that we should vote for the sustained air strikes, we should make sure that we force or encourage or demand that those who have the power, including our NATO allies, come to the peace table, and that we remember that the greatest of all those that we can give to the world is love and charity. I hope that we will stand for what is right.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think this is unprecedented. Maybe some of you who are more historically informed and more constitutionally informed can correct me, but I think this is the first time in the history of this Congress where Congress has initiated a declaration of war.

Generally, as I understand it, the President comes to the Congress when he finds situations such as required and requests that Congress declare war. Conceivably I am erroneous on that, but I do not recall. Maybe some of my more learned colleagues can recall a time when the Congress initiated a declaration of war.

I think this is ill-conceived. A declaration of war I think would be divisive within NATO. It would put restrictions on the front line states. It would make them unable to assist us in the efforts they are giving us in providing landing operations and staging operations in those countries, and I think it would be a very dangerous precedent for this Congress to tell the commander-in-chief that he must go to war if he does not want to. I know that is not necessarily the case as we see it today, but I think to start this in this Congress at this time, with the Congress initiating a declaration of war, is ill-advised, and I urge Members to vote ''no''.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I oppose a declaration of war, having just returned from the Balkans more firmly convinced, no ground troops.

I know you cannot see it, but this is a picture of a young Apache pilot in the Balkans who graduated with my son. He said, ''No ground troops. The cost in human life would be too high.''

We need a negotiated settlement, not a declaration of war. I am working to provide momentum, leverage and direction to the administration to settle this conflict.

My colleagues on the other side are dissatisfied because of a lack of leadership by the administration. We are dissatisfied with a lack of leadership and failed foreign policy.

Do not declare war. Do not lose lives of our military. Focus our attention on rebuilding the military, helping the refugees, and negotiating a settlement that returns the refugees to their homes in safety and brings our POWs and our troops home.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this particular proposal and to urge my colleagues to keep our eyes open.

This conflict today, we may not like the cards we are dealt, but they are dealt. We may not like how we got there, but we are there. There are millions of people in Europe whose lives are at stake, whose happiness and soundness are at stake, and, if we walk away, if we walk away, we will have done the wrong thing, and you will know that today and you will know that 20 years from now.

Many of us can debate how we got here, how we should do it the next time. I think those are good debates. I think we should discuss what should happen the next time, because there will be a next time.

For those of you who did not have the opportunity today to read the papers, look at what is happening in Indonesia. We are about to send what they call ''police advisers'' from the United Nations to Indonesia. It is happening elsewhere across this globe, and I do think we need to discuss that.

At the same time, we do not have the luxury to always deal the cards. We are sitting here today, we have to deal with it today. We have to support the efforts to bring those people home, to bring our men and women home, and to do the right thing by humanity, today, tomorrow, and every time we have to do it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I am against this declaration of war, as I am sure practically everyone in this Chamber is.

The origin of many European parliaments was when the leaders of a country got together, formed an organized body and reined in the king who was engaged on various adventures. That is, in a sense, what we are trying to do here today.

If the Europeans have a European problem, they ought to be making the decision and they ought to be sending their own ground troops.

Russia should be deeply involved. It has not been included. There is only one other superpower in the world; that is Russia. They should be tied to the West, and they should be helpful in this particular matter. If the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] is to keep Europe at peace, then Russia should be a member.

The Serbs cannot move north, that is NATO territory; and if they move south toward Greece, that is NATO territory, and that would be one sovereign nation invading another, and that would be appropriate for NATO to take action and defend Greece.

I include for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, portions of the speech Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger made back in 1984. He was an outstanding Secretary and a very wise man. He developed six major criteria which should be met when we use U.S. combat forces abroad.

THE USES OF MILITARY POWER

Thank you for inviting me to be here today with the members of the National Press Club, a group most important to our national security. I say that because a major point I intend to make in my remarks today is that the single most critical element of a successful democracy is a strong consensus of support and agreement for our basic purposes. Policies formed without a clear understanding of what we hope to achieve will never work. And you help to build that understanding among our citizens.

Of all the many policies our citizens deserve—and need—to understand, none is so important as those related to our topic today—the uses of military power. Deterrence will work only if the Soviets understand our firm commitment to keeping the peace . . . and only from a well-informed public can we expect to have that national will and commitment.

So today, I want to discuss with you perhaps that most important question concerning keeping the peace. Under what circumstances, and by what means, does a great democracy such as our reach that painful decision that the use of military force is necessary to protect our interests or to carry out our national policy?

National power has many components, some tangible—like economic wealth, technical pre-eminence. Other components are intangible—such as moral force, or strong national will. Military forces, when they are strong, and ready and modern, are a credible—and tangible—addition to a nation's power. When both the intangible national will and those forces are forced into one instrument, national power becomes effective.

In today's world, the line between peace and war is less clearly drawn than at any time in our history. When George Washington, in his farewell address, warned us, as a new democracy, to avoid foreign entanglements, Europe then Lay 2-3 months by sea over the horizon. The United States was protected by the width of the oceans. Now in this nuclear age, we measure time in minutes rather than months.

Aware of the consequences of any misstep, yet convinced of the precious worth of the

freedom we enjoy, we seek to avoid conflict, whiled maintaining strong defenses. Our policy has always been to work hard for peace, but to be prepared if war comes. Yet, so blurred have the lines become between open conflict and half-hidden hostile acts that we cannot confidently predict where, or when, or how, or from what direction aggression may arrive. We must be prepared, at any moment, to meet threats ranging in intensity from isolated terrorist acts, to guerrilla action, to full-scale military confrontation.

Alexander Hamilton, writing in the Federalist Papers, said that ''It is impossible to foresee or define the extent and variety of national exigencies, or the correspondent extent and variety of the means which may be necessary to satisfy them.'' If it was true then, how much more true it is today, when we must remain ready to consider the means to meet such serious indirect challenges to the peace as proxy wars and individual terrorist action. And how much more important is it now, considering the consequences of failing to deter conflict at the lowest level possible. While the use of military force to defend territory has never been questioned when a democracy has been attacked and its very survival threatened, most democracies have rejected the unilateral aggressive use of force to invade, conquer or subjugate other nations. The extent to which the use of force is acceptable remains unresolved for the host of other situations which fall between these extremes of defensive and aggressive use of force.

We find ourselves, then, face to face with a modern paradox: The most likely challenge to the peace—the gray area conflicts—are precisely the most difficult challenges to which a democracy must respond. Yet, while the source and nature of today's challenges are uncertain, our response must be clear and understandable. Unless we are certain that force is essential, we run the risk of inadequate national will to apply the resources needed.

Because we face a spectrum of threats—from covert aggression, terrorism, and subversion, to overt intimidation, to use of brute force—choosing the appropriate level of our response is difficult. Flexible response does not mean just any response is appropriate. But once a decision to employ some degree of force has been made, and the purpose clarified, our government must have the clear mandate to carry out, and continue to carry out, that decision until the purpose has been achieved. That, to, has been difficult to accomplish.

The issue of which branch of government has authority to define that mandate and make decisions on using force is now being strongly contended. Beginning in the 1970s Congress demanded, and assumed, a far more active role in the making of foreign policy and in the decisionmaking process for the employment of military forces abroad than had been thought appropriate and practical before. As a result, the centrality of decision-making authority in the executive branch has been compromised by the legislative branch to an extent that actively interferes with that process. At the same time, there has not been a corresponding acceptance of responsibility by Congress for the outcome of decisions concerning the employment of military forces.

Yet the outcome of decisions on whether—and when—and to what degress—to use combat forces abroad has never been more important than it is today. While we do not seek to deter or settle all the world's conflicts, we must recognize that, as a major power, our responsibilities and interests are now of such scope that there are few troubled areas we can afford to ignore. So we must be prepared to deal with a range of possibilities, a spectrum of crises, from local insurgency to global conflict. We prefer, of course, to limit any conflict in its early stages, to contain and control it—but to do that our military forces must be deployed in a timely manner, and be fully supported and prepared before they are engaged, because many of those difficult decisions must be made extremely quickly.

Some on the national scene think they can always avoid making tough decisions. Some reject entirely the question of whether any force can ever be used abroad. They want to avoid grappling with a complex issue because, despite clever rhetoric disguising their purpose, these people are in fact advocating a return to post-World War I isolationism. While they may maintain in principle that military force has a role in foreign policy, they are never willing to name the circumstance or the place where it would apply.

On the other side, some theorists argue that military force can be brought to bear in any crisis. Some of these proponents of force are eager to advocate its use even in limited amounts simply because they believe that if there are American forces of any size present they will somehow solve the problem.

Neither of these two extremes offers us any lasting or satisfactory solutions. The first—undue reserve—would lead us ultimately to withdraw from international events that require free nations to defend their interests from the aggressive use of force. We would be abdicating our responsibilities as the leader of the free world—responsibilities more or less thrust upon us in the aftermath of World War II—a war incidentially that isolationism did nothing to deter. These are responsibilities we must fulfill unless we desire the Soviet Union to keep expanding its influence unchecked throughout the world. In an international system based on mutual interdependence among nations, and alliances between friends, stark isolationism quickly would lead to a far more dangerous situation for the United States: we would be without allies and faced by many hostile or indifferent nations.

The second alternative—employing our forces almost indiscriminately and as a regular and customary part of our diplomatic efforts—would surely plunge us head-long into the sort of domestic turmoil we experienced during the Vietnam war, without accomplishing the goal for which we committed our forces. Such policies might very well tear at the fabric of our socieity, endangering the single most critical element of a successful democracy: a strong consensus of support and agreement for our basic purposes.

Policies formed without a clear understanding of what we hope to achieve would also earn us the scorn of our troops, who would have an understandable opposition to being used—in every sense of the word—casually and without intent to support them fully. Ultimately this course would reduce their morale and their effectiveness for engagements we must win. And if the military were to distrust its civilian leadership, recruitment would fall off and I fear an end to the all-volunteer system would be upon us, requiring a return to a draft, sowing the seeds of riot and discontent that so wracked the country in the '60s.

We have now restored high morale and pride in the uniform throughout the services. The all-volunteer system is working spectacularly well. Are we willing to forfeit what we have fought so hard to regain?

In maintaining our progress in strengthening America's military deterrent, we face difficult challenges. For we have entered an era where the dividing lines between peace and war are less clearly drawn, the identity of the foe is much less clear. In World Wars I and II, we not only knew who our enemies were, but we shared a clear sense of why the principles espoused by our enemies were unworthy.

Since these two wars threatened our very survival as a free nation and the survival of our allies, they were total wars, involving every aspect of our society. All our means of production, all our resources were devoted to winning. Our policies had the unqualified support of the great majority of our people. Indeed, World Wars I and II ended with the unconditional surrender of our enemies . . . the only acceptable ending when the alternative was the loss of our freedom.

But in the aftermath of the Second World War, we encountered a more subtle form of warfare—warfare in which, more often than not, the face of the enemy was masked. Territorial expansionism could be carried out indirectly by proxy powers, using surrogate forces aided and advised from afar. Some conflicts occurred under the name of ''national liberation,'' but far more frequently ideology or religion provided the spark to the tinder.

Our adversaries can also take advantage of our open society, and our freedom of speech and opinion to use alarming rhetoric and disinformation to divide and disrupt our unity of purpose. While they would never dare to allow such freedoms to their own people, they are quick to exploit ours by conducting simultaneous military and propaganda campaigns to achieve their ends.

They realize that if they can divide our national will at home, it will not be necessary to defeat our forces abroad. So by presenting issues in bellicose terms, they aim to intimidate western leaders and citizens, encouraging us to adopt conciliatory positions to their advantage. Meanwhile they remain sheltered from the force of public opinion in their countries, because public opinion there is simply prohibited and does not exist.

Our freedom presents both a challenge and an opportunity. It is true that until democratic nations have the support of the people, they are inevitably at a disadvantage in a conflict. But when they do have that support they cannot be defeated. For democracies have the power to send a compelling message to friend and fore alike by the vote of their citizens. And the American people have sent such a signal by re-electing a strong chief executive. They know that President Reagan is willing to accept the responsibility for his actions and is able to lead us through these complex times by insisting that we regain both our military and our economic strength.

In today's world where minutes count, such decisive leadership is more important than ever before. Regardless of whether conflicts are limited, or threats are ill-defined, we must be capable of quickly determining that the threats and conflicts either do or do not affect the vital interests of the United States and our allies . . . and then responding appropriately.

Those threats may not entail an immediate, direct attack on our territory, and our response may not necessarily require the immediate or direct defense of our homeland. But when our vital national interests and those of our allies are at stake, we cannot ignore our safety, or forsake our allies.

At the same time, recent history has proven that we cannot assume unilaterally the role of the world's defender. We have learned that there are limits to how much of our spirit and blood and treasure we can afford to forfeit in meeting our responsibility to keep peace and freedom. So while we may and should offer substantial amounts of economic and military assistance to our allies in their time of need, and help them maintain forces to deter attacks against them—

usually we cannot substitute our troops or our will for theirs.

We should only engage our troops if we must do so as a matter of our own vital national interest. We cannot assume for other sovereign nations the responsibility to defend their territory—without their strong invitation—when our own freedom is not threatened.

On the other hand, there have been recent cases where the United States has seen the need to join forces with other nations to try to preserve the peace by helping with negotiations, and by separating warring parties, and thus enabling those warring nations to withdraw from hostilities safely. In the Middle East, which has been torn by conflict for millennia, we have sent our troops in recent years both to the Sinai and to Lebanon, for just such a peacekeeping mission. But we did not configure or equip those forces for combat—they were armed only for their self-defense. Their mission required them to be—and to be recognized as—peacekeepers. We knew that if conditions deteriorated so they were in danger, or if because of the actions of the warring nations, their peace keeping mission could not be realized, then it would be necessary either to add sufficiently to the number and arms of our troops—in short to equip them for combat, or to withdraw them. And so in Lebanon, when we faced just such a choice, because the warring nations did not enter into withdrawal or peace agreements, the President properly withdrew forces equipped only for peacekeeping.

In those cases where our national interests require us to commit combat forces, we must never let there be doubt of our resolution. When it is necessary for our troops to be committed to combat, we must commit them, in sufficient numbers and we must support them, as effectively and resolutely as our strength permits. When we commit our troops to combat we must do so with the sole object of winning.

Once it is clear our troops are required, because our vital interests are at stake, then we must have the firm national resolve to commit every ounce of strength necessary to win the fight to achieve our objectives. In Grenada we did just that.

Just as clearly, there are other situations where United States combat forces should not be used. I believe the postwar period has taught us several lessons, and from them I have developed six major tests to be applied when we are weighing the use of U.S. combat forces abroad. Let me now share them with you:

(1) First, the United States should not commit forces to combat overseas unless the particular engagement or occasion is deemed vital to our national interest or that of our allies. That emphatically does not mean that we should declare beforehand, as we did with Korea in 1950, that a particular area is outside our strategic perimeter.

(2) Second, if we decide it is necessary to put combat troops into a given situation, we should do so wholeheartedly, and with the clear intention of winning. If we are unwilling to commit the forces or resources necessary to achieve our objectives, we should not commit them at all. Of course if the particular situation requires only limited force to win our objectives, then we should not hesitate to commit forces sized accordingly. When Hitler broke treaties and remilitarized the Rhineland, small combat forces then could perhaps have prevented the Holocaust of World War II.

(3) Third, if we do decide to commit forces to combat overseas, we should have clearly defined political and military objectives. And we should know precisely how our forces can accomplish those clearly defined objectives. And we should have and send the forces needed to do just that. As Clausewitz wrote, ''no one starts a war—or rather, no one in his senses ought to do so—without first being clear in his mind what he intends to achieve by that war, and how he intends to conduct it.''

War may be different than in Clausewitz's time, but the need for well-defined objectives and a consistent strategy is still essential. If we determine that a combat mission has become necessary for our vital national interests, then we must send forces capable to do the job—and not assign a combat mission to a force configured for peacekeeping.

(4) Fourth, the relationship between our objectives and the forces we have committed—their size, composition and disposition—must be continually reassessed and adjusted if necessary. Conditions and objectives invariably change during the course of a conflict. When they do change, then so must our combat requirements. We must continuously keep as a beacon light before us the basic questions: ''Is this conflict in our national interest?'' ''Does our national interest require us to fight, to use force of arms?'' If the answers are ''Yes'', then we must win. If the answers are ''No'', then we should not be in combat.

(5) Fifth, before the U.S. commits combat forces abroad, there must be some reasonable assurance we will have the support of the American people and their elected Representatives in Congress. This support cannot be achieved unless we are candid in making clear the threats we face: The support cannot be sustained without continuing and close consultation. We cannot fight a battle with the Congress at home while asking our troops to win a war overseas or, as in the case of Vietnam, in effect asking our troops not to win, but just to be there.

(6) Finally, the commitment of U.S. Forces to combat should be a last resort.

I believe that these tests can be helpful in deciding whether or not we should commit our troops to combat in the months and years ahead. The point we must all keep uppermost in our minds is that if we ever decide to commit forces to combat, we must support those forces to the fullest extent of our national will for as long as it takes to win. So we must have in mind objectives that are clearly defined and understood and supported by the widest possible number of our citizens. And those objectives must be vital to our survival as a free nation and to the fulfillment of our responsibilities as a world power. We must also be farsighted enough to sense when immediate and strong reactions to apparently small events can prevent lion-like responses that may be required later. We must never forget those isolationists in Europe who shrugged that ''Danzig is not worth a war'', and ''Why should we fight to keep the Rhineland demilitarized?''

These tests I have just mentioned have been phrased negatively for a purpose—they are intended to sound a note of caution—caution that we must observe prior to committing forces to combat overseas. When we ask our military forces to risk their very lives in such situations, a note of caution is not only prudent, it is morally required.

In many situations we may apply these tests and conclude that a combatant role is not appropriate. Yet no one should interpret what I am saying here today as an abdication of America's responsibilities—either to its own citizens or to its allies. Nor should these remarks be misread as a signal that this country, or this administration, is unwilling to commit forces to combat overseas.

We have demonstrated in the past that, when our vital interests or those of our allies are threatened, we are ready to use force, and use it decisively, to protect those interests. Let no one entertain any illusions—if our vital interests are involved, we are prepared to fight. And we are resolved that if we must fight, we must win.

So, while these tests are drawn from lessons we have learned from the past, they also can—and should—be applied to the future. For example, the problems confronting us in Central America today are difficult. The possibility of more extensive Soviet and Soviet-proxy penetration into this hemisphere in months ahead is something we should recognize. If this happens we will clearly need more economic and military assistance and training to help those who want democracy.

The President will not allow our military forces to creep—or be drawn gradually—into a combat role in Central America or any other place in the world. And indeed our policy is designed to prevent the need for direct American involvement. This means we will need sustained congressional support to back and give confidence to our friends in the region.

I believe that the tests I have enunciated here today can, if applied carefully, avoid the danger of this gradualist incremental approach which almost always means the use of insufficient force. These tests can help us to avoid being drawn inexorably into an endless morass, where it is not vital to our national interest to fight.

But policies and principles such as these require decisive leadership in both the executive and legislative branches of government—and they also require strong and sustained public support. Most of all, these policies require national unity of purpose. I believe the United States now possesses the policies and leadership to gain that public support and unity. And I believe that the future will show we have the strength of character to protect peace with freedom.

In summary, we should all remember these are the policies—indeed the only policies—that can preserve for ourselves, our friends, and our posterity, peace with freedom.

I believe we can continue to deter the Soviet Union and other potential adversaries from pursuing their designs around the world. We can enable our friends in Central America to defeat aggression and gain the breathing room to nurture democratic reforms. We can meet the challenge posed by the unfolding complexity of the 1980's.

We will then be poised to begin the last decade of this century amid a peace tempered by realism, and secured by firmness and strength. And it will be a peace that will enable all of us—ourselves at home, and our friends abroad—to achieve a quality of life, both spiritually and materially, far higher than man has even dared to dream.

In brief, there is no vital United States interest in what is going on in Kosovo. What is going on in Kosovo is tragic, but it is not at the level of defending vital interests of the United States by making war in the area. Kosovo should receive humanitarian aid.

I think all of us abhor Milosevic. He should be tried as an international war criminal, and, if convicted, a bounty ought to be offered for him.

The Balkans are a quagmire of ethnic and religious rivalries that we cannot solve alone. Let us remember Dien Bien Phu, when many of his key advisers pressured President Eisenhower to send our armed forces to bail out the French. He was a wise President; he turned them down. There was not vital interest of the United States at stake.

Eisenhower had 800 advisers in Vietnam. He told them not to get involved in the battle—simply train the soldiers. He was a wise President.

John F. Kennedy was not a wise President when it came to Vietnam. He put 16,000 people there and told them to get engaged and shoot. Lyndon Baines Johnson was not a wise President when it came to foreign affairs. LBJ upped the ante to 550,000 American troops. They were heavily engaged. We lost that war. There was no vital interest for our country.

During the Bush administration the United States put an arms embargo on sending arms to Bosnia. That was the wrong decision. If the Bosnians had weapons, they could have protected their country and its people. The Albanians should have arms to protect their people.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, of the many books that have been written about the failed American policy in Vietnam I think one of the most damning was a book called ''Dereliction of Duty.'' It talks about how the generals and admirals who comprised the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the early Vietnam years knew that President Johnson was intentionally lying to the American public about his plan, or lack of a plan, in Vietnam, that there was no plan to win the war, there was no plan as to how to win the war, and yet not one of these people who claimed to be looking out for their troops was willing to step forward and risk their career by saying, ''Mr. President, do it right, or do not do it at all. If you are not willing to do it right, I will resign my commission and go out and tell the American people the truth about what is going on.''

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is doing the exact same thing. This Congress is criticizing the American President for the way he is handling this conflict. Yet the American President says he will not introduce ground forces, and the Congress that is damning him today by 250 votes said, ''Do not introduce ground forces.''

We have a President who says, ''I am not going to stop the bombing.'' We have a Congress, 250-plus votes, said, ''Do not stop the bombing.''

We share in the responsibility for what is happening right now. Tonight, brave young Americans will get in F–15s, F–16s, A–6s, and they will put their lives on the line in what is for them a very real war.

□ 1800

One cannot wish it away. We just voted not to end it. The choice we have is to do it right or to repeat the mistakes of the Congresses and the Presidents during Vietnam and to pretend that some half-hearted policy is going to achieve American objectives, and to look the other way as the casualties mount because we are not willing to put our necks out, we are not willing to risk our careers, but we are going to let those kids risk their lives.

Think about it. This is our constitutional obligation. The vote to get the kids out failed. That leaves but one other alternative, and that is to do it right for the sake of those kids who are putting their lives on the line right now.

Now, if we want to revoke the last vote, if we have changed our minds, then vote it. But if we are going to ask those kids to make the ultimate sacrifice, then we as a Nation ought to commit this Nation to the effort and not just a handful of pilots.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished chairman for yielding time to me.

I rise in strong opposition to this particular resolution, and I especially am concerned about the timing of these votes. I understand the reasons why my friend and colleague from California did what he did to maintain the integrity of the process and the responsibility that we have as parliamentarians to engage in that process. I, however, went to the leadership and asked if we could postpone these votes at least until next week, as a group of Members of this body, in fact 10 of us, travel to Austria, Vienna, Austria tomorrow evening to meet with the senior leadership of the Russian Duma and their major factions to try to find some common ground to provide leverage to convince Milosevic that it is time to come to the table and end this conflict.

We have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker. We have not used that opportunity before this debate and this vote, and that is extremely unfortunate. We should not be locked into an artificial vote time frame that tells us when to come forward and have Members in such disarray as we are going to see today watch the results of this vote. And that will tell us the problem that Members have in terms of what we are doing.

I understand the process is important, but I also understand the substance of what we are about is even more important, because we are talking about an issue and decisions and votes that could affect our ability to bring Russia in in a way that helps us bring this to a resolution peacefully. In my mind, Mr. Speaker, that is the top priority. Keeping our ground troops, keeping NATO ground troops from having to confront the Russian military, and from those Serbs in a confrontational way that will lead to additional bloodshed.

It is unfortunate we are having these votes today. In my opinion, it is not in our country's best interests that we have these votes. I wish we could have avoided that. I think the vote results will show the concern that Members have, not necessarily with just the issue of what we are about, because anyone could argue that, in fact, we are in war today with the things that are occurring. But rather, the timing, the sequence, and the way this is being done without full consideration to what I think is one very real opportunity.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute 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, 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.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, war is hell, but at times it is our most dreaded necessity. At times it is unavoidable. At times it is a matter of self-defense. None of this is the case in Kosovo. This war was not, nor is it now unavoidable. It is neither a dreaded necessity, nor is it fought in self-defense against an attacking enemy. All the good intentions in the world do not justify continuing such a war. A war that has every potential for disastrous consequences and catastrophe, not only for the United States, but also for our

NATO allies, and for all of the people of Europe, both east and west.

The deep divisions and misgivings expressed here in Congress over continuing this war are heard throughout the Nation and among our NATO allies. These divisions and misgivings are understandable, they are justified, and they cannot be ignored. The administration has failed to make a persuasive case to Congress or to the American people.

For these reasons, and consistent with my concern and support for our troops, I voted to withdraw U.S. forces from the war in Kosovo, and I will vote against ratifying this war with a declaration from Congress.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the conflict in Yugoslavia requires this body to take the extraordinary step of declaring war today, for the first time in the last 50 years of American history. To declare war today could have dangerous consequences that nobody, regardless of party, wants to have occur. If war is declared, then any country that has a connection to Serbia becomes a potential enemy of the United States and could be drawn into the conflict in the Balkans. We could find ourselves at war technically with Russia or China, who have a relationship with Serbia, two of the world's most potent nuclear powers.

We did not declare war when we engaged in the conflict in Korea, Vietnam, the Persian Gulf, Panama, Haiti or Grenada. Why are some forcing Congress, or trying to force Congress to declare war now? We have not done so in 50 years, since World War II. Now is not the time to escalate the conflict. We should not tie our military's hands with the red tape and other legal obligations that flow from a declaration of war. We should not engage in an action that might cause this conflict to spread to other regions of Europe beyond our control.

This measure demands defeat, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

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

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am confident the House will reject this unwarranted proposal for a declaration of war. What we should do when we complete rejecting this constitutionally-propelled resolution by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), who wants to bring this to court and test it, and he will apparently have his day in court, is then to make sure we leave no confusion about where the Congress and the American people are. We must pass the Senate language which I will offer to authorize the activities we are under.

We have created sufficient confusion today by contradicting even our own statements here on the floor. Many of those who argued against the President unilaterally, saying he would not use ground troops, have now passed what is potentially a statute that would prohibit the President from using ground troops unless Congress comes together, meets and passes it in both Houses.

So let us not leave this Chamber leaving confusion in Belgrade or anywhere else. The bulk of the American people are with the President on this action; the bulk of the American people are proud that we are fighting to save human beings from murder. There is no second agenda here. There is no oil, there is no Communist threat, there are simply human beings who will then be murdered. Reject this amendment, reject the proposal to declare war, and join us to simply state that we support the actions that are being taken, so that Mr. Milosevic can take no heart in the debate in this great, free and Democratic institution that we speak clearly and honestly, that we want to set Kosovo free.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), who is the proponent of this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) is recognized for 5½ minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, we are at war. There is no question that that is the truth. We are at war. And I believe that it is fair under the Constitution for us to declare that war if we are at war, and if we do not wish to engage in the war, to withdraw from that war. That is why I offered these alternatives to this body.

I am going to go through evidence that is unmistakable that we are at war, both quotations from the administration and just average facts that would compel the conclusion to any fair observer that we are at war.

Before I do so, though, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), my colleague, my good friend, and a distinguished veteran of the Vietnam war.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to look. If NATO and OSCE are unanimous, then why are Hungary and France still shipping oil to Serbs? Why do we have Hungary and Poland and the Czechs who say that if we go to war they will not support us, and we had to fight for airspace.

Please look at other solutions to this problem besides ground troops and bombing, and realize that there are many, many nationalists lined up behind Milosevic to take his place. It is not just Milosevic. We have caused the nationalism in many cases. But look at the Mujahedin and Hamas who, in my opinion, will cause problems for the next 100 years unless the President looks at the Albanian President and Izetbegovic and says, deport them within 30 days.

Have we looked into the children's eyes that are the refugees? They do not have a clue as to why they are being uprooted from their homes. And in my opinion, we have caused a lot of it. It is not just a single focus. We have to reach out and look at all of the different factors that are affecting Kosovo and Bosnia.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank my colleague.

To this day, we have flown 11,574 missions. We have 4,423 air strikes, but this is not war, says the administration. Please, this is war. Recognize it, say it, admit it.

The Secretary of Defense said in testimony in the Senate Committee on National Security on April 15, ''We are certainly engaged in hostilities. We are engaged in combat. Whether that measures up to a classic definition of war I am not qualified to say.''

For heaven's sakes, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense of the United States says he is not qualified to say whether we are at war when he admits we are engaged in hostilities, we are engaged in combat.

The Secretary of State of the United States, in testimony before the Committee on International Relations on April 21, refused to answer my question whether we were in hostilities. It is shameful that the Secretary of State of the United States did not answer a question put by a member of the Committee on International Relations, the committee of jurisdiction over international relations, as to whether we were in hostilities.

□ 1815

The reason she didn't, I believe, is because I explained in asking my question to her that the word ''hostilities'' appears in the war powers resolution, and she was afraid of confessing that hostilities were in existence, because that might trigger the War Powers Resolution. She did admit we were in conflict.

The next day, April 22, her spokesperson, the Assistant Secretary of State, admitted we were in an armed conflict. The President's executive order of April 13 accords extra pay to our soldiers who are in, and I quote the word, ''combat.''

The Deputy Secretary of State Thomas Pickering on February 10 before our committee answered my question, ''Would Serbia be within its rights to consider the bombing of sovereign Serbian territory as an act of

war?,'' by saying ''Yes, they would be within their rights to consider it an act of war.'' I asked him, ''Is Kosovo a part of sovereign Serbia?'' He said, yes, it was.

We have prisoners of war, admitted by the President and called as such by him and by the Assistant Secretary of State Jacobs. We had a call-up yesterday of 33,102 troops from our Reserves.

We are at war. It is inconvenient, perhaps, to admit the truth, but it is the truth. We are at war. I applaud two of our colleagues who have spoken today, our colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), who said, this is war. We should declare it to be war if we wish to be at war.

But if we do not wish to be at war, then we must not permit the incidents of war, the bombing and the troops. Why do we have this distinction? Why do we say the bombing is okay but the troops are not? Is bombing any less war? Is it less war to the people in Yugoslavia? It is war.

The President needed the approval of Congress before he commenced the bombing. It is no victory that today he sends us a letter saying that he will come to Congress before commencing ground troops, because he says ''before commencing ground troops in a non-permissive environment,'' he does not say ''before putting in ground troops to fight.'' And he does not say he will wait for a Congressional vote.

If the Serbs are sufficiently diminished, ''degraded'' is the word they use in the administration, so that entry will be quasi-permissive, then I take it the President would put in ground troops.

Please, we are at war. The honest choice is this: If we are at war, declare we are at war. If my colleagues do not wish us to be at war, withdraw the troops. I ask my colleagues to stand up to their constitutional obligation and to honesty on this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this joint resolution. This resolution would pursuant to section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution, declare a state of war between the United States and the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Again, Mr. Speaker this joint resolution is not in the best interest of United States of America.

Neither NATO nor the United States believes that a state of war exists in the current conflict in the Balkan region. The President has not requested that Congress issue a declaration of war. I believe that a declaration of war would be entirely counterproductive as a matter of policy and is unnecessary as a matter of law.

On only five occasions in the United States history and never since the end of World War II has the Congress declared war, reflecting the extraordinary nature of, and implications attendant on, such a declaration. While we are not at war with either the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or its people, Slobodan Milosevic should not doubt the determination of NATO to see the stability of Europe reasserted. With resolve NATO can attain a durable peace that prevents further repression and provides for democratic self-government for the Kosovar people.

Mr. Speaker, if this resolution is adopted this body would convey the wrong message. The adoption of H. J. Res. 44 would indicate the existence of a bilateral war between the United States and Yugoslavia. A bilateral war between the United States and Yugoslavia has not been declared and in my opinion should not be declared; rather our efforts must remain in concert with the allied effort under the NATO umbrella.

As a matter of law, there is no need for a declaration of war. Mr. Speaker, every use of U.S. Armed Forces since World War II has been undertaken pursuant to the President's constitutional authority. In some cases like the Persian Gulf War, action was taken under congressional authorization, but not since World War II has Congress declared war.

Mr. Speaker, in the time in which we live, the President must have the discretion and authority to use U.S. Armed Forces when there is a clear and significant risk to our national security interests. I would hope that if nothing else we would have learned that instability in Europe does have an immediate impact on our own security interests.

In addition, a declaration of war could have serious counterproductive effects on NATO cohesion and regional stability. Russia, already agitated over NATO action, could be further alienated from joining in diplomatic efforts to achieve a lasting peace.

As NATO reaffirmed at its 50th Anniversary, it remains committed to the stability of Europe. NATO is acting to deter unlawful violence in Kosovo that endangers the fragile stability of the Balkans and threatens a wider conflict in Europe. The NATO alliance is as united as ever, and there is no sense in giving up now, and there is no better prospect for getting a fair and lasting settlement.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution and let us proceed with our NATO allies to bring about a peaceful settlement.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as with all Americans I am greatly distressed by the brutality and loss of freedom the Kosovars are suffering at the hands of military forces of the Serbian regime in Belgrade. However, NATO military policy, while inflicting heavy penalties on the infrastructure of Yugoslavia, has done nothing to stop the forced removal of the Albanian residents of Kosovo, the original objective announced by President Clinton and our NATO allies. It may, in fact, have aggravated the situation. And the effort of the honorable Congressman from California, TOM CAMPBELL, and his supporters, to move for a congressional declaration of war is fraught with additional danger with regard to both our domestic tranquility and the possibilities of expanding the conflict.

On the domestic front the President as Commander in Chief would be empowered to call up the Reserves and federalize the National Guard. All regular enlistments in the armed services would be extended until 6 months after the termination of the conflict. (10 U.S.C. 506, 671a) Private property deemed necessary for military purposes could be seized. (10 U.S.C. 2663–64) Under certain conditions, the President could take over private manufacturing plants, transportation systems, and regulate the transmission of electrical energy. (10 U.S.C. 4501–02, 9501,–02, 4742, 9742, 16 U.S.C. 824) Private vessels could be requisitioned by the government (46 U.S.C. App1242–a), radio and television transmission rules could be suspended (47 U.S.C. 606), and a variety of controls could be established with regard to aliens, particularly those from states considered enemies. While it is not certain, it is highly probable that Congress would agree to pass other legislation deemed necessary to achieve victory, which would curtail other aspects of civil life we take for granted.

With regard to United States foreign policy, the negative costs could be equally grave. Such a declaration could be divisive in NATO, with some members (Greece, Italy) determining that the effects of such a war declaration by the U.S. Congress would decrease the support among their own citizens, thus ending their cooperation and producing a rupture in the alliance. It would certainly increase the sense of hostility with Russia, the Ukraine and possibly other former Soviet states.

While we are all agreed with the objective of bringing peace and justice to the Balkan region, there needs to be further reflection and discussion regarding the terms we wish to establish with the Yugoslav government and the means by which we achieve this end. It may be desirable to consider establishing an ad hoc group within the UN General Assembly, beyond just the NATO members, to aid in the search for an honorable and sensible end to this increasingly grave crisis.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 44, which would declare a state of war between the United States and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. I oppose this resolution because I believe that a declaration of war, like the NATO air strikes, will only increase instability in the region and exacerbate the atrocities against ethnic Albanians.

At this very volatile time, my support and prayers go out to the brave men and women of the United States Armed Forces who have been dispatched to Yugoslavia. We must take every measure possible to bring an end to this crisis to ensure their safe and expeditious return home.

While I will vote against the declaration of war, I would like to commend my colleague from California, Congressman CAMPBELL, for introducing this resolution into the House of Representatives and bringing forward Congressional action on the U.S. involvement in Kosovo. It is my belief that these debates should have taken place six weeks ago, before a single bomb was dropped and before any U.S. troops were sent into the hostile situation in the Balkans.

By failing to vote on the air strikes before their commencement, and instead debating authorization now, when we are already heavily involved, the Administration is conducting a war without Congressional consent as required by the Constitution. A vote to authorize the President to conduct military air strikes at this juncture is nothing more than a rubber stamp from Congress for an action that has already begun. In my opinion, our inaction prior to military strikes abdicated our Constitutional responsibility and furthermore, prevented the voice of the people I represent, who are overwhelmingly against the air strikes, from being heard.

There are those who rise today in support of the Administration's action in order to end the

genocide of the ethnic Albanians. I agree, in the strongest terms possible, that we have a moral imperative to intervene and to bring an end to the horrific suffering. However, whether air strikes, ground forces, or a declaration of war—these violent means as a method to bring peace and stability to the Balkans have only, and will only escalate the crisis.

As a person who strongly believes in the teachings and work of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., not just on his birthday, but throughout the year, I profoundly subscribe to the principles of nonviolence. Our policies, and our actions, must set an example for our young people that violence should never be an option. If peace is our objective, and I am certain that this is a goal upon which all in this chamber can agree, then I implore us to consider the words of Dr. King. In his last book, ''The Trumpet of Conscience, A Christmas Sermon on Peace,'' Dr. King discusses bombing in North Vietnam, and the rhetoric of peace that was connected to those war making acts.

He wrote,

> What is the problem? They are talking about peace as a distant goal, as an end we seek. But one day we must come to see that peace is not merely a distant goal we seek, but that it is a means by which we arrive at that goal. We must pursue peaceful ends through peaceful means. All of this is saying that, in the final analysis, means and ends must cohere because the end is pre-existent in the means and ultimately destructive means cannot bring about constructive ends.

The Administration's policy and the NATO campaign in Kosovo to date have produced only counterproductive and destructive results: a mass exodus of over half a million ethnic Albanians, significant civilian deaths, an escalation of Milosevic's campaign of racial hatred and terror, and greater instability in the region. The results are just the opposite of what we want to achieve. Our goal is to prevent innocent people from being killed. In the name of saving Kosovars, we are destroying Kosovo.

At this juncture, I am convinced that our best hope for peace and stability in the region is the negotiation of an immediate cease fire. It is my strong belief that the United States and NATO must reach out to the United Nations, Russia, China, and others to work together to develop a new, internationally negotiated peace agreement and to secure Serbian compliance to its terms. In order to end the suffering in the Balkans and to achieve long term stability, support of a diplomatic political settlement is the only action we can employ.

As we today speak of a policy to end genocide in the Balkans, I am also greatly disturbed to think of the people in many countries in Africa and all over the world, who have also suffered unthinkable atrocities, beyond our worst nightmare. As a result of ethnic conflict in Africa, over 150,000 have been killed in Burundi; 800,000 in Rwanda; and 1.5 million in Sudan. More than 200,000 Kurds have died in Iraq and Turkey, and hundreds of thousands in Burma, and over 1 million in Cambodia.

It is my hope that our nation can develop a foreign policy framework to address suffering and killing all over the world, without the use of force, ground troops, air strikes and other violent means.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the declaration of war.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, last November, I asked Iowans to remember the victims of Hurricane Mitch * * * and in America's generosity, we responded with private and public philanthropy. I voted for federal assistance not only for humanitarian reasons, but also because it is in our own country's interest that the economics of our trading partners to the South be salvaged.

Sharing our nation's treasure is a long tradition of United States humanitarianism. Perhaps the best example was the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe after World War II and there are countless others.

We are now facing a man-made disaster with hundreds of thousands of homeless in the Balkans. Our country is partially responsible for these refugees, because without President Clinton's go ahead, there never would have been NATO military action. We should give strong financial support to Albania and Macedonia to help them clothe, feed and shelter the displaced Kosovars.

However, there is a big difference between providing humanitarian financial assistance to homeless victims whether in Guatemala or Albania and spending the blood of our sons and daughters in a ground war in the Balkans. One of the lessons we should have learned in Vietnam is that the public will tolerate loss of life and limb only when it is convinced that its vital national interest is at stake. While the American public is rightly concerned about the human rights violations in Kosovo, few believe that our own country's interests are at risk.

Vietnam also taught us that military might is only one factor in determining the outcome. We were much stronger militarily than the Viet Cong, but they were much more committed. It was their country. We have an analogous situation in Kosovo, a province of Yugoslavia, which the Serbs consider the birthplace of their nation.

We are hearing arguments that the credibility of NATO is at stake. For those of us who remember the Vietnam era only too clearly, these were the same arguments that got us deeper into a Southeast Asia war. The lesson we should have learned then was: Unless you are willing to wade in a swampy pit, don't dig your hole deeper. The consequences of failing to carry through later will be much worse than not getting more deeply involved now.

So where do we go from here? First, Congress ought to assert its Constitutional duty. The Framers assigned the power to enter wars to Congress only, not the President. Congress should step up to the bar and not let the President take the risks of war and then either cheer or castigate depending on the outcome.

I support Congressman TOM CAMPBELL's attempt to get Congress to vote on a declaration of war. I will vote ''No,'' since our country has not been attacked by Yugoslavia nor do we have such an overriding national interest to justify going to war over their own civil war.

If Congress votes for war, then we will have upped the ante a thousand fold. If Congress votes no, then I would support taking this to the courts in order to get a cease and desist order on the executive.

But what about Kosovo itself? Milosevic is indicating that he would now accept non-NATO international observers in Kosovo. We should suspend bombing, institute a full UN-sponsored economic boycott, and resume negotiations. Probably the best that can be achieved is a partition of Kosovo with the Serbs and their religious and historical sites on one side and the Albanian Kosovars on the other. A UN peacekeeping presence will be necessary for generations.

One thing, though, is clear to me. I just completed town hall meetings in every county in my district. Iowans are very skeptical about our military involvement in that part of the world. Of the nearly one thousand people who attended, only a handful were for placing U.S. ground troops in Kosovo under any circumstances.

Humanitarian aid, yes. U.S. ground forces, no.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 151, the joint resolution is considered as read for amendment, and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 2, nays 427, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—2

Barton
Taylor (MS)

NAYS—427

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon

Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Aderholt
Blagojevich
Slaughter
Tauzin
Wynn

□ 1837

Messrs. MCINTOSH, MCINNIS, UPTON, HUTCHINSON, and NADLER, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio and Ms. KILPATRICK changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the joint resolution was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present today for rollcall votes 98, 99, 100, 101, and 102.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' or ''aye'' on rollcall vote 98, and ''no'' or ''nay'' on votes 99, 100, 101, and 102.

AUTHORIZING PRESIDENT TO CONDUCT MILITARY AIR OPERATIONS AND MISSILE STRIKES AGAINST FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 5 of House Resolution 151, I call up from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) authorizing the President of the United States to conduct military air operations and missile strikes against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The text of Senate Concurrent Resolution 21 is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 21

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States is authorized to conduct military air operations and missile strikes in cooperation with our NATO allies against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5 of House Resolution 151, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

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

Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues are distributing a letter that frankly is, I am sure, unintentionally inaccurate. I would hope that every Member of this body, before they vote, reads the five line resolution.

This five line resolution is not an authorization for ground forces, and I will ask my colleagues to listen as I read it, because it is only five lines. The resolution that has come from the Senate says: ''The President of the United States is authorized to conduct military air operations and missile strikes in cooperation with our NATO allies against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.''

It says nothing else. Make it clear. Members should vote however they believe is correct, but they should do it based on the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) control my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) will control the remainder of the time allotted to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject matter under consideration, S. Con. Res. 21.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, as I have previously indicated, I am prepared to support statutory authorization for appropriate measures necessary to achieve all of our objectives in Kosovo. Accordingly, I support this resolution, although I consider it to be only a halfway measure. It is not a statutory authorization, even though it purports to be such, and it addresses itself only to the present military air operation by NATO in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

As I previously stated, I believe that it would be both timely and prudent for the administration to come to the Congress with a request for statutory authorization for any and all measures necessary to bring about our stated objectives in Kosovo. We do not want to encourage Mr. Milosevic to believe that our Nation is not prepared to pursue victory, and we do not want him to believe that he can wait us out and his will is superior to our manifest determination in this matter.

I believe that this measure advances, in a modest way, our determination of support for an end to the brutality in Kosovo and, accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 21. The Congress needs to have a voice in the involvement of the United States in Operation Allied Force. We should stand up and express our support for our troops and our allies in NATO.

We must also take this opportunity to show to President Milosevic that we are united in our belief and determination that this campaign of terror must be stopped. We must continue to work with our NATO allies to restore peace to the region, to ensure that the Kosovo Albanians who want to return to their homes can be allowed to do so under peaceful circumstances, and we must continue to ensure that Mr. Milosevic will withdraw his military and paramilitary forces from Kosovo and, ultimately, provide for self-governance in Kosovo.

To accomplish these goals we must participate in Operation Allied Force and support the air strikes. We are steadily diminishing the power of Mr. Milosevic and his military forces. For the United States to withdraw from this attack at this moment would undermine the entire NATO effort and would, in effect, validate Mr. Milosevic's inexcusable and terrible campaign of ethnic cleansing.

□ 1845

Our NATO allies have stepped up to the plate in Kosovo. Leaders of the NATO alliance have recently reaffirmed their commitment and resolve to continue the air strikes until we stop President Milosevic. This is the time for Congress to step up and to endorse those air strikes.

The Senate concurrent resolution authorizes the President to conduct military air operations and missile strikes against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Passage of this resolution will express our endorsement of these strikes and send a strong message to President Milosevic that we are unified with our allies. This will also send a strong message to our troops in the field.

Fifty years ago we formed NATO to work together for the security of Europe. The cold war has ended and communism has ended. However, there is a great need for us to work to assure the safety and stability of countries in Europe who have been our partners for over 50 years.

We can continue this good work by adopting this resolution today, sending a message that we are united as a country and determine our resolve to stop the slaughter in Kosovo.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

I hope Members will think very seriously about this resolution, because what this resolution says is that this House is about to take ownership in what the President has put us into since he started bombing Kosovo. So I think we should think very, very seriously whether we are going to take ownership of the bombing of Kosovo.

Let us go back a little ways. Let us go back to even the negotiations in Rambouillet. I do not think many Members of this House have even read the provisions of the peace agreement in Rambouillet. One of the provisions of the peace agreement was that Milosevic had to agree to allow foreign troops, the peacekeeping troops, to have free reign over the entire country of Yugoslavia, not just Kosovo, but the entire country of Yugoslavia, which put Milosevic in a very untenable situation. No wonder he was not going to sign this agreement.

Then the Secretary of State, who believes in bombing to support her diplomacy, decides that we are going to bomb him to the peace table and make him sign something that would actually slit his throat with his own people.

Then after trying to force him with bombing, and I remind Members of the briefings that we had with this administration, the first briefings, that frankly scared me to death because those briefings with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff told us that this was no big deal, that we were going to bomb for a couple of days, 48 hours, and then stop bombing and Milosevic would come to the table.

When asked the question, what if he does not come to the table, they said, well, we will go to Phase 2; and Phase 2 is that we will bomb for a few more days. Then he will be going to the table, by crackie. And when we asked, ''Then, what?'' then they said, well, we will bomb for another week and that will force him to come to the table and this will be all over with. And then when we asked, ''Then, what?'' there was silence. This administration started a war without a plan farther along than 2 weeks.

And Phase 3. That is what brought us to the bombing, my colleagues. Once they started bombing and found out that Milosevic was a pretty tough customer and that the Serbian people were pretty tough people that have been through these kind of things before, and some people have said that the Germans had something like 20 divisions in Yugoslavia trying to route the Serbians out of those mountains and those caves, and they could not do it.

So what they are doing here is they are voting to continue an unplanned war by an administration that is incompetent of carrying it out. I hope my colleagues will vote against the resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there are three reasons why it is legitimate, why our actions in Yugoslavia should be authorized by this Congress: Number one, the strength of NATO; number two, our experience with Milosevic; and number 3, the alternative of doing nothing.

It is in our vital interest that there be a strong and resolute NATO. Think of the hundreds of thousands of innocent soldiers, sailors, and airmen that were lost in Europe because we did not have NATO when we needed NATO.

We need NATO now. We need to act with NATO. We need a strong NATO. And if we do, we will not have to be the world's peacekeeper in the future.

Secondly, our experience with Milosevic, because NATO did not get involved when it had an opportunity, such as in 1992, when it was recommended; what resulted, with the same leadership, Mr. Milosevic, 200,000 lives were lost, 2½ million people were displaced, 40,000 women were raped. It could have been prevented had NATO acted when it had the opportunity.

But thirdly, think of the alternative. This is the fault line, my colleagues, between the Muslim and the Orthodox worlds. This is the fault line that has existed for generations. If we had not gotten involved in a multilateral action, NATO taking the leadership, think what would have happened. Extremists would have been involved.

We know what Milosevic was going to do, why he had 40,000 troops amassed on the border, why he did not want to compromise at Rambouillet, because he knew exactly what he was going to do; and he did it. But if he had done that and NATO had not gotten involved, do my colleagues really think other nations would have stood by? Of course they would not have. We would have had the Mujahidin getting involved. We would have had Islamic extremists getting involved.

And do my colleagues really think Russia then would not have gotten involved if there had not been the strength of NATO taking the leadership here?

My colleagues, we are doing the only responsible thing. This is not the United States acting unilaterally. We are acting multilaterally. We are acting with NATO. We are acting in the long-term interests of this country. We are doing the right thing, for a number of reasons. And the Congress should be supporting it. They should vote ''aye'' today.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my colleagues, particularly on this side of the aisle. We can question whether we should have ever gone in. But we are in. And if we do not win, we might as well withdraw from NATO, fold it up, because the credibility will be gone.

The message that we send to Saddam, to Iran, to Qadhafi, to Korea, to China, to Russia, is that we do not have the resolution, we do not have the will. Think about it.

This past Saturday, I was privileged to have lunch with two foreign policy experts, Henry Kissinger and Ziggy Brzezinski. I posed these questions to them. They said, send me a letter and we will reply. And Dr. Kissinger sent this response to me:

Prior to the initiation of the bombing, I repeatedly expressed my uneasiness about the Rambouillet process. But, having begun the military operation, we must win it militarily. To back down would demonstrate a dangerous lack of commitment and credibility, both to nations tempted to take advantage of our perceived weakness and to our NATO allies.

From Dr. Brzezinski:

I have your letter of April 26. Let me state unequivocally that in my view it is absolutely essential that NATO should prevail fully, and thus without making any compromises regarding the demand it made prior to the bombing, in the course of the current Kosovo conflict. Failure to do so would be most damaging to America's global leadership and would doubtlessly undermine both the credibility and the cohesion of NATO. Accordingly, the U.S. Congress should encourage the President to use all means necessary to successfully complete the ongoing mission.

I could not say it any better.

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

CENTER FOR STRATEGIC & INTERNATIONAL STUDIES,
Washington, DC, April 28, 1999.

Hon. TOM BLILEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BLILEY: I have your letter of April 26. Let me state unequivocally that in my view it is absolutely essential that NATO should prevail fully—and thus without making any compromises regarding the demands it made prior to the bombing—in the course of the current Kosovo conflict. Failure to do so would be most damaging to America's global leadership and would doubtlessly undermine both the credibility and the cohesion of NATO. Accordingly, the U.S. Congress should encourage the President to use all the means necessary to successfully complete the ongoing mission.

Yours sincerely,

ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI.

NEW YORK, NY,
April 27, 1999.

Hon. TOM BLILEY,
House of Representatives, Rayburn Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BLILEY: This is in response to your letter of yesterday.

Prior to the initiation of the bombing, I repeatedly expressed my uneasiness about the Rambouillet process. But, having begun the military operation, we must win it militarily. To back down would demonstrate a dangerous lack of commitment and credibility, both to nations tempted to take advantage of our perceived weakness and to our NATO allies.

I have stated this view repeatedly and publicly—in an article in Newsweek and in my recent testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee (both of which I enclose), as well as in numerous television interviews: ABC's ''This Week'' with Sam Donaldson and Cokie Roberts, CNN, Fox News, Charlie Rose, CNBC, Reuters TV, as well as the BBC, ARD (German TV), Britain's ITN and various other American and European networks.

I would be glad to have you refer to this letter in the coming debate in the House of Representatives, if it would be useful.

I enjoyed our discussion at luncheon at the Romanian Embassy.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. KISSINGER.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. 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.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), a member of our committee.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, even though I am not opposed to air strikes philosophically in the Balkans as a vehicle to achieving American policy.

Unfortunately, the policy of this administration, which includes air strikes, has been confusing and sometimes incoherent. Air strikes as part of a policy that would recognize Kosovo, and part of that policy would be arming the Kosovars to defend themselves, certainly might have been a respectable plan at one point.

Instead, this administration is using bombing to force both parties into accepting a plan in which American troops would be garrisoned in the Balkans for years and years to come. This is total nonsense. And we will be spending tens of billions of dollars and putting American lives at stake in order to achieve what? The garrisoning of troops, leaving the troops in the Balkans all of those years?

This is a blank check, my colleagues. This resolution is a blank check for an air war which will lead to tens of billions of dollars and American blood being shed. And do my colleagues know where that check is going to be cashed? It will be cashed at the bank that is holding the money for the Social Security Trust Fund. It is going to be cashed at the bank that is supposed to be paying for the defense of our country all over the world. Because we are going to be spending the money, instead of buying ammunition and making sure our defenders are safe overseas, we are going to be wasting that money in the Balkans on big explosions. It is going to make us worse off. We are not going to be as safe.

And as far as NATO goes, this is an organization that did its job. Are we now to be the policemen of the world? And because we are part of NATO, to keep an organization going, finding a purpose for it, we are going to spend our money all over the world, send our troops all over the world, in order to create stability wherever there is not stability? American lives are going to be put on the line?

This will, in the end, cost American lives. It will break our bank. We will not be able to deter the aggression in Asia and from China and elsewhere where there are serious threats. Oppose this resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY).

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

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, I support Senate Concurrent Resolution 21.

The reason I could not support the other alternatives is because I think it would be wrong to withdraw. I also believe it would be wrong to hamstring our Commander in Chief's authority to conduct operations. And finally, I believe it would be wrong to declare war.

My major concern is that all of these options send the wrong signal. Neither with respect to NATO nor President Milosevic should we even hint that we might withdraw block funds for further development.

□ 1900

Nothing would make Milosevic happier than knowing the power and the might of the United States would no longer be fully engaged. By the same token, we should never suggest to our own forces that our full support for their effort may be less than forthcoming. What we need to do is to authorize the continuation of the current effort and give the current effort more time to work.

Mr. Speaker, I have said it before. You cannot run the Department of Defense like a business, with 535 Members of a board of directors. The same thing goes for foreign policy and military operations. You cannot substitute the opinions of these board members for the sound judgment of Chairman Shelton and General Clark and Secretary Cohen and, yes, the Commander in Chief. We should not get into the details of whether ''you can do this mission, but you can't do that mission.'' That is like the Vietnam War with the President choosing Vietnam targets on sand tables in the White House basement. It was wrong then, it is wrong now, and Congress should not be part of it.

What Congress should do is to affirm or deny the general policy and turn over the details to the war fighters. I believe that the Gejdenson amendment, which has already gotten bipartisan support in the other body, makes the best sense in the current situation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee

on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I just want to point out one thing. All we are doing in all of these resolutions today is sending messages. I think we have sent some pretty strong messages. I imagine tonight if there is a television capability in Belgrade that the Belgrade television will say Congress, U.S. Congress votes 430–2 against war against Yugoslavia.

But with respect to this particular message that we are sending, we mention in this resolution, Montenegro. I do not think that there is a Member of this body who thinks that we should be bombing Montenegro. I agree that we should be bombing Belgrade, and I support the President in that respect. But I do not think we ought to send a message to the people of Montenegro that this Congress is in favor of bombs being dropped in that part of the world because they indeed are struggling, struggling to create a democratic form of government, struggling to do what we are requesting they do. I think that if we send a message, we should make certain that the people of Montenegro know that we are supportive of their efforts and sorry they are in the dilemma they are in.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the distinguished minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask each Member to seriously consider voting for this resolution. As I enter this debate, I think it is worthwhile tonight at 7 o'clock here in Washington to take into account the votes that we have taken and the messages that we have sent from this Chamber this afternoon, today.

First, we have said that we do not want a general declaration of war against Serbia. Second, we have said that we do not want to withdraw all of our troops out of the region. Third, we have said that if there is to be a ground war, we want the President to come back here and get a vote from this body.

If we now vote against what the Senate passed 4 weeks ago in a bipartisan way, a simple authorization of what is now happening on the ground in Kosovo and around Kosovo, we will send a message to our young men and women who are out there trying to carry out this policy that we have conflicting signals on war or withdrawal or what we are going to do about a ground war, but we send the clearest signal of the day that we do not even want to authorize what we are doing.

It also will send a message to Mr. Milosevic and his leadership that the House of Representatives of the United States of America is totally confused and certainly is not behind what is happening. I do not think that is the message we want to send. If we learned anything from Vietnam, I think we should have learned that before we commit our troops and put them in the field and leave them out there with ambivalence, that we have to stand finally behind something.

I know there are lots of worries by Members here about ground troops. I have worries about ground troops. I have not decided how I would vote on ground troops. But I have decided that what we are doing with 19 other nations of NATO is the right thing for our country to do. If it is to succeed, we must be unified together as a people, behind the effort, and America must be unified with NATO in its first affirmative action in 50 years, since it was conceived, to move forward to try to end this killing and mayhem that is going on and has been going on for weeks now in Kosovo.

I urge Members to put aside partisan feelings and political goals and objectives. That can have no place in this consideration. There is not a Republican Army or a Democratic Army or a Republican Air Force or a Democratic Air Force. This is the United States of America. Our young people, our best, are out there tonight doing what we have asked them to do. At the very least, we owe them and NATO an affirmation that we as the representatives of the American people at least support what is happening now, without prejudging or saying what we would do about other propositions that might come later.

I urge Members to support this resolution. The Senate passed it 4 weeks ago with a bipartisan vote. Fifty-seven Members of the Senate voted for this resolution. I think it would be a grave error if we would not support it tonight. I urge Members to search their conscience, I urge Members to stand behind this policy for the sake of the United States, for the sake of our young people, for the sake of our future.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Armed Services.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the distinguished minority leader that this is not about partisanship, it is about policy. We have an advantage here tonight in that we are being asked to authorize something that happened 5 weeks ago. That gives us the advantage because we can see the immediate effects. We have got the benefit here of a crystal ball to see what the results will be of the President's policy.

The question for all of us is, do you want to stand behind this? Is this the policy and the results that you want? Because if it is not, you will be endorsing everything that has gone on in the last 5 weeks and taking on the risk of what will happen in the future.

What have we seen? The political aims are not clear and they have not been from the very beginning. Mostly they are humanitarian. Our objective was to prevent a humanitarian disaster in the Balkans. We have exacerbated that humanitarian disaster, and hundreds of thousands of Kosovar Albanians have been pushed out of their homes and those homes burned because our military means were not tied to those political objectives.

I am a former Air Force officer. I believe in air power, as my father did and my grandfather before him. And despite the images that we see on our televisions of precise attacks, we can hit the bridges, but we cannot change the mind of Slobodan Milosevic. As a result, we have not been able to stop a door-to-door campaign of repression and ethnic cleansing, and we have made it worse.

The refugees themselves enhance the instability of the Balkans. We have pushed those refugees into neighboring countries which themselves are fragile, and we will have to deal with the consequences of that for the coming decade. We have increased domestic support for Milosevic and enhanced Serbian nationalism in Serbia. That does not serve NATO interests or American national interests.

And we have stretched our forces dangerously thin. We are almost out of cruise missiles. Fully a fifth of the American Air Force is committed and tied down in the Balkans. What kind of risk does that put us in in Korea? We are a superpower, but much of our power comes from our own restraint and the threat of the use of that power.

NATO will endure. I used to serve at the United States Mission to NATO. It will continue to have the credibility to do that which is in its vital interests to do and that, Mr. Speaker, is the fundamental problem. This is not in the vital national interests of the United States. If it were, we would be there, foursquare, with decisive military force to get the job done and come home. But because it is not, we cannot sustain this operation. I will not vote to support an action which has been shown to fail.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

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

I have a great deal of respect for our new colleague, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) and her unique expertise, but I flat out disagree with her in a couple of important respects. I believe it is ludicrous to assume that but for the NATO air campaign, Slobodan Milosevic would not have turned 1 million people out of their homes. He could not, Mr. Speaker, forcibly evict 1 million people from their homes in 2 weeks without having

a very thoroughly developed plan well in advance. Do not kid yourselves. This was on the game plan of Slobodan Milosevic and would have occurred irrespective of the NATO air campaign.

I also disagree with my colleague in believing that it is time to pack it in, to let Slobodan Milosevic have his evil way. The gentlewoman from New Mexico supported that approach in a vote earlier today and it was rejected. We must now stand together, just like happened in the Senate, in a bipartisan way, to support the air campaign.

A vote for this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is a vote for our troops, a vote for NATO, a vote for American leadership and a vote to end the ethnic slaughter in Kosovo. Children and the elderly are dying by the side of the road today as Serb forces shove them to the border. Thousands and thousands of young men have disappeared, many more murdered perhaps right now, even as I am speaking. We cannot turn our back on this dimension of ethnic cleansing.

While we send an unequivocal message to Milosevic, let us send with this resolution an equally clear message to our troops and all of the troops, Americans and others, involved in the NATO engagement. We need to support our troops and can do so with this resolution.

I regret and regret very much we have no alternatives but to continue with this intervention. It is now our only option. I urge my colleagues' support.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a member of the committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Americans have big hearts. It is one of our best traits. Whenever we see killing anywhere, injustice anywhere, we want to stop it, even if our national interests are not at stake.

On Kosovo, having good intentions and a bad plan have proven to hurt the very people we are trying to help. We have increased human suffering. We have not stopped it. We have spread instability rather than prevented it. With the lessons of the Vietnam War barely cold on our plates, here we go again. Like Vietnam, we wage a war we are not committed to win, by the seat of the pants, war by committee, war by posters, war by the politically correct. It is having fatal results.

□ 1915

Worst of all, we forgot the most important lesson of Vietnam. It is fatal to enter a war without the will to win it. Those who sought this war lack the political courage to win it. To aggressively target Slobodan Milosevic, his leaders in the Serbian Army he commands, they have forgotten what General MacArthur has told us. War's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision. In war there is no substitute for victory.

If a lethal criminal entered our home, entered our school, entered an airport, entered our neighborhood and began to gun down innocent families, it would be the first responsibility of law enforcement to stop them cold, now, to bring the shooter down without flinching. History will record in Kosovo an America that flinched, and the lives of Kosovars fell around us because we were unwilling and lacked the courage to bring the shooter down, the leaders, the Army and to end the atrocities.

There is nothing humanitarian about a policy that puts American pilots' and fighters' lives on the line so that Milosevic can live. There is nothing just about a policy that allows Kosovars to die cold and hungry and lonely on the side of the road while we preserve Serbian troops, our enemies, the killers on the very day American pilots flew into Yugoslavia.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we should flinch either, and I do not see how denying any authority to continue this is nonflinching. I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) whose efforts forced this House against its will to stop hiding.

There were 2 aspects to this issue. One, what is the policy choice in Yugoslavia? It is an unhappy choice. I believe that the policy of continued bombing in conjunction with our allies, and it is awkward to carry out an allied policy, but it is better than an unilateral one. When we accept the strength of an alliance, we take constraints with it. I think that is the best policy in a set of bad choices.

The House now has to make a choice, and it is inappropriate for this great elected body of representatives, when confronted with a difficult choice, to say: None of the above. But if we vote down this resolution, that is what we are doing. Thanks to the efforts and the integrity of the gentleman from California who insisted we face up to our responsibilities, we voted. We voted not to pull out.

Now 139 people who voted not to pull out can consistently vote against this. But are we to be told that there are dozens, maybe 100, 125 Members who do not think we should pull out but simply do not want to be blamed for staying in? We had one comment say:

Oh, well, we should not take ownership of this.

That is an inappropriate attitude for people who are elected. The draft does not work here. We all ran for this job, and a lot of it is fun, and sometimes it is not, and having to help ratify this unpleasant choice is one of those moments when it is the least fun, the least attractive. But we do not have the option of simply copping out. Members could be against this, they can be for it, but they cannot vote for none of the above. They cannot conscientiously say it is too hard, I will vote over here, and I will vote over there.

I am delighted that we have a chance here to pass a concurrent resolution to have a combined policy, House and Senate, which says we support this current military policy. Members may be opposed to the military policy, and then they should have voted for the resolution offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), or they can be in favor of it and they should vote for this. But punting is not an option; it is not football season. We cannot simply say:

Let this one pass from us.

I voted for the resolution offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING). I voted for it because I do think before we commit ground troops, this House ought to vote. But I must say I have some second thoughts about putting that authority into the hands of a group of people, some of whom say, ''Gee, can I duck the hard one?'', and that is what we are talking about now. If people thought the policy was wrong and we should pull out, they had a chance to vote that way.

Mr. Speaker, I hope people will not simply try to duck a tough issue and will vote to ratify the least unpalatable choice.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH).

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts I agree with him with the need for consistency, and I will consistently be opposing this action and will vote against it, and for several reasons.

First of all, we had the minority leader talk earlier today about how this was, quote, the first affirmative action by NATO. What he is saying is actually this is a radical extreme departure in the history of NATO, the first time they have attacked on the offensive instead of being defensive. This is an extreme radical departure for NATO, make no mistake of it, and guess who is paying for that extremism and radicalism? It will be the men and women who are in my district, who are in five military bases, whose sons and daughters go to the public schools of my children. It is very easy to play fast and lose with military tradition, very easy to make an extreme radical departure for the first time in 50 years of a defensive alliance, but that is happening in this situation.

We also see the ghosts of LBJ rising like from the mist of the Potomac where we have a President who is selecting bombing targets in a war. We have Madeleine Albright going on television, on PBS, declaring early on that this was going to be a short, clean, tidy war.

These people do not know what they have gotten into. It is a 610-year-old ethnic war, civil war, religious war, and, yes, Milosevic is a murderer. He has murdered according to the New York Times 3700 people.

But I see the selective outrage up here. I hear nothing about those that want to support the KLA who were murderous. I hear nothing about the 60

million killed in China over the past 50 years. I hear nothing about the 2 million killed in Sudan. Of course there is an oil pipeline that Occidental Petroleum wanted to get through Sudan, so I heard no moral outrage then. I hear no moral outrage about the 1 million people slaughtered in Rwanda. Of course they are not the same color as a lot of us.

I mean let us not go here and beat our chests in moral self-righteous indignation if we are not willing to apply the same test to every region that we want to start wars in.

I will oppose it.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Florida would have heard a great deal about all of those outrages had he been active in the Congressional Human Rights Caucus. The folks who cry crocodile tears for all these people who have been killed and tortured and murdered are nowhere to be seen when we are dealing with human rights issues.

Mr. Speaker, the greatness of this country is measured by the moments when we act in a bipartisan fashion. It was the Marshall Plan, it was NATO, and it was all the bipartisan measures passed by our predecessors that created the great moments of American history in the 20th century.

In the other body 16 of my colleagues' Republican colleagues, some of the most distinguished members of the Republican party, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, their most credible presidential candidate, Senator LUGAR of Indiana, the foreign policy expert, Senator JOHN WARNER, head of the Armed Services Committee and 13 others voted for this identical resolution. They have risen to a high level of bipartisanship.

Now I have some credentials along those lines. I stood up with President Bush 8 years ago and voted to support that President because I felt the national interest was at stake. It is no less at stake today. The blind hatred that is so apparent on the part of some of my colleagues towards this administration makes it impossible to make rational judgments.

What we are asking for is to get our troops the feeling that the Congress is behind what they are doing day and night under the most difficult circumstances. That is all that this resolution calls for. And JOHN MCCAIN saw fit to vote for it, as did 15 other distinguished Republican senators. They have taken ownership, if I may borrow the phrase of the Republican whip, they have taken ownership of this measure because this is an American engagement. It is not a Republican or a Democratic engagement, just as the Marshall Plan was an American engagement and NATO was an American engagement.

We are seeing a miracle unfold. Nineteen nations of the most disparate types are united, but our own House of Representatives has risen with division. Vote for this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH).

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. In response to some reckless words from the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) first of all, they were not crocodile tears. It was my resolution that passed on Sudan last year. My colleague can ask the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) or anybody else, that I have been on the forefront for human rights in China, and I challenge my colleague to check the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD over the past year and-a-half or 2 years. If anybody has spoken out more on human rights than myself, I would like my colleague to let me know.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, it should be obvious that the President does not need this resolution to use air power because he is already using it. He needs Senate Con. Resolution 21 because, if it passes, both houses of Congress will have satisfied the War Powers Resolution to authorize force, and that effectively gives the President the power to wage an unlimited war even with ground troops.

Section 5 of the War Powers Resolution states that the President must terminate the use of force after 60 days unless Congress, first, declares war; second, enacts explicit authorization of the use of force; or third, extends the 60-day period. Although Senate Con. Resolution 21 refers only to air war, it is an explicit authorization of force. The President will not be limited to only air war once the War Powers Resolution requirement is fulfilled. Since this resolution authorizes the President to conduct military operations against Yugoslavia in the air, its passage by the House is, in fact, a blank check for the President to wage war, not only to bomb, but to send ground troops.

If Senate Con. Resolution 21 should fail, then the war in Yugoslavia will be limited to air war, which is what is now being waged, and no ground troops, and the President will have to get Congress' authorization to deploy ground troops at a later time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for yielding this time to me.

I would like to start with a quote by a man called Jacob Brownoski that I think is apropos to this situation. In it he says there are two parts to the human dilemma. One is the belief that the end justifies the means, that deliberate deafness to suffering has become the monster of the war machine. The other is the betrayal of the human spirit where a nation becomes a nation of ghosts, obedient ghosts or tortured ghosts. The road to war is paved with unchecked ignorance, arrogance and dogma.

What is our national interest in Yugoslavia? It is peace and stability in a democratic process where all men are created equal. It is in our national interest to check the road to war that has caused the dilemma that we are now in.

I am going to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution before us this evening, and in doing so, yes, I want to stipulate to the work of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) for human rights in China, and let us say that everybody in this room cannot tolerate the atrocities, the brutality that Milosevic has exacted upon the people of Kosovo.

□ 1930

Let us not have a fight about anyone's sincerity on the issue. But in supporting this resolution, I want to say what it is not. This resolution is not a declaration of war. It is not a blank check for the President. It does not authorize the use of ground troops.

In fact, I do not support ground troops in Yugoslavia. It is interesting though to hear those who have criticized President Clinton for taking ground troops off the table as an option now say that they do not support this because it could lead to the authorization of ground troops. It is interesting to hear the same people who want to double the appropriation from $6 billion to $12 billion and those are on the majority side of the aisle say they do not want to support the military action that that funding is being appropriated for.

So how can we have it both ways? We criticize the President for no ground troops, but we do not want to support this resolution because it could lead to ground troops. We do not want to support this resolution because it supports the President's policy on the flights and the strikes, and yet we want to double the amount of money that is there. It reminds me of Yogi Berra who said of a restaurant, ''I don't like the food in that restaurant, and, besides, they don't give you enough.''

Mr. Speaker, let us sound a resounding vote of yes on this resolution, so Milosevic can hear it, so our flyers in the area can hear it, and for the children who are displaced in the region.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I look around this room and I see my senior colleagues, like the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), the gentleman

from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), and I realize very clearly that over the years as the baton has passed from one generation to the next in this political body, that those men and women who serve here manage to make sure that the young men and women who serve in our Armed Forces are used properly for vital national security interests.

I am proud to be here as a new Member. I take very seriously my charge to vouchsafe and keep secure the interests of those young babies now who come to our country as new citizens from birth and what have you. And I absolutely do not understand, Mr. Speaker, what the vital national security interest that senior Members of this body on both sides of the aisle have protected for years and years, what national security interest it is that we are proposing to protect by conducting a unquantified and unidentified military campaign in Yugoslavia, whether it be in the air or on the ground.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the stability of Europe, which is supported by all of the NATO leaders, is very much in the interest of America's national security. I would also suggest that what is extreme and radical is not the action of our NATO allies. What is extreme and radical have been the actions of the modern day Hitler, Slobodan Milosevic.

I do not think we should write a blank check in this matter, and this resolution does not. Let us be clear about that. What we can do in voting for this resolution though is check the power of someone who has killed not 3,700, but hundreds of thousands of innocent men, women and children. How ironic it would be that the NATO leaders who left this Nation's capital just a few days ago unified to stand up to that reign of terror would have that unity now undermined by those of us who work in this Capitol.

Let us recognize that if we stop the air war now, Milosevic wins, NATO loses; the ethnic cleanser wins, and Europe's stability loses. Every other two-bit terrorist in the world would be emboldened to emulate this modern day Holocaust.

If this measure is defeated now, especially in light of the passage of the Fowler resolution earlier, what we will have done today is this: We have said we are not yet ready to support a ground war, and now we are not even sure we want to continue supporting an action of an air war supported unanimously by our NATO allies.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask Members on both sides of the aisle, please, in a bipartisan vote, do not send this message to Mr. Milosevic. Let us send him a clear message, that while we are not quite sure if we want to commit to ground troops today or any day, we do not believe that God's gift of life and liberty stops at the American border. Let us support this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand at all why we cannot have this debate with the clear feeling and understanding that this is not about politics, this is not about party. Some of us just think he is wrong, this is wrong-headed foreign policy.

I believe that in my absolute soul. We do not need to be attacking from the air, we do not need to be attacking with ground troops. We need to get out of the Balkans. It is going to lead to a disaster that will carry us well into the 21st century, and primarily because it is not in our national interest. I totally disagree with that.

Is it a humanitarian cause? Absolutely. And are there ways we should deal with that? Yes. But we need a leader, not a commander-in-chief. We needed a leader to deal with this with Europe.

Many, many, many months now have gone by. I have been there and done this, Mr. Speaker. I watched this occur as a young man when we went to Vietnam. I did not question the Congress and I did not question the President. He said we needed to go, and I was ready to go.

I will tell you another thing. Those of you who think this is such a clear-cut mission, perhaps if you are young enough, and I consider myself, maybe we ought to resign from Congress and go into the Balkans. Let us fight through the mountains over there with the Marines, if that is what you believe is so important; and if you are not young enough to go, send your sons. That is the question: Will you let your son die for humanitarian interests that we well should put on the backs of the Europeans?

It is time for them to grow up. We need a leader who is sanctioning Britain and sanctioning France and talking to Russia and saying you guys have been burned down twice in this century, you need to be in the Balkans. You need to have peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to vote for this one minute, and I hope no one will, because I agree this may allow him to put ground troops in.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. It is identical to the resolution passed by the other body in March. It expresses Congress' support for our forces caring out a brave mission. It sends an important message to Slobodan Milosevic that his savage campaign of ethnic cleansing against the Kosovar Albanians will not be tolerated.

Mr. Milosevic continues to wage war on ethnic Albanians. His acts of violence, mass murder of civilians, driving 950,000 people, whole communities, from their homes to refugee camps in foreign countries, have forced our hand. If left unchecked, he will continue his crimes in Kosovo.

I heard a Member opposed to our mission in Kosovo earlier today compare this action to the Gulf War and say that the difference was that we had a national interest in the Gulf; oil. Well, I do not know the going rate for a barrel of oil today, but I do know that you can put no price on the lives of men, women and children who have been slaughtered in Kosovo.

It is in our national interest to stop genocide. We have witnessed a grave humanitarian crisis in Kosovo and a destabilization of the region and neighboring countries like Macedonia and Albania.

By endorsing air strikes now, Congress is not tying its hands in the future. Congress can still and I believe should vote on sending ground troops if we reach that point in the future.

Vote to authorize air strikes in Yugoslavia. Let our young men and women in the Armed Forces know that our prayers and our support are with them as they fight to counter aggression and to foster peace.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER).

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. First, as was expressed by some of my colleagues in their concern earlier today on our first resolution when they had concerns with wording, I believe this resolution is very poorly drafted, and those that had that concern earlier I am sure must share that concern on this resolution, because it authorizes the President ''to conduct military air operations and missile strikes against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.''

Now, this appears to authorize the President to conduct airborne operations; in other words, drop paratroopers into the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

It also authorizes the President to pursue ''missile strikes'' of an unspecified variety, which theoretically could include strategic weapons.

Moreover, I oppose this measure because, as one of those in the leadership who met with the President twice prior to the bombing, I joined many of my colleagues from both parties in asking the President face-to-face to seek specific authorization from the Congress before proceeding with any air campaign. He ignored that request. Today I cannot in good conscience retroactively authorize him to do something that I did not support and that he undertook without regard for the Congress' responsibilities under the Constitution and the very direct bipartisan

advice he received before he began the bombing.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution to authorize United States involvement in the NATO air operations against Slobodan Milosevic's military force.

It is both in our strategic and humanitarian interests to end the vicious ethnic cleansing campaign that Slobodan Milosevic is pursuing in Kosovo. His actions have threatened the stability of southern Europe, jeopardized our efforts to maintain peace in other parts of the Balkans and unleashed a flood of refugees into poor and underequipped nations in the region. It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that we must take action to end this tragedy.

A couple of weeks ago I traveled to Brussels with Secretary Cohen. I met with General Clark and the delegates of our NATO allies. The resolve that every person and every country involved in this operation showed then was reinforced this past weekend in Washington.

The truth is, our air campaign is working. We are knocking out the infrastructure of Mr. Milosevic's military and isolating his troops in Kosovo. If we continue to take out the four corners of his fighting machine, his whole house of cards will come crashing down.

We must make clear to Mr. Milosevic that the bombing campaign will not cease until he withdraws his troops and allows the citizens of Kosovo to return to a life of peace and autonomy. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The Chair would advise Members that since this resolution was taken directly from the table, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) has the right to close.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has 7 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, we have sons and we have daughters of America in Apaches, in F–16s, in submarines, fighting for principle and fighting against ethnic cleansing.

Now, we can do nothing; we can ignore the horrific holocaust. That is not acceptable. We can send in ground troops, and that is not an option for me, for many of our NATO allies, or for our troops. But we can support this authorization to conduct military air operations against Yugoslavia.

□ 1945

We must now aggressively and vigorously pursue victory for our people, for principle against ethnic cleansing, and for NATO. Defeat is not acceptable.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support our policy on Kosovo. Some in this debate have said our goal is not clear, but our goal is to stop Milosevic's slaughter of Albanian Kosovars, to prevent the spread of conflict, and to permit the Kosovars to return safely home. Our allies share that objective.

This century is the bloodiest in human history and the world's democracies must stand against Slobodan Milosevic's bloody repression if we hope to deter other tyrants from engaging in ethnic slaughter.

In Kosovo there are no clear answers, no good options, but to do nothing in the face of Milosevic's barbarity would be barbarous itself.

Some see Kosovo as another Vietnam. I disagree. Kosovo is another Cambodia, another Rwanda. Let us learn the lesson of those in other killing fields and not allow our belated or inadequate response then to compound this tragedy today. The lack of a perfect choice is not an excuse to take no action.

Some here today have declared after 30 days that this policy is a failure. Well, we should be made of sterner stuff than that. The young men and women in our military are made of sterner stuff than that. We need to be patient with this policy in Kosovo. The bombing campaign, even with its limitations, should be given time to work. Ground forces may yet be required, and we will have that debate. But for now, we should maintain our unity, stay the course. America is strong enough to see this through.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, the day the bombing began, this Member stood on the floor and said, this is a tragic day, undoubtedly the beginning of a tragic scenario, and that is exactly what it was. We have heard today about hamstringing the President. But I would like to point out that, in fact, no authorization was requested by the President before the bombing began, and he has not asked for that authorization to this day.

This is a gratuitous authorization. I do not think it is wise that it is brought up. I wish even at this late date that it would be withdrawn. Bombing for peace, bombing for peace is wrong, and it is not working. I regret the fact that any of our colleagues would suggest that decisions of this gravity are based upon partisan considerations.

I say to my colleagues, we have a war, in Yugoslavia. We can call it whatever we want, but it is a euphemism unless we recognize it is a war. It is an unmitigated disaster. Our and NATO's involvement in this war is an unmitigated disaster. That is the ugly truth, and everybody knows it. They certainly know and talk about it in the Pentagon.

In the past, NATO, the 12 members, the 16 members, now the 19 members, were a defensive pact, and for the first time NATO has used those forces aggressively. We can imagine what the Soviet Union said, and now what the Russians say about NATO as an aggressive force. Well, we have just confirmed their worst suspicions and, in fact, we set back Russian-American relations dramatically for years to come. We have reinforced the wrong people in Russia in the process.

We cannot say that this war has unintended or unanticipated consequences. They were entirely predictable. I had hoped that people in the administration would have looked at and understood the history of the Balkans. I would have hoped they would have talked to people who know Mr. Milosevic and how he came to power.

I had a chance to visit with the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and General Shelton in a meeting convened by the Speaker, a bipartisan meeting, and I laid out the dire consequences that I thought would prevail if, in fact, the bombing campaign began, and all of those predictions but one have come true. The remaining prediction is that after starting to bomb we would have combat troops involved in Yugoslavia in 2 months. We are a little over a month and counting, and we are headed for those combat troops in Yugoslavia.

Now, look at it from the side of the Albanian militants, the KLA. They never wanted autonomy, they wanted independence, and that is what they want today. Look at it from the side of the Serbians. We have to recognize that Kosovo is sacred ground for the Serbs. It is where they all came together in an infamous but courageous defeat in 1389, and they have not forgotten what happened on the Field of Blackbirds.

It is for them the same as if Lexington, Bunker Hill and Yorktown are rolled up into one. It is like asking a Texan to give back the Alamo, site of another courageous defeat, to the Republic of Mexico. That is what it means to the Serbs. Milosevic had no option to give up his Serbian control over Kosovo. He did not have that option. And what we have predicted, that the Serbs would coalesce around Milosevic, has happened. Yes, I say to my colleagues, as negative and terrible an individual as Milosevic is, he would now be followed by more Serbian leaders who have this very kind of militant, aggressive Serbian nationalism rearoused.

What has happened, of course, is that Milosevic made his reputation in

Kosovo by jumping right over his mentor by speaking to the abuses, real, alleged and exaggerated, that were taking place against the Serbian minority in Kosovo. And that is how he played upon their emotions, and that is what has been further ignited by the bombing campaign.

What happened when we threatened we would bomb, and then we held off, and we threatened and we threatened? Well, of course, it provided time for him to deploy his troops in and around Kosovo, in fact right on the Macedonian border, for that matter. And all of the NGOs and independent observers, they went out of Kosovo, naturally, and so no one is there to report on the atrocities and the ethnic cleansing that were accelerated when we began that air war, just as predicted.

Some people have said, and in fact the Secretary of State said before our committee, well, we had no idea he would be so brutal and thorough and energetic in the ethnic cleansing. I say to my colleagues, we had an object example in Bosnia with Croatian and Serbian ethnic cleansing like we had not seen since World War II in Europe. Of course, we had an idea of what he would do.

Were we ready for it? Did we anticipate it? Did the people that launched this war have this in mind? Look at the refugees coming out of Kosovo into Macedonia and Albania and Montenegro. Look at the people dying from all kinds of disease and from hypothermia. NATO was not able to take care of them. It is obvious NATO was not ready for it. The Administration and NATO did not anticipate this result.

One of the frustrating things about being on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence at a period of time when Yugoslavia was in danger of disintegration was that we had the best information about what would happen with the disintegration of Yugoslavia. We knew a blood bath was coming in Bosnia where three religious/ethnic groups live side by side, and we knew that Kosovo was a tinderbox waiting to explode with its Albanian majority, but our vital national interests were not involved yet. Where they are and still remain involved is in Macedonia. And we should have gone to great lengths never to destabilize Macedonia. This air war is, in fact, pushing us towards a destabilization of Macedonia. Why is that so important? Because it is likely to bring Greece and Turkey, overtly or covertly, in on opposite sides, fracturing the NATO alliance, and that, I say to my colleagues, is very much against our vital national interests.

But we have taken steps inadvertently, but predictably, to destabilize Macedonia. And yet today, the Yugoslavian military is basically intact. All the armor units are setting there; they are not using their engines, they are not using fuel, they are in hiding. And they have not used their air defense systems at this point. We have been attacking, but we have been attacking refineries and bridges and a whole variety of things that are important to the long term, but the Yugolavians or Serbians military is basically setting there intact. And what are we assured on the other side? We have assured the rule of the KLA militants in Kosovo beyond this.

I urge all of my colleagues to take a look at the May-June 1999 issue of Foreign Affairs and read the article by Chris Hedges, the former Balkan Bureau Chief of the New York Times.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the resolution. Vote against it. I voted against the War Powers Act; for strategic and tactical reasons we do not want to give that 30-day warning before a withdrawal would theoretically be required under the invocations of the War Powers Act. I urge my colleagues, do not take this gratuitous step to authorize the bombing war.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), our closing Democratic speaker, a senior member of the Committee on International Relations who just returned from a trip to the Balkans region.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, we have a very important vote coming up in a few minutes. We are hearing discussions today about people saying, this in our national interests? Why should we be concerned about those people over there?

Well, for 50 years we have been partners with our neighbors in western Europe. We came together to stop the Soviet threat from taking over Europe and coming over to our shores. All of a sudden, when there is a problem with our partners, now we have decided that perhaps now that we have defeated the USSR, it is time for us to take a look at this partnership. Maybe if there is a difficult situation coming up, we ought to step out of it because I thought we were the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Next week we are going to have a constitutional amendment voting on flag desecration because we love our flag so much. And here we see people talking about, let us take our flag and let us run out of there because a person in a country of 11 million people, about the size of Tennessee, has raped and robbed and destroyed, killed, maimed a whole group of people, and we are saying this is not in any interests of ours. Destabilizes central Europe, destabilizes western Europe, and it continues to spread.

I am shocked by some of the speeches that I have heard in this discussion today. Mr. Speaker, 60,000 people in Montenegro, 120,000 in Macedonia, 300,000 in Albania.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous support for S. Con. Res. 21 so that we can put this in its right and proper perspective.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. Con. Res. 21. This resolution authorizes the current military air campaign that was launched by NATO a little over a month ago. Mr. Speaker it is important to note the bipartisan support, which this bill received in the Senate. I believe that this resolution will enable NATO to achieve its goal of a durable peace that prevents further repression and provides for democratic self-government for the Kosovar people.

This Body can send an invaluable message to Milosevic, to our troops, and to the world. If we adopt this resolution authorizing air operations and missile strikes against Yugoslavia, we will show our support for the troops carrying out this mission. If we adopt this resolution we will signal to our NATO partners that our resolve to see stability and peace prevail in Europe is no less today than it was during WWI and WWII. When we adopt this resolution we signal to Milosevic that his campaign against the Albanians of Kosovo is unacceptable.

Endorsing airstrikes today does not preclude a vote in the future to authorize ground troops in the future. But we are certainly not at that point now. Instead this Body should show patience and determination. The airstrikes are an effective means of delivering our message. We must make Milosevic feel the pain and pay a heavy price for his policy of repression and aggression in Kosovo.

If this Body fails to adopt this resolution now it would be interpreted as a vote of no confidence for our foreign policy in the Balkans. It would send confusing signals about our national resolve to persevere to friend and foe alike. The blame for this crisis lies not with the President, the U.S. Congress, or even the NATO airstrikes; rather the blame rests with Slobodan Milosevic.

Milosevic shoulders the blame for the current crisis. I stand firm in my determination to see the killing of innocent Kosovar Albanians ended. War and conflict is not my first choice, it is not the first choice of any American, but there are times when force must be employed. We joined the NATO alliance some fifty years ago to provide stability and to limit aggression. If we ignore the acts committed by Milosevic, then our fifty-year commitment to NATO will have been lost.

During WWII this nation turned away a ship full of Jewish immigrants from our shores. The 907 immigrants on board the S. S. St. Louis sought to escape the horrors of Nazism but our nation sadly turned them away. In the aftermath of WWII the American people pledged to never again to allow ethnic cleansing to occur and to never again to ignore the plight of those who face genocide. This Body must answer the call of the 1.6 million Kosovars displaced from their homes and of those who can rest in the unmarked mass graves.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. We should follow the Senate and send a unified message to our troops, to Milosevic, and to our allies.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Gejdenson resolution to authorize the NATO action in Yugoslavia.

Tragically, we were unable to prevent Serbian forces from brutally killing thousands of people, forcing innocent people from their

homes, and burning and bombarding countless villages.

Now, we must do everything in our power to put an end to this tragedy, to halt the mass killings, and hold accountable those responsible for the unspeakable atrocities that Serbian forces are committing against the ethic Albanians in Kosovo.

First, we must aid the refugees in any way that we can. We cannot allow refugee camps to turn into death camps due to poor sanitation, the spread of disease, and the lack of food and shelter. I support a massive humanitarian response to this crisis. The U.S. should do whatever it takes to bring food, medicine, and shelter to the refugees, and I support efforts by the United States and other countries to admit any refugees seeking asylum.

But I am afraid that is not nearly enough.

We have a moral obligation to protect the internally displaced ethnic Albanians within Kosovo. Those who have not yet been slaughtered must be protected. We must not allow them to suffer the same fate as so many other Kosovars.

Unfortunately, we did not act soon enough to address the murderous actions by Serbia, and today thousands of people are dead because of international indifference. We ought to create safe havens for ethnic Albanians inside of Kosovo—and we ought to do it as soon as we can. This would prevent further expulsions and mass killings. This will not be easy and will not be without a loss of lives, but it must be done. We cannot allow the leader of one nation to wipe out an entire ethnic group. At the end of World War II and the Holocaust, the world made a collective promise to all future people. We said ''never again'', we ought to mean it.

However, it is unlikely, at this point, that air strikes alone will bring an end to this conflict. We ought to consider other options, including the use of ground forces. We now have to be prepared to forcefully enter Kosovo and occupy the area in order to make the safe return of refugees possible. This is not a task that we ought to take lightly, but it is one that must be done.

NATO must continue to assess the situation and make adjustments as they see fit. This resolution gives the Administration the flexibility to respond quickly to any new developments and continue their efforts on all fronts to resolve this conflict. I urge support for this resolution.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I voted for the bipartisan Senate-approved resolution authorizing President Clinton to continue military air operations and missile strikes against Yugoslavia. I supported this resolution because it shows strong support for the troops while endorsing the NATO action as the best available way to convince President Milosevic that his campaign of ethnic cleansing is unacceptable.

We in Congress must take care to be supportive and not limit our future military options in Kosovo, especially given that the situation may change faster than Congress can react. For that reason, I opposed the Goodling-Fowler resolution as it would have required Congressional authorization before using ground troops. Even though the Goodling-Fowler resolution will never find its way into law, the act of approval by the House sends all the wrong signals about our commitment to NATO's actions. We cannot afford to tie NATO's hands or broadcast our military intentions—especially at this important juncture in the conflict.

I also opposed both proposals by Representative CAMPBELL, one declaring war on Yugoslavia and the other demanding the removal of our armed forces from their positions near Yugoslavia. I believe both resolutions were extreme and not helpful in advancing NATO's efforts to restore peace to the region, in returning the Kosovars to their homeland, or in reducing or eliminating Milosevic's ability to threaten his neighbors or terrorize minorities inside Yugoslavia.

However, I feel clarifying Congress' role in foreign conflicts under the War Powers Act is one worth considering at an appropriate time. We in Congress have continued to neglect what Congress' exact role should be in these situations. It is unfortunate that we seem to only visit this issue in the middle of conflicts, when such debate is confusing at best, and often inappropriate. I am hopeful we can schedule a full debate on this issue at a time certain before the end of this Congress.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Speaker, the vote today on S. Con. Res. 21—although largely symbolic because of its timing—presents every Member of this House with a grave dilemma. On the one hand, we can vote against this resolution and the deeply flawed policy that it represents, even though doing so risks undermining our troops and giving comfort to Slobodan Milosevic, Europe's last Communist dictator. On the other hand, we can vote for this resolution and ratify a flawed policy which has failed to make any progress towards stopping the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo.

Neither of these choices is attractive. But I believe that my duty as Member of the United States Congress compels me not to undercut our current policy, flawed as it might be, but to focus on finding a credible diplomatic alternative.

I support a negotiated solution to the conflict in the Balkans, and I was one of 15 Democrats in this body who last month voted against authorizing the use of U.S. troops in Kosovo. I warned back then that a continued escalation of military action would only serve to undermine conditions for lasting peace in the region. Regrettably, these fears have been borne out.

With all that said, Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience vote against the efforts of our Nation's Armed Forces when a military operation is already underway. Our soldiers are in the Balkans doing the job we sent them to do. A unilateral halt to the bombing at this stage in the conflict would not bring us closer to a lasting peace in the Balkans. Instead, it would give the Milosevic regime a boost and deprive the NATO alliance of critical negotiating leverage.

However, the sooner we begin negotiations, the sooner the air strikes can stop. Continuing to seek a military solution to a political problem will only mean that more Albanian Kosovar, Serb, and American lives are lost in vain. Just yesterday, General Wesley Clark, commander of NATO forces, acknowledged that NATO air strikes have not slowed the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo's Albanian population. And just yesterday, NATO forces again mistakenly struck a civilian target in Serbia, killing 17 people including 11 children.

The United States of America believes very strongly in doing the right thing—and we have an exemplary record of fighting for what is right around the world. But as Henry Kissinger has pointed out, a supremely moral foreign policy is useless if it is not effective.

As difficult as it may be, we must acknowledge that the bombing campaign has not been effective—and we must immediately begin to seek a negotiated solution to this conflict. The sooner negotiations start, the sooner the bombs will stop, and the sooner the Kosovo refugees can return home.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of this resolution which passed the Senate last week with bipartisan support. But let us step back and take a long-term view of the Balkans.

Milosevic is the only tyrant left in Europe. Who amongst us predicted 10 years ago that some of the most reprehensive Communist regimes in Central Europe would today be thriving democracies and members of the European Union and NATO. That is the trend in Europe and that is my long-term prediction for the Balkans as well. One tyrant cannot stop it for long.

But in the meantime we have some short-term objectives.

Peace and humanity will prevail in Kosovo.

The refugees will go home.

They will have security.

And they will have self-autonomy.

And, Mr. Milosevic, these terms are not negotiable.

NATO will prevail.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I voted to require the President to obtain congressional approval before deploying ground troops in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY). The framers of the Constitution clearly intended that the power to initiate war, whether declared or undeclared, should reside in the legislative branch of government. The power to lead the nation without congressional authority into a costly overseas military adventure is a power the Constitution explicitly denies the President of the United States.

The Administration's policy in FRY is extremely short sighted and is a clear example of why the Administration should have come to Congress before committing U.S. troops to the NATO airstrikes. A congressional debate would have forced the Administration to define every aspect of NATO's Balkan policy. Congress should have been given the chance to ask the tough questions that still linger after weeks of bombing. Instead, NATO and the Administration are defining and defending their policy as they go along. The result has been a tenuous military coalition with a mission constantly questioned. This has emboldened Milosevic to escalate his genocidal campaign and strengthened his power in Serbia. A completely unified NATO force backed by a well-defined long term Balkan policy before executing any military operations might have made Milosevic a willing participant in peace negotiations.

The congressional leadership has presented Congress with a lot of bad choices today as well. It is unfortunate that Congress is falling into the trap that the Administration has set for it. Before the NATO airstrikes began, the Clinton Administration wanted us to believe that the only options available were to bomb or do nothing. Now Congress wants us to believe that the only options are to continue the severely flawed military operations or withdraw our troops and do nothing. Unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces from the military operations at this time would cause the collapse of

NATO and be tantamount to a victory for Slobodan Milosevic.

While I support the efforts of my colleagues today to begin asserting their Constitutional duty to authorize military actions, I question the timing. Debating whether or not to withdraw our troops while they are engaged in a military action, is extremely irresponsible. There is a way to assert our Constitutional duty without undermining the safety of our troops. I have introduced legislation for the last 8 years to require Congress to authorize military actions before U.S. troops are placed in hostilities.

The continuing religious and ethnic strife in the Balkans is unlikely to be resolved by offensive military actions. Milosevic has more than demonstrated his willingness to sacrifice the lives of his own people to retain his power. There is another option. The U.S. and NATO should call for a cease fire contingent upon a pull back of Serbian forces and the beginning of real negotiations including Russia and the United Nations. The Rambouillet agreements were fatally flawed and designed to fail. It's time to go back to the drawing board and negotiate enforceable peace between Milosevic and the Kosovar Albanians.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the House has the opportunity to debate these important questions before us today. While I have not supported the first three options before us, I do believe that Congress needs to have a voice in the involvement of the United States in Operation Allied Force. We should stand up and express our support for our troops and our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). We must also take this opportunity for Congress to show Mr. Milosevic that we are united in our belief and determination that his campaign of terror must be stopped.

We must work with the international community to help restore peace to the region and to ensure that the Kosovar Albanians who want to return to their homes are allowed to do so. We must work with our Allies to force Milosevic to withdraw his military and paramilitary forces from Kosovo and to provide self-governance for Kosovo. Mr. Speaker, we must work together with our Allies in Europe to achieve a lasting peace in this critical region.

To accomplish these goals, we must continue to participate in Operation Allied Force and support the air strikes. We are steadily diminishing the power of Mr. Milosevic and his military forces. For the United States to withdraw from this operation at this time would, in my opinion, undermine the entire NATO effort to stem Milosevic and his campaign of terror against the Albanian population, hand Milosevic a victory and, in effect, validate his campaign of ethnic cleansing. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues how we can in good conscience turn our back on these people and the horrible crimes that are being perpetrated against the Kosovar Albanians.

While I commend my colleague from California, Mr. CAMPBELL, for bringing this issue before the House, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing both of his resolutions. We should not withdraw our troops or declare war against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

I also oppose H.R. 1569 offered by Representatives FOWLER, GOODLING, and KASICH. This bill would prohibit the Department of Defense from deploying ''ground elements'' in Yugoslavia unless such a deployment is authorized by Congress, I again urge my colleagues to vote ''no''. Passing this proposal at this time is at best premature and at worst is a prescription for failure of our current air strike operation. The Fowler/Goodling/Kasich bill is unnecessary. Congress ultimately holds the power of the purse and will continue to have the ability to withhold funding for this operation. In addition, if events change and the President decides that ground troops are needed, he should come to Congress and ask for our support and approval at that time.

Furthermore, if this prohibition of funds were to become law, many aspects of the current NATO operation could be imperiled. We would be weakening our own position for future negotiations for a settlement by removing the threat of possible ground troops in the future. We must show Milosevic our resolve. We must make it clear to Milosevic that we intend to prevail and that we are reserving options to accomplish victory.

The Fowler/Goodling/Kasich bill also puts our current operations in Yugoslavia at risk. For example, MacDill Air Force Base, located in my community, is the headquarters for U.S. Special Operations Command—a unified command that oversees special operations for the Army, Navy and Air Force. Forces housed at MacDill could very well be involved on the ground in Yugoslavia and Kosovo in support of our air strikes. I am concerned that this bill would put their operations and possibly their lives at peril. We should not limit the ability of the troops already in and around Yugoslavia as part of our current operation.

Our NATO Allies have stepped up to the plate in Kosovo. Just last weekend, at the NATO Summit here in Washington, DC, the leaders of the alliance reaffirmed their commitment and resolve to maintain the air campaign against Yugoslavia until our objectives are met. Now it is time for Congress to step up to the plate and endorse the NATO air strikes against Yugoslavia.

I urge my colleagues to support the Gejdenson Alternative offered in the form of Senate Concurrent Resolution 21. This Resolution authorizes the President to conduct military air operations and missile strikes against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Passage of this Resolution will express Congress' endorsement of NATO air strikes and send a strong message to Milosevic that we are unified with our allies.

Adopting this Resolution will reaffirm to our troops carrying out this mission that Congress supports them. By endorsing the NATO action, Congress will be sending a message that we are unified as a nation and determined to stop Milosevic.

Fifty years ago, we formed NATO to work together for the security of Europe. Today, the Cold War has ended and communism has ended. However, there is still a great need to work to ensure the safety and stability of countries in Europe who have been our partners for these 50 years. We have heard a lot about the fear of Milosevic and his forces crossing over the borders. Some thought this might be an unfounded fear. However, we now know that the Serbian forces have crossed over into Albania, proof that Milosevic has no fear and is quite willing to cross sovereign borders to continue his atrocious attacks on the people in this region. The stability of Eastern Europe is at stake and we must stand by our allies in the region.

I urge this House to show Mr. Milosevic that we stand behind our military and our allies. Join me in supporting Senate Concurrent Resolution 21.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to section 5 of House Resolution 151, the Senate concurrent resolution is considered as having been read for amendment, and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 213, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—213

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Callahan
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez

Vento
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Wolf
Wu

NAYS—213

Abercrombie
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLay
DeMint
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kingston
Kleczka
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mink
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Rivers
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stark
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Upton
Visclosky
Walden
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Aderholt
Blagojevich
Hansen
Mollohan
Shuster
Slaughter
Tauzin
Wynn

□ 2018

Mrs. BONO changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the Senate concurrent resolution was not concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1480, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–120) on the resolution (H. Res. 154) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1480) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the United States Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 833

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 833.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 833

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules is planning to meet the week of May 2 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 833, the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1999.

Earlier today the Committee on the Judiciary ordered H.R. 833 reported and is expected to file its committee report tomorrow, Thursday, April 29. Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H–312 of the Capitol by 3 p.m. on Monday, May 3. Amendments should be drafted to the amendment in the nature of a substitute ordered reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. Copies of this amendment may be obtained from the Committee on the Judiciary. It is also expected to be posted on the committee's web site.

Members should also 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 House rules.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now recognize Members for the purpose of 1-minute speeches.

ADMINISTRATION SHOULD EMBRACE ALL ATTEMPTS FOR PEACE IN BALKANS

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I have asked the Russian government to work constructively towards a resolution of the Balkans crisis, and I am happy to say that the Russian government has responded in the hopes of achieving a workable solution.

Unfortunately, the administration has missed what I and many of my colleagues consider a tremendous opportunity to end this conflict and the bloodshed on both sides.

I commend our counterparts in the Russian Duma and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for their efforts in furthering this option which relies on diplomacy instead of smart bombs.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal includes Serbia's compliance with all NATO conditions, an end to ethnic cleansing, deployment of international troops to Kosovo, and all under a United Nations sanctioned monitoring group.

As a veteran who understands the horrors of war, I believe that we, as a Nation, would regret not pursuing a peaceful solution to this conflict, a conflict which has already caused a humanitarian disaster and potentially thousands of lives, military and civilian alike.

I hope the administration will embrace this effort for peace in the Balkans.

CONGRESS AND NATION SHOULD UNITE TO STAND FOR PRINCIPLE, FOR OUR ALLIANCE, AND FOR FREEDOM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I was elected to this House on May 19, 1981 in a special election. I had decided to get into politics when JOHN KENNEDY ran for President of the United States and he gave an inaugural address, what I think was probably the most famous in our history, perhaps. He said that this Nation would pay any price, bear any burden to defend freedom here and around the world.

I love this institution. I am proud that I am a Member of the House of Representatives. But I have served no worse day than this one in the House of Representatives.

The previous speaker talked about the cooperation of our Russian allies. I agree with that proposition. But more importantly is the cooperation of each of us in a nonpartisan, bipartisan way to say that when our Nation and when our leader makes a determination to confront tyranny, dictatorship and genocide, that we will stand together.

Our young people are flying out of Aviano tonight, this day, this hour. I hope the message that we send to them is not as a divided House or Nation but as a Nation that sees its duty and responsibility as the leader of the free world and, when it comes to the water's edge, can unite to stand for principle and for our alliance and for freedom.

□ 2030

U.S.-CUBAN BASEBALL GAME IS PROPAGANDA BONANZA FOR CASTRO

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this Monday the latest U.S. concession to the Castro dictatorship will take place just a few miles from the Capitol when the Baltimore Orioles will play the Cuban national team.

This event is nothing but a propaganda bonanza for Castro as it helps the dictatorship divert attention from the repression that continues on the island.

For every pitch thrown in the game, one more person in Cuba will be fearing that one of Castro's thugs could come knock on his door and arbitrarily arrest him.

For every hit, one more political prisoner in Cuba will be hungry and needing the medical attention that the regime denies him.

For every inning that goes by, one more dissident will be harassed for speaking merely about bringing freedom to the enslaved island of Cuba.

And let us not fool ourselves. Playing ball with Castro will do nothing to help the Cuban people achieve their long-sought freedom.

Just last Friday, the United Nations Human Rights Commission condemned the atrocities of the Castro tyranny. Yet on Monday we will play ball with that same dictatorship.

We must stop rewarding the Castro tyranny while the regime continues its brutal repression on the people of Cuba, who desire to live in freedom.

DEPLOYMENT OF TROOPS FROM MOODY AIR FORCE BASE, VALDOSTA, GEORGIA

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

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, about 100 members of the 41st Rescue Squadron are scheduled to leave by tomorrow to be deployed in the NATO operation to bring peace and stability to Kosovo. While all of us who serve in this body consider it a very personal matter whenever our troops are sent into harm's way, this is especially the case when they are in our own hometowns.

These troops are from Moody Air Force Base in Valdosta, Georgia, located in Georgia's Second Congressional District. They carry out combat search-and-rescue missions, a highly skilled and dangerous job, yet very vital to these operations.

As they embark upon this mission, I know all of my colleagues join with me in wishing them godspeed and a safe return. My prayers go out to all of the deployed men and women and their families for a speedy return.

God bless NATO. God bless our troops and their families. God bless the people of Kosovo. And God bless America.

ON KOSOVO: BIPARTISAN VOTE IN HOUSE

(Mr. OSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I have been a Member of this House for 14 weeks, as I shared earlier today; and I have to tell my colleagues, my pride in serving here and the honor that I share in being here multiplied at least three orders of magnitude today.

I am a thousand times more proud today of the action of this House in exercising its constitutional authority as one of the legs of this government in specifying its concerns from both sides of the aisle as to the action we have been undertaking in Kosovo.

I want to note for the record that in fact this was a bipartisan vote on both sides of the question. There were more Republicans voting in favor of continuing the President's action in Kosovo than there were Democrats voting against it. But, in fact, there were Members on both sides of the question, from both sides of the aisle.

This is a strength of America. It is the thing we have that no one else in this world does. It is something to be proud of rather than question. And I am still honored to be here.

God bless the United States of America.

TODAY IS A DAY WHICH HOUSE WILL PROFOUNDLY REGRET

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with virtually every word uttered by the previous speaker. The previous vote, in my view, represents an appalling lack of judgment, an appalling lack of will, an appalling lack of leadership, an appalling lack of vision, an appalling abandonment of the national interest, an appalling abandonment of the troops in the field, an appalling lack of bipartisanship.

It is a day which this House will profoundly regret.

IN SUPPORT OF U.S. TROOPS IN KOSOVO

(Mr. SCARBOROUGH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is so easy for other people to come up and say we should stifle our voices and not speak our minds, when people in my district from five military bases in my district are the ones that will be dying over there.

The very children of those troops that will be dying are the ones that go to public school with my children. The wives and husbands of the troops that will be dying are the ones that go to church with me every week. The ones that will be dying over there are the ones that I see every day in and out, five military bases, probably more active duty people in my district than anybody.

So let us not get up here and be self-righteous and talk about how we do not support the troops. This is about supporting the troops. If we think the President's policy is wrong-headed, do not tell me we do not have the right to come to this floor and talk about our concerns.

We have grave concerns. We need to sit back and look at the policy, refocus, and decide what is best not only for the world, not only for this country, but for the troops that we are sending in harm's way.

U.S. AND NATO WILL PREVAIL IN KOSOVO

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I am just in my second term here in the United States and I have to state that tonight I have never been more embarrassed to be a Member of this institution based on the vote that we just cast a few minutes ago.

Has partisan politics so permeated this culture that we cannot see the long-term vision of what is happening in Europe? Milosevic is the only surviving tyrant left on the continent. He is surrounded by democracies.

Who amongst us 10 years ago could have predicted that some of the most repressive Communist regimes in central Europe would be flourishing democracies and members of the European Union and NATO today?

That is the inevitable course of events in Europe. And we have a role. Peace and humanity will prevail in Kosovo. The refuges will go home. They will have security. They will have self-autonomy.

And, Mr. Milosevic, make no mistake about this vote tonight, that is not negotiable; the U.S. and NATO will prevail, or God help us all.

CONGRESS IS SENDING WRONG MESSAGE TO U.S. TROOPS IN KOSOVO

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what we wrought just a few minutes ago. And it is interesting to listen to my colleagues talk about defending the troops and saving lives. But if they would have read the resolution that we had before us just a few minutes ago, although I am not challenging the conscience of those who express themselves, this is where we should do it. That is why we have a democracy.

But it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that just a few minutes ago we voted not to support those troops who have their lives on the line, who engage in the military air strikes, just as our Senate colleagues voted a couple of weeks ago to say we support their efforts in bringing about peace, in bringing about a resolution in fighting for the refuges.

I am not sure what we thought we were doing, but the message that goes out to those who have to leave right now and engage in war and conflict on behalf of the freedom of those of us here in the United States and of those refugees being murdered and raped is that we are not in support of their efforts.

I hope that we will not say to the POWs we do not want them home. I hope that we will correct this mistake that we have made. But most of all, I hope the clear message will be that we, as Americans, stand united behind freedom, behind justice, and behind the safe return of the refugees and the POWs.

PRESIDENT NEEDS TO CONSULT CONGRESS AND AMERICAN PEOPLE WHEN SENDING TROOPS TO WAR

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to address the House in relation to some of the comments that my colleagues have just made.

This has been a very serious day today. We have had some serious debate. Some people really have really been struggling with their consciences and their decisions because we have been talking about young Americans' lives, because we have young American lives at risk today. There are young men and women from my district that are flying over Yugoslavia tonight, dropping some of those bombs.

The message that I think was sent today was twofold. One was to the President of the United States, that whenever he is going to send our young people into harm's way, he needs to come to this Congress, he needs to consult with the Congress, and he needs to go to the American people.

This is not a unilateral decision that should be made by the President. He needs to come to the Congress, the representatives of the people. This is not about whether we support the troops or not. We all support our troops, and we are going to give them every resource they need. But the President of the United States needs to come to this Congress.

And second is that we do have a democracy that works. Our forefathers were so wise because this is an institution that works. And while we disagree and sometimes we like the way the vote comes out and sometimes we do not, the institution of our government works and it will continue to work for as long as this country lasts.

CONGRESS SUPPORTS AIR WAR IN KOSOVO

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this has been a momentous day. And it is important that the Nation, and especially the leaders in Belgrade, do not misinterpret what happened here.

America will continue the air war, and that air war has the support of this House. America demands the resettlement of the Kosovars in safety in Kosovo, and that has overwhelming support. And that is all indicated by our rejection of the resolution to withdraw all military efforts from the Yugoslav theater.

We also voted clearly, and the White House should not misconstrue this, that before massive ground forces are deployed, Congress must be consulted.

And finally, in what I fear will be a confusing vote, and I use this speech to avoid such confusion, we voted 213–213 on a resolution that seemed restricted to the air war, but those who understand our legal system will recognize that the reason we voted that way was to make sure our own courts did not misinterpret that vote as a vote in favor of a carte blanche to the President. We support the air war by a large vote in this House.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WAMP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

BLIND EMPOWERMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. EHRLICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Blind Empowerment Act, which will impact the lives of nearly a quarter of a million blind people.

The Blind Empowerment Act, Mr. Speaker, restores the long-standing linkage between blind people and senior citizens under the Social Security Act. This bipartisan legislation, which currently has over 230 cosponsors, will restore this historic link and empower blind people.

For nearly 20 years, the blind and senior citizens were linked for purposes of the Social Security earnings test. Generally, the test has been a part of our Social Security program since its inception. The test reduces the benefits of recipients who earn above a certain amount of income from their work.

In 1977, the Social Security amendments established the earnings limit for the blind who receive disability benefits. This exempt amount was linked to the identical exempt amount as applied to seniors 65 and over.

In 1996, we did the right thing by raising the earnings limit for seniors from $11,500 to $30,000 by the year 2002. That was the Senior Citizens Freedom To Work Act. Giving seniors the opportunity to increase their earnings and keep their benefits was the right thing to do.

During the process, however, this historic link between the blind and the seniors was ended, which aided in balancing the budget. As a result, by 2002, when the exemption for seniors becomes $30,000, the lower limit set by Congress for the blind will be half that amount.

It is also important to note that when blind individuals earn more than the earnings limit threshold, they lose all of their benefits. The senior citizens in the same situation would only have their benefits reduced by a rate of $1 for every $3 earned over the limit.

We should not roll back the progress of the last 2 decades by continuing a policy which discourages working individuals from becoming self-sufficient and making a contribution to their communities.

It is my belief that ''delinkage'' occurred because our priorities in 1995 were to rein in deficit spending and not to provide a disincentive to the working blind. The blind want to work and take pride in doing so.

In an era of budget surplus, need for capable workers in a tight labor market, and a clear opportunity to demonstrate fairness and equity, it is time for Congress to restore this historic link. The increasing number of working blind Americans will produce additional tax revenue and contributions to the Federal Treasury and the Social Security Trust Fund.

Approximately 70 percent of working-age blind people are underemployed or unemployed. Accordingly, blindness is often associated with adverse social and economic consequences. It is difficult for blind individuals to find sustained employment or, for that matter, employment at all.

□ 2045

This is especially good, commonsense legislation during this favorable economic time. When I listen to business owners back in my district, one thing they tell me is that their priority is to find and keep quality workers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this House, the rest of my colleagues in this House, to join me in sponsoring the Blind Empowerment Act. I am confident Congress will do the right thing and restore fairness and trust by reestablishing this historic link and return to the blind the vital economic freedom which will empower them to provide for themselves and their families and contribute to the health of this Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WAMP). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. OSE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RECOGNITION OF JUNIOR ROTC PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, recently in my home district, I was invited to participate in a special banquet sponsored by the high school leaders who are members of the Junior ROTC program. The program is administered by a retired military officer and the instructors are usually retired senior noncommissioned officers.

That evening, Mr. Speaker, I was very impressed with the discipline, decorum and the conduct of these young high school students. These young Junior ROTC cadets learn about honor, duty and responsibility to their families, to their communities and to their nation. These young people learn also what it means to live as a free people, to understand and appreciate more what democracy and freedom is all about.

But what impressed me even more, Mr. Speaker, was that as part of the opening ceremony, three candles were brought forth and placed on the head table. The candles were lit, and then the young cadet started explaining that these three candles represented Staff Sergeant Andrew Ramirez from Los Angeles, California; Sergeant Christopher Stone from Smith's Creek, Michigan; and Specialist Steve Gonzalez from Huntsville, Texas. These three soldiers are currently being held captive by the Serbian Army of Yugoslavia. The young cadet then reminded her cadet corps members and the entire audience that on behalf of approximately 1,000 Junior ROTC cadets and all the young people of American Samoa that we should all pray for the safety and welfare of these three soldiers and a special prayer for their families and loved ones.

And I want to thank Major Ernest Logoleo and his administrative staff for doing an outstanding job with the JR-ROTC program in Samoa. And I also want to commend our JR-ROTC instructors for their commitment to excellence and teaching these young people the importance of living under a democratic form of government. Our instructors are—from the Samoana High School . . . CW3 Vasaga Tilo, MSG Afiafi Tinae, MSG Roy Peeble, and SFC Willie Togafau; from Leone High School . . . 1SG Mikaele Taliloa, 1SG Ben Laussen, MSG Tasiga Tofili, and SFC Vainuupo Nuusa; from Fagaitua High School . . . MSG Fatuesi Fatuesi, SFC Ofisa Asoau, and SSG Ernest Misaalafua; from Tafuna High School . . . MSG Lorn Cramer, MSG Arona Gabriel, and MSG Fesili Bryant; from Manu'a High School . . . 1SG Siaosi Asalele and SFC Mose Mata'utia.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend the student cadet leaders from their respective high schools for their demonstration of leadership and example among their peers—Cadet Colonel Fatherday Sele of Samoana High School; Cadet Colonel Diamond Otto of Tafuna High School; Cadet Colonel Bert Fuiava of Manu'a High School; Cadet Colonel Rea Vele and Jason Poyer of Fagaitua High School; and Cadet Colonel Jessica Afalava of Leone High School.

Mr. Speaker, as I was preparing my remarks for this special order, I had a difficult time trying to say with some sense of certainty, how the current debate now pending before the House Floor, is going to end—the options on whether Congress is going to officially "declare war" against the Republic of Yugoslavia, or whether Congress is simply going to pull the plug and tell the President of the United States to take our military presence completely out of Yugoslavia; or, that the President is not to move an inch until and unless the Congress says otherwise. Mr. Speaker, these options do not paint a very pretty picture for our nation and to our NATO Allies, let alone the lives of the three American soldiers that are now being held at risk. And Mr. Speaker, whether it be three American soldiers, 30,000 or 300,000—this begs the question how does America value the lives of our men and women in uniform? whether it be three, 3,000 or more? Mr. Speaker, I consider the life of any American soldier just as important as 3,000 or more.

Mr. Speaker, how is it possible for this Congress to declare war against Yugoslavia and then decide to take our armed forces out of that country? The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we already have committed our soldiers to Yugoslavia by keeping the peace in the State of Bosnia and already has cost our government some $9.4 billion to maintain the peace in this area of Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, there have been some arguments made that our Nation is not the "policeman of the world," that this matter of Bosnia and Kosovo is not in our national interest. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may have already forgotten the fact that we did say that the Balkans is a European issue, and it should be handled by the Europeans. In fact, as I recall, President Chirac of France was quite specific about this matter, saying to the effect, "You Americans stay out of this controversy. We in Europe will handle this." Well, we did. After 3 years of utter failure by France, England, Germany and other leading European countries to solve the crisis in Bosnia, our President was then asked to step in and the Dayton negotiations resulted in where we are now maintaining the peace in Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to be king of the mountain, the leader of the free world and the most powerful nation on this planet. I remember once mentioning to a foreign diplomat here in Washington that the United States is getting tired of being the world's policeman. This gentleman turned to me and said, "So you would prefer China and Russia filling the vacuum? You would now prefer that we negotiate with China or Russia the global issues that will affect the life and death struggles of many nations that look up to America as their last hope for freedom and for economic and political stability?" Mr. Speaker, I had to think again about what this diplomat said to me and wondered what would this world be like if America was not the premier leader of the free world, if America was to take the third or fourth seat down the line and allow China or Russia to lead the world on issues that affect the lives of every human being living in this world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to stay the course, let the President lead this Nation, and that we should support his efforts to resolve the crisis in Kosovo. And if it becomes necessary that we utilize whatever force of arms to bring Milosevic to properly negotiate a peace agreement in that area of the world, so be it. And let us remember those three soldiers who are now held as hostages in Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Major Logoleo and his administrative staff, the instructors of the Junior ROTC program, and more especially some 1,000 high school cadet students who participate in this program. My only hope is that in the future the program will continue to give these young people excellent training in leadership, organization and a love and appreciation of the principles that our Nation was

founded upon, equality, freedom and democracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MANAGED CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago the Republicans defeated President Clinton's health care reform bill. They claimed it would allow the Federal Government to interfere with the doctor-patient relationship. Yet when the same relationship was threatened by a corporate bureaucracy, Republicans last year offered legislation that did nothing to protect the sanctity of choices made by doctors and their patients.

It is the same story in the 106th Congress. Democrats have been waiting 2 years to pass the Patients' Bill of Rights. Right now we are ready to work to improve Americans' access to quality health care. Right now, today, we are ready to make consumer protections real for all Americans. Although many States have passed legislation making patchwork protections State-by-State, this patchwork does not provide a good fix for over 160 million Americans, Americans who need health care reform.

While there are many fine managed care organizations in my own district, and they are good, Sonoma and Marin Counties, California, on the leading edge of health care reform, too many horror stories are all too well known across this country. Doctors tell us real-life horror stories about how they are gagged by insurance companies that dictate what they can tell their patients about treatment options. They tell us that a patient's treatment decisions are often overruled by a clerk and that patients are denied a specialist's care. Or they tell us that patients are shuttled out of a hospital before recovery is complete.

Americans know better. They want better treatment. Americans are demanding that the Republican leadership take real action on health care reform. But instead, the Republican legislation does not ensure that patients have the right to even see a specialist. Nor does it prevent insurance companies from continuing to send women who receive mastectomies home early, against the advice of their physician. Lastly, under the Republicans' bill, if patients are denied care, they would not have the right to a meaningful external appeal. In other words, they will not be able to sue.

In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, the Republican bill will do little to prevent medical decisions from being made by insurance company clerks instead of by doctors and their patients.

What our health care system needs is the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights. This legislation will make sure that doctors and patients are free to make decisions about patient health. The Patients' Bill of Rights will ensure that patients have the right to openly discuss with doctors their treatment options, have the right to receive uniform information about their health plan, have the right to go to the emergency room when the need arises, have the right to see a specialist, and seek remedy from the courts when claims have been unfairly denied.

It is time to put doctors and patients back in charge of our health care system. I urge the Speaker and my colleagues to support the Patients' Bill of Rights. I plead with the Republican leadership to bring HMO health care reform to the House floor for debate.

CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE IN DEALING WITH KOSOVO ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, over the last month this Congress could not have been more irresponsible in the way it has dealt with the issue in Kosovo if it had taken lessons. I would like to walk through with you the quaint way in which this institution has stumble-bummed its way through its efforts to try to deal with our constitutional responsibilities.

First of all, it gratuitously decided to vote on the question of whether or not the President could use peacekeepers in Kosovo. That is not a constitutional prerogative of the Congress. The President as Commander in Chief has the prerogative of deciding where to use troops in noncombat situations.

Then, having gratuitously decided to support the placement of those peacekeepers in Kosovo, when the war began this institution then did not step up to its responsibilities to vote on whether or not the combat should proceed. The Senate did. They passed, I believe, the McCain-Warner motion which indicated their support for the ongoing military operation in Kosovo.

Then, further compounding its backwards approach to this issue, this House decided today that it was going to stipulate that under no circumstances could ground troops be used in Kosovo. Again, that is not a congressional prerogative. Once you are in a combat situation, it is the President and his military advisers who have the constitutional obligation to determine what the best way is to proceed militarily, whether it is through the use of ground forces, whether it is through the use of air power, whether it is through the use of naval power or a combination of the three.

The Congress has the right and an obligation to address the question of whether military activity should proceed, but when they are proceeding it has no right to try to micromanage the combat situations. That is a responsibility of our military leaders and the President.

Then, having compounded the confusion by gratuitously getting involved in that issue, it then proceeded to turn down, by one vote, the endorsement of the McCain-Warner language, good bipartisan language with Republican leadership in the other body. It then turned down our obligation to support troops in the field. I just find the way this institution has approached this to be mind-boggling.

And now, tomorrow, after they have turned down their authorization for what is going on in Kosovo, we will be marking up the supplemental appropriation bill in the Committee on Appropriations. And guess what? The same crowd that voted ''no'' on authorizing this military operation today will be going into that committee and demanding that we double the amount of money that the President asked to spend on it, taking it from $6 billion to over $13 billion and creating an opportunity to pork up the next year's defense bill in the process.

Never, never in the 30 years that I have served here have I seen less vision. Never have I seen less leadership. Never have I seen more confusion. And never have I seen the national interest being left in the dust the way it is tonight. I want to see how many Members of the majority party who today voted against authorizing this operation will tomorrow then demand that we double the amount of spending for the supplemental. It is very clear to me, based on the votes taken here today, that that supplemental appropriation is dead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GANSKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHADEGG addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BISHOP addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF DR. DAVID J. CANTOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, after this week we will be losing a trusted friend at the Congressional Research Service (CRS) who has been instrumental in providing timely and accurate information to Members of the Congressional Steel Caucus and to our staffs regarding the U.S. steel industry and its workers. I am speaking of Dr. David J. Cantor, who is retiring at the end of this month after spending 18½ years with CRS as a specialist in industry economics.

Dr. Cantor brought to CRS a distinguished academic and professional background when he joined the staff in 1980. Dr. Cantor has a Ph.D. in Economics from Harvard University and held faculty positions at Boston University, Nasson College and Golden Gate University. He spent several years with the U.N. Industrial Development Organization in Vienna, Austria and worked as an Energy Specialist with the California Energy Commission.

At CRS, Dr. Cantor has followed energy economics and the pharmaceutical industry, but his primary specialization has been following the steel industry. In the early 1980s, Congress enacted an enforcement mechanism for the Voluntary Restraint Agreements (VRA), which allowed the domestic steel industry and its workers to take actions to modernize the U.S. steel industry and make it world competitive. Throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, Dr. Cantor authored numerous reports monitoring the Steel VRA program which allowed the Steel Caucus to closely monitor the Administration's enforcement of this program.

Dr. Cantor also authored a report demonstrating that import limitations of the steel VRA program were not responsible for rising steel prices. More importantly, Dr. Cantor authored a series of reports that defined the steel industry as a basic industry, and not just as a supplier to steel using sectors of the economy. As Chairman of the Congressional Steel Caucus, Dr. Cantor's work has been instrumental in our work to maintain this vital U.S. industry and the important jobs associated with it.

Most recently, many of us have worked closely with Dr. Cantor to understand the current steel import crisis and to formulate legislative proposals that respond to this import crisis.

We in Congress who work closely on issues relating to the U.S. steel industry and to workers in this important industry have come to trust and value Dr. Cantor's analysis of steel issues. We have come to expect the clear and unequivocal conclusions that he has provided to us. To his tribute, he has earned the trust of not only Members of Congress and their staffs, but also of the steel industry, the unions and steel users. On behalf of the Members of the Congressional Steel Caucus, I would like to thank Dr. Cantor. We wish him and his wife all the best when they begin their retirement in Phoenix, Arizona this summer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2100

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE'S OBFUSCATION OF ISSUES SURROUNDING GULF WAR ILLNESSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WAMP). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the GAO recently presented me with results of a year-long investigation regarding reports that the presence of antibodies for squalene had been discovered in the blood samples of 6 Gulf War veterans. I am deeply troubled over the Department of Defense reply to the GAO recommendation. The GAO simply stated that since scientifically-credible research produced these findings, it would behoove the Department of Defense to conduct their own test to replicate or to dispute the results. We owe this to our veterans.

The DOD response to the report has been unconscionable. In the department's official letter of comment Dr. Sue Bailey accused the GAO of being, and I quote, scientifically and fiscally irresponsible. That is a reprehensible statement, and I can not allow that accusation to go unchallenged.

The recommendation reflects the scientific community's conclusion that the squalene antibody research is based on well-established principles. The lead researcher at Tulane University is widely respected. Tulane and the researchers have offered their assistance to DOD. Considering this, the Department of Defense cannot accuse the GAO of scientific irresponsibility.

What is irresponsible is for the DOD to conclude that it can afford to wait for the lengthy publication process before conducting its own inquiry. Over 100,000 Gulf War era veterans are now afflicted with a tragic assortment of health problems. We have a moral obligation to aggressively pursue any legitimate research that may provide hope and answers.

Further, the DOD challenged the GAO's recommendation on fiscal grounds. I find this stunning. Over $100 million have been spent researching Gulf War illnesses with little to show for the effort. DOD officials admitted to the GAO that they could develop such an assay at minimum cost and test it on a sample of sick veterans. This first step could be funded for as little as $10,000.

GAO's investigation was hindered repeatedly by DOD's refusal to provide forthright and truthful answers to investigators. They misled the GAO regarding when they began the research of the experimental squalene adjuvant, how many studies they did and how many personnel were involved. While assuring the GAO that investigational vaccine were not used, DOD officials were not able to provide documentation on the process and results of the decision-making related to the administration of vaccines during the Gulf War.

These actions mirror the continual difficulty that has been encountered in trying to get the truth regarding risk factors during the Gulf War. There has been a pattern, a consistent pattern, of denials. For example, DOD initially refused to even acknowledge that many vets were having serious health problems.

With this kind of track record and a tragic past history of experimental medical research, the DOD cannot expect us to simply accept their denials and refusals. Our ability to recruit and retain has been compromised by the department's obfuscation on many issues surrounding the Gulf War illnesses. They must act immediately and with integrity to resolve whether or not squalene antibodies may be contributing to the illnesses of Gulf War era veterans. It would go a long way in helping the DOD to restore its seriously damaged credibility and restoring the trust of our men and women in uniform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MORAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL WARS MUST BE FOUGHT IN SELF DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from several Members already about being unhappy with the legislative process today. The votes did not go exactly the way I wanted, but I am not all that unhappy with what happened because there was a serious effort for this House to restore some of the responsibility that they have allowed to gravitate to the administration and to our Presidents over the many years.

Today's legislative process was chaotic, but I think it was chaotic for a precise reason. We are trying to rectify something that has been going on for more than 50 years, and it is not just this President. It is every President that we have had since World War II.

We have in the Congress permitted our Presidents too much leeway in waging war.

This was an effort today to restore that responsibility to the House. It was done sloppily, but considering the alternative of doing nothing, this was much better.

So I am very pleased with what happened today. I am disappointed that there was such strong feelings about the outcome. But I suspect they were not unhappy with the process as much as they were unhappy with not winning the votes.

But nevertheless the votes were very important today. One of the most significant, if not the most significant: we on this House floor today voted up and down on a war resolution. This is not done very often and under the circumstances that exist today, probably the first time.

But that was an easy vote. The House overwhelmingly voted not to go to war. This makes a lot of sense. This is a very good vote. Why should we go to war against a country that has not aggressed against us?

So this was normal and natural and a very good vote. The problem comes with the other votes because they do not follow a consistent pattern.

I think there are too many Members in this House who have enjoyed the fact that they have delivered the responsibility to the President. They do not want war, but they want war. They do not want a legal war, they want an illegal war. They do not want a war to win, they want a war that is a half of a war. They want the President to do the dirty work, but they do not want the Congress to stand up and decide one way or the other.

Today we saw evidence that the Congress was willing to stand up to some degree and vote on this and take some responsibility. For this reason I am pleased with what happened. So voting against the war that has no significant national security interest makes a lot of sense to me.

Another vote, the vote to withhold ground troops unless Congress authorizes the funding for this; this is not micromanaging anything. This is just the Congress standing up and accepting their responsibilities. So this in many ways was very good. This means that the people in this country, as they send their messages to the Members of Congress, are saying that this war does not make a whole lot of sense. If the people of this country were frightened, if they felt like they were being attacked, if they felt like their liberties were threatened, believe me the vote would have been a lot different.

But I am very pleased that this House stood up and said:

Mr. President, you have overstepped your bounds already. Slow up. Do not get this notion that you should send in ground troops. It makes no sense to this House.

Now the interesting thing is that was a resolution, it was a House Resolution, that probably really does not have much effect other than a public relation effect because it would have to be passed by the Senate, it would be vetoed by the President, we would have to override his veto. So, in the practical legislative sense it does not mean a whole lot, but it means something in the fact that we brought it to the floor and we were required to vote on it.

Another resolution that was defeated unfortunately, and it was defeated by a two-to-one margin; this would have said that the President would have to cease, we should have told him to cease, because we have not given him the right to wage war. As a matter of fact, even today we said there will be no war, there will be no declaration of war, so we should consistently follow up and say what we should do is withdraw and not fight a war.

Likewise, when we come to the endorsement of the military bombing, fortunately it went down narrowly. But it in itself, too, does not have any legal effect. That is a House Concurrent Resolution that has no effect of law other than the public relations effect of what the Congress is saying.

But I think it is a powerful message that the American people have spoke through this House of Representatives today to not rubber stamp an illegal, unconstitutional and immoral war. The only moral war is a war that is fought in self-defense. Some claim that this is a moral war because there are people who have been injured. But that is not enough justification. The moral and constitutional war has to be fought in self-defense.

LET US PURSUE A DIPLOMATIC SOLUTION ASAP TO END THE SITUATION IN KOSOVO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this evening the House had an emotionally charged debate about our policy in Kosovo, and contrary to remarks made after the vote, this was not a vote against the troops. This was a vote against the policy of this administration. All of us support the troops and the young men and women who are doing their duty.

But I think it is also sad. I understand that people become so emotionally charged that, if they lose, they automatically say this was a partisan vote, and I understand that. But I think it is important to remember that these are very serious issues, and all of us have very strong feelings about them, and we may not all agree with the views of others.

But I think, as we debate U.S. involvement in Kosovo, it is important to remember that there has been political and religious turmoil in Kosovo since at least 1389. The Muslim forces of the Ottoman Empire defeated Serb forces on the plains of Kosovo at a place called the Field of Black Birds, and Kosovo has been a sacred place for Muslims and Orthodox Serbs for generations. It is unimaginable really that either group would ever be forced to leave a place they consider their homeland.

Now today in the New York Times and other national magazines our military commanders of NATO acknowledged that 5 weeks of intensive bombing has failed to reduce the size of the Serbian forces in Kosovo or in their operations against Albanians. The 4,423 bombing sorties may have rendered Serb air defenses ineffective, but air strikes have not accomplished the stated purpose, to stop the ethnic cleansing of the Kosovars. However innocent civilians in Belgrade, in Kosovo and other locations throughout Serbia and Yugoslavia have been killed by NATO air strikes, and the number of civilian casualties and incidents of misdirected weapons continues to increase. Relentless bombing has become ineffective, and the more it continues, the more innocent civilians are going to be killed and injured in Kosovo and in Serbia, and certainly a military action in which the only victims are civilians will not be long supported by the world community.

Now I do not think we should mislead the American people. We already are in a quagmire in Yugoslavia, and there is no easy way out, and it is very complex.

But in my view, and the reason that I have voted against the resolution this evening, because we have all sat by and we have watched these relentless air strikes that are totally destroying the infrastructure of Yugoslavia, and in the near future they are going to be coming back to America to help rebuild the country; but the reason I voted against the resolution tonight giving the President authority to continue these air strikes is because I believe that at this point America only has two options. One is an all-out ground war with air support to recapture Kosovo.

□ 2115

Now, this option would require over 75,000 ground troops, casualties would be inevitable, and troop presence would be essential to protect Kosovars for a long time once the war was completed.

The other option is a diplomatic solution. The goal of NATO should be to return the Kosovars to Kosovo. A military presence will be required to assure their safety, and, of course, Serbian forces must be removed. Now, there have been some indications recently that Mr. Milosevic may accept and be willing and required to accept the presence of foreign troops in Kosovo. In fact, he alluded to that in a recent interview with C-SPAN.

So I think that we have a real opportunity here through the Russians, through our NATO allies, through others that have contacts with Mr. Milosevic, to push this opportunity. I

hope the President and his advisers will pursue a diplomatic solution as soon as possible to end this situation.

INPUT FROM CONSTITUENTS ON ISSUES OF CONCERN TO AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WAMP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to be recognized tonight in this special order. This special order is one that I hold for a number of members of the majority. I know there are some who are monitoring tonight's special order, and, for those who have something they would like to add to this hour, I would invite them to the floor now.

Mr. Speaker, being from Colorado, I want to take the opportunity to discuss just briefly before I move on to my other remarks once again the tragedy that took place a week ago yesterday in Colorado, and just express for the people of Colorado our profound gratitude for all of those throughout the country who have expressed their support, their concern, who have supported us through prayer and in so many other ways.

It is a tragedy that has really gripped our state, as it has the whole Nation, and it is encouraging for all of us in this time when we need a lot of courage and strength to know the rest of the country stands with us as a State and thinks daily about the families and the victims and all of those involved, young children, not only in Colorado but throughout the country, that are trying to make sense of a situation where I am afraid there is no logical conclusion that can be drawn as to what allows this kind of thing to occur in America.

Nonetheless, it has, and a great Nation such as ours will emerge from such a tragedy stronger in the long run, I am fundamentally convinced of that, and I believe that is possible because of the strength and support and the prayer of all those who have given considerable thought to our State in the last few days.

This is a topic that also emerged, Mr. Speaker, at a town meeting that I had last week. I go home to Colorado every weekend and visit with constituents and hold town meetings as often and as frequently as I can. The Fourth Congressional District of Colorado, which I represent, is a very large one. It represents approximately half of the State of Colorado, the eastern plains, and 21 counties in scope. So I use the opportunity of the weekends to get back home and talk to as many constituents as I possibly can.

I have a standing town meeting every Monday morning halfway between Fort Collins and Loveland, Colorado. Monday morning is a breakfast meeting. Naturally, the focus and concern expressed from the audience there was about the shootings in Littleton and the tragedy at Columbine High School. A number of suggestions and solutions and theories were suggested, of course, but, once again, just the feeling of helplessness, the feeling of just devastation in the wake of something so tragic as the death of so many young people and their teacher is something that we will never, ever forget.

Another topic that comes up at the town meetings frequently is the issue that was at the heart of the debate that took place on the floor today, and that is of the U.S. involvement in Kosovo. I have to say I have run across in the last three weeks one constituent in my district who believes the President has acted properly in committing our armed services and our armed forces to carry out his war in Kosovo, that out of literally thousands of constituents that I have had a chance to meet with over the last three weeks.

The concern of those that I represent is certainly for the troops and is certainly for the most positive outcome we can possibly salvage from the operation in Kosovo, but their paramount concern is for the integrity of our Constitution.

There are many interpretations, I suppose, that can be made of the votes that took place here. Some of our colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle were seen not too long ago flailing their arms and speaking in elevated voices about their disappointment with the outcome of today's votes.

Some believe that the Congress, standing up for the Constitution, is an embarrassment. I would disagree entirely. He think that when our great founders 223 years ago, not just in launching a great country through the Declaration of Independence, but a few years later constructing a Constitution, were correct in suggesting that the authority to declare war should reside within the Congress, this House, as well as the other body, and should not be a function, certainly not a unilateral function, of the chief executive.

There are those today that disagree with that premise, and, after a month and a half of debate and deliberation, this Congress spoke forcefully and reasserted its authority and its constitutional role in deploying troops around the world and expressing its opinion about the constitutional basis for warfare.

One of the things I do in my district, Mr. Speaker, is ask for a lot of opinions. I ask people to write letters. I ask people to attend these town meetings that I hold. I ask people to fill out public opinion surveys that I distribute throughout my district and at these town meetings, and I want to share with you and the other Members tonight some of the results of some of those public opinion surveys. I want to go through some of the responses that I have heard from many people, because it really deals with those first two topics that I addressed at the start of this special order.

One of the questions that I asked in this survey, I asked 8 questions, and some of them rather open-ended. I asked, number one, what is the single most important issue facing the country today? Number two, I asked what is the single most important issue to you or your family? It is remarkable to see some of the responses that came in in response in answering this survey.

The number of times that the issue of morality and our national integrity came up was just astounding. It comes up as the number one issue more often than I would expect it, until you read the full descriptions of people's concerns, and then it becomes more apparent.

Here is one that I want to share. Again, what is the single most important issue facing our country today? Morality and the deficient educational system is the answer. Lack of old fashioned basic educational skills.

Please tell me why, this writer asks, and this writer is from Fort Collins, Colorado, please tell me why our children are cheated out of learning the very exciting history of our great country. This is the greatest country ever conceived, and we do not even teach these children why it is the greatest. They are kept completely in the dark. They are not taught that this is a constitutional republic instead of a democracy, the writer says. They learn nothing about the Founding Fathers, the greatest thinkers of all time. They know nothing about the Revolutionary War that was fought for 6 years to give the American people liberty and the pursuit of happiness. They know nothing about the suffering that the soldiers went through to save this country for liberty. Every other civilized country in the world teaches their children the country's history but ours. Instead, our children are taught socialism. It isn't until we are out of school that we realize how little we know, but it takes years for us to figure out why we have been taught so little.

Here is another writer who writes about his experience in Vietnam and talks about our history as a country and what we stand for as a Nation, why soldiers are deployed around the world and for what purpose. He speaks about getting back to a constitutional framework from which we exercise public policy.

Here is one that wrote about taxes as the number one issue.

We recently finished our kids tax forms for 1998. One of our children is 22 years old and has lived at home half of the year. The other is 19 and has lived at home for the full year. They both attend college full-time and work. They also have the maximum tax withheld from their paychecks. The 22-year-old had to pay in $89 and the 19-year-old had to pay in $181. We feel if government wants to help these kids, quit taxing them so much. College is so expensive, and then to tax them so much is truly unfair.

This is from a husband and wife with two children. They are also from Fort Collins, Colorado.

Here is another one. Again, the first question I asked in the survey is what is the single most important issue facing the country today? Moral decline is the answer from this woman from Wellington, Colorado. What is the single most important issue facing your family? The respondent says strong families for us and America.

When I asked what do you think is the biggest challenge for our schools, I put a number of boxes. Not enough funds reaching the classroom, class size too big, violence and drugs. This respondent checked none of those. They checked the ''other'' box and wrote in weak families as being the issue that has their greatest level of concern.

They wrote a special note that they attached. Congressman SCHAFFER, we are watching, we are listening. Hang tough on your moral convictions. Vote strong for the family. A strong family is a strong Nation. Keep up the good work. We pray for our Nation.

I receive lots of letters like this. I know many other Members of Congress do too. I want to assure all those who observed today's proceedings that it is worthwhile to write to your Congressman, it is worthwhile to pick up the phone, to attend the town meetings, to let us know what you think. There are legions of people here in Washington who read these and respond to them and take them to heart and make them become part of the direction we move in Congress.

There are several here. I see the gentleman from Texas has joined me on the floor, but before I yield time to him, I have to share this one response I received from an attorney who wrote, and please think about this.

Once again, the single most important issue to him, according to his response and return survey, is the breakdown of the family. He asks to see the attached letter, a handwritten letter that he placed on his letterhead.

It says Honorable BOB SCHAFFER, regarding the survey attached, breakdown of the family. There are a number of statistics he included.

Over 85 percent of my criminal case clients come from divorced or single parent families. Every school shooting incident nationwide that I am aware of, except one, involved children from broken homes. Both incidents in Colorado last week of young kids bringing guns or ammunition to school involved kids from broken homes.

Timothy McVeigh's, the Oklahoma City bombing, in parentheses, parents were divorced when he was in his teens. Most of my non-personal injury civil case legal work involves problems people face as single parents or divorced spouses, debt, bankruptcy, child support, child welfare, these kinds of actions and others, and I don't ever handle actual divorce cases, he says with an exclamation mark. There are about the same number of divorce cases as felony criminal cases filed in Larimer County each year, 1,600 cases. We would not need a new courthouse or nearly as large a local, state or national government budget if not for all the broken families.

□ 2130

So there is a connection between social and fiscal issues, he says.

Here are some suggestions he gives us as far as causes. Number one, judges who legislate to set aside State laws, and he gives an example: the right of minors to get abortions, contraceptions without parental involvement, creating an atmosphere of no family responsibility and sexual license, and he is referring of course to the Title X clinics, which is a legitimate concern that all Americans should have. This is the program where the Federal Government provides funds for local health clinics to provide contraceptive services to children without the knowledge, much less the consent, of their parents. He cites that as an example of the authority of families being undercut.

Number two, the number two cause he cites: No-fault divorce and other family-ignorant legislation. Treating non-married parents like real parents regarding custody and visitation.

Three, government welfare programs without goals. This at least is being turned around. Thanks for letting me air my views.

Again, this is from an attorney and one who I happen to know is very involved in many local charities and community activities in the northern Colorado community. I have lots more input from constituents and things that are on people's mind, but I want to yield the floor to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to participate with him in his special order. The gentleman takes, as I do, great faith in learning from our town hall meetings. Meeting with the people we represent, we never fail to learn when we listen carefully to their thoughts, when we listen carefully to the burdens they are under, whether they are just struggling to make ends meet or just trying to get their business going and keep it afloat, or just to have dreams for their kids that they want to make happen and how difficult it is when government gets in the way; even when the government is trying to help, it gets in the way. It is so important.

Like the gentleman, I also consult my constituents whom I represent at my cracker barrel sessions, my town hall meetings, which we have always called cracker barrel sessions around the tradition of meeting around the cracker barrel, talking about what is going on in the community and talking about politics, and we do the same thing today because we have a traditional district. Issues like Kosovo, the war, the shootings in Colorado, Social Security, there is much to discuss, and we had some of our best cracker barrel sessions ever, and I am looking forward to a new round we are holding in the next 6 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, on Kosovo, I want to talk a bit about that. I had a moment, a brief moment this afternoon to start to discuss it, and time was short, and I wanted to go back to it because it is such an important issue.

Mr. Speaker, Americans have big hearts. That is one of our best traits. Whenever we see killing, whenever we see injustice anywhere, we want to stop it, whether there is a national interest in it or not. Well, Kosovo, having good intentions, but a bad plan of proving to hurt the very people we are trying to help; rather than stopping the human suffering, we have increased it. Rather than stabilizing the region, we have made it more unstable. And now, it appears we are ready to pour more fuel on a very deadly fire in this very volatile region.

It seems tragic to me that with the lessons of the Vietnam War barely cold on our plates that we have not learned from it. Like Vietnam, we are waging a war today almost by the seat of our pants, driven not by military expertise, but by polls and what is politically correct and what are the overnight focus groups saying. As the gentleman would guess, results are predictably fatal, and failing.

Worst of all, I think we forget the most important lesson of Vietnam. It is fatal to enter any war without the will to win it. Those who most sought this war have shown that they lack, unfortunately, the political courage to aggressively target Slobodan Milosevic, his leaders and the Serbian army he commands. As General Douglas MacArthur said in a speech to Congress back in 1951, I believe, he said, ''War's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision. In war, there is no substitute for victory.''

Well, if a lethal criminal entered our neighborhood today, our schools, our hospitals, and began to shoot our families and innocent children and victims, the first responsibility of law enforcement would be to bring them down, to stop them cold, now. How would we feel if that responsibility, the law enforcement officers flinched, reluctant to take the shot, reluctant to do what it takes to stop the killing? Well, history will record in Kosovo that America flinched, that the allies flinched. The lives of innocent people, young and old, were lost because the commanders in chief somehow found it immoral or were reluctant to bring the shooters down and end these atrocities.

Last Thursday as I read The Washington Post, I read in one section about the atrocities and the fresh graves that had been dug, and I also read a NATO admission that they were, by design, leaving large sections of the Yugoslav Army untouched in the desire or the strategy that perhaps someday they can be part of a peacekeeping mission. So what I realized was that on the

same day we were describing how young American fighter pilots were heading into Yugoslavia, led and being cleared the way by young American pilots leading the process and clearing the path with overhead reconnaissance planes, again with young American soldiers in them, all risking their lives in this conflict, yet, at the same time, we were, by design, preserving the lives of the Yugoslav Army, the ones who were committing the atrocities.

I find nothing humanitarian in a policy that allows young American soldiers to lose their lives, but lets Milosevic live. I find nothing moral or just about a policy, a strategy where the lives of innocent Kosovars die lonely and cold and hungry by the side of the road while we leave the Yugoslavian Army untouched, those who committed the atrocities, remain untouched.

Today in The Washington Post, and in many papers across America and in Texas where I live, NATO updated the war, and they went through a pretty impressive list of the aircraft that they destroyed and the airfields and some of the hangars and office buildings, and some of the infrastructure. But when it came to talking about the Serbian Army and what damage we had done to those who have committed the atrocities, they were silent.

Unfortunately and tragically, we now have pilots, young American pilots who risk their lives, and not in the hopes of preserving the American Army, but in preserving the Yugoslavian Army, and their targets are picked not by military experts, but by pollsters, and that is a failure. In this war, our humanitarian effort unfortunately has failed the Kosovars and failed the allies miserably. And now, like a desperate gambler who will not acknowledge their losses, we are thinking, if we can just gamble a little more, if we can just bomb a week longer, if only we can send in Apache helicopters, if only we put American ground troops in, just one more roll, just one more gamble, and perhaps we can win it all back.

Well, we cannot win back the lives of the Kosovars that have been lost and we cannot bring back together the refugee families that have been torn apart. But surely we can save the hopes and dreams of Americans and allied soldiers whose lives have yet to be gambled with.

A short walk from this Chamber, the Vietnam War Memorial lies half buried, silent, below the green grass of the national Mall. Mr. Speaker, 58,000 lives and names are engraved on the wall, 58,000 fathers, brothers, sons and some daughters gone because America's leaders then would rather lose the lives of soldiers than lose face as a Nation. Mr. Speaker, 58,000 teenagers, because the average age of those fighting on the front line in Vietnam was 19 years old, barely out of high school. Mr. Speaker, 58,000 Americans who lost their lives in a war we were not willing to commit to victory to, and it is eerily like the war we are in today, because as America and allied political leaders flinched, Kosovars fell down around us, and we can never get that back; that opportunity for victory in saving those lives is gone.

We have a moral obligation today, to our young soldiers and their families, to prevent another Vietnam War. We have a moral obligation to our soldiers' mothers who love them like no one else can, to their fathers who harbor dreams for them, can barely talk about without getting emotional; to the brothers and sisters and family members of every American soldier and their spouses and their friends, we have a moral obligation, because it is unconscionable to allow young Americans to give up their life and die while we allow the shooters, all of them, to live by design.

I care a great deal about Kosovo and Kosovars. I am concerned about NATO. But my duty is to our American soldiers. I think that is our highest moral obligation and duty, to prevent another Vietnam War and all the destruction, all the lives and all the families that have been damaged and hurt so much by it because we did not have the courage and the will that when we started the war to conclude it, in victory. It is hard. It is hard to do that, and that is why war should be the last resort, because it is so damaging.

I think before the President pours more deadly fuel on this fire, I think and I would respectfully ask that he exhibit what I would call battlefield leadership. And it means first being honest, truthful to oneself about the failure of the current strategy. It means putting the troops you command first, not yours, worrying not about your record, not about NATO's credibility, not about your legacy, but caring about the troops under your command.

I think probably the toughest battlefield decision has been made many times by those who recognize that a hill cannot be taken, that sacrificing more lives and sacrificing more young people will not accomplish that goal, and to put them first, to do no more harm to them, and to determine what in real life can be done to advance our just and moral cause. I think the President needs to be totally honest with the American people about the steep price, and I mean staggering price, that we will pay, already we must pay, in lives, in resources, in years, to even attempt to secure a temporary peace in that civil war.

My exit strategy, unfortunately, the time has gone for that. My exit strategy was simple. Although I opposed the intervention, once in, my belief is that we bring the shooters down and end the atrocities, or we do no more harm and negotiate an international peace treaty, attempt to secure what we can of Kosovo, attempt to relocate; how many refugees really want to go back to a region they can no longer call home; and to attempt to contain the damage we have now done in the neighboring regions. I believe it is time to do no more harm. I am not willing to sacrifice young American lives to a war we are not committed to win. That is my duty. That I think is Congress's duty, and I look forward to the day when we can complete that duty.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, that comment, that phrase about winning is usually something that one side or another could understand in the case of some military conflict or the engagement in warfare. But the definition of winning with respect to this conflict is very nondescript. The President and his spokesman, in announcing this war to the American people, in moving forward in an act of warfare in the Kosovo province, failed to identify the clear objectives and the national interest that is at stake when it is impossible and the President is incapable of clearly laying out the objectives to be achieved. It is by definition impossible to determine when one has won and when it is time to declare victory and go home.

□ 2145

That is the real dilemma that the President has put us in, because it has set off a whole cascade of problems that stem in all directions, and does so without the clear definition of what victory means for the United States of America. Without that definition, I am afraid this is an engagement to which we will be committed for a long, long time.

I am curious, at the cracker barrel sessions that the gentleman has back in Texas, this notion that there is a lack of a clear objective and an exit strategy. And it seems to be, at least in my part of this country, and I am curious to find out about the gentleman's, the source of a tremendous amount of anxiety and concern.

I might also point out, before I yield the floor back to the gentleman, from the perspective of the best interests of our troops it is unconscionable in my mind to send troops in harm's way; to send our soldiers, sailors, and airmen to conduct their duty in Kosovo without clear objectives, without knowing when the job is going to be done, and expect them to accomplish this mission.

They will do it. These folks, you give them a mission and they will do it, they will do it proficiently. They are literally the best in the world, and they do the American people proud. But they are Americans, too, and they deserve to have answers about what objectives are being achieved. There are no answers to that question.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. The gentleman from Colorado is right on target and people know it. Every time we go into a classified briefing on this war I am always hopeful to hear more, to hear that there is a plan I am not aware of, a hint of a mission that is so clear that I know that we can achieve it. Because the gentleman is right, the military,

they will achieve any objective, no matter how difficult. They will lay their lives on the line.

But in fact, it is just the opposite. I come out thinking, at each of those sessions, and believing that we ought to give the military right now every medal possible and every acclaim possible, because they seem to be fighting this with two hands tied behind their backs, and a leg, perhaps, as well.

It is interesting about objectives. I went back and took a look at America's intervention in our world wars and our intervention in Korea. The clarity of our missions in Germany and in the world wars, and the vagueness of our mission in Vietnam and here, is eerie.

I looked back and I read a statement by President Johnson from Texas, as a matter of fact, as he addressed the Nation in 1968. Tell me if this sounds familiar:

''Our objective has never been the annihilation of the enemy. It is to bring about a recognition in Hanoi that its objectives could not be achieved.''

If that sounds much like the President's objective, not to defeat Milosevic in Yugoslavia but only to degrade their ability to conduct their activities further, the gentleman is right.

And with a mission so vague, and without a commitment, unfortunately, with a lack of courage to do what war requires us to do for compassion and humanity, that is why we do not get into wars until there is no other resort, because it is destructive to us and the enemy, and we must have the courage and will to win.

My concern, and I think it has already been proven, is that we have lacked that. The Kosovars have paid the price. The question will be will American soldiers be the next to pay the price. I am not willing to wager their lives in this war, because that is what it is, without a clear objective, and in fact, without that will to win.

I always use, and perhaps the gentleman does, as well, I use a test for our conflicts: If a young soldier were killed in this battle, could I go to the family and tell them, look them in the face and tell them they lost their son or daughter, their brother or sister, their wife or husband, and that they did it to defend America, in the best and highest cause of American interest?

In this case, I cannot tell them that that death would be justified. It is a high standard, but I think it ought to be any time these young people are sent into battle on our behalf.

We have a war memorial just at the bottom of this hill, the Vietnam War Memorial, where every time you go, and every other memorial is so lively and so inspiring and you get a sense of history, and it is people talking, and there is an enthusiasm and inspiration by our memorials. But when you go to the Vietnam War Memorial, it is stone cold quiet.

Every time I go, and I walk from the base of the memorial, and you start to look, as you look at the names and you begin to walk up and out of the memorial and up into the sunlight, my thought every time is, never again. Never again will we put bright young American lives with wonderful hopes and dreams, and those of their families, never again should we commit them to war where our political leaders and our Commander in Chief do not have the will and the courage themselves to win. That, unfortunately, is where we are at today. I wish there were an easy way to say it.

I like to believe the best in everyone. I hope and try to believe the best in our Commander in Chief, even as disappointed and upset as I get at times. But this time, we have lost that opportunity. We can never bring those people back. We can only save Americans and learn from the Vietnam War, never again.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The folks back home, when this topic comes up, are insistent that warfare is sometimes necessary and sometimes it is the only option, but that is the standard, that it is only something we should resort to when all other options have been exhausted.

The President is convinced that all diplomatic solutions have been tried and none of them worked. But I want to make it clear that, in looking back over today's debate and even responding to some of the discussion that has taken place here, no single one of us who opposes the President's decision to commit an act of warfare opposes our involvement in trying to resolve the terrible situation that exists in Kosovo, this ethnic cleansing that is taking place at the hands of Slobodan Milosevic.

This is a topic which we are very concerned about, and we want to spend American resources and spend America's diplomatic might and economic leverage and do whatever we possibly can to honor the dignity of human life, and the lives of all those who are involved, victims or otherwise, in the Kosovo conflict.

But this is not a new conflict. This official policy of ethnic cleansing by Milosevic is about 6 years in the making now. What is most distressing is the length of time that this struggle has gone on and has been allowed to fester and grow without any real concern coming out of the White House until a few months ago, when the President at that point suggested to the country that now there are no options.

I submit that the President of the United States and the office of the presidency should be held up and he maintained as the most forceful leader for liberty and freedom around the planet.

The rest of the world does look to the United States of America for guidance and leadership in precisely these kinds of situations. They look to us to be the mediators, the negotiators, to exercise our leadership position and authority, to bring leaders of democracies around the world together to stand against the tyranny of dictatorships and tyrants of the sort Milosevic is a part.

But that really did not happen over that 6-year period. Again, the White House all of a sudden and suddenly became concerned just a few months ago, and left the United States at quite a disadvantage. The relationships that we have lost and have been set back with respect to emerging democracies in Eastern Europe with Russia, with the Ukraine and other former Soviet Republics, are setbacks that are going to take many, many months, if not years, to regain.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman makes a point that is real critical here. Today, and in much of this debate, people will try to convince Americans that it is between those who care for humanity and those who want to isolate America. It is a rhetorical trick, a way to wedge people onto different sides, as opposed to talking about reasonable approaches.

But the fact of the matter is that America does have a role in peace in this region. We do have a role to play. But the world has changed. Now that we are the strongest world superpower, while the world has changed, we are confused about our role in it today.

We still respond by wanting to fight the disputes and fights of every one of our brothers, older or younger, around the world. And we will. We will jump to any battle, to any fight, and we will fight every one of our brother's and sister's fights for them.

But at some point, because we have so many around the world, we simply cannot. You can fight other's disputes until you are so weak yourself that you lose your own fight when called upon to protect your own family, your own interests. That is where we are today.

I think our new role, America's new role, is not to fight every one of our brother's fights, but to help teach them and work with them so that they can fight their own disputes, settle their own conflicts.

America's role in peace, I believe, is to not lead others in what is principally their challenges but to support them, to help, to advise, to provide technology, to back them up in their challenges and their responsibility, but to not be always taking the lead in their fights; because frankly, we have new challenges here in America, such as the terrorism challenge, where the smallest rogue nations can develop biochemical weapons. International drug cartels have a distribution network literally to every community in this country.

Then on top of those two, we have organized crime which finances instability because it is profitable to do that. So now America faces a challenge where literally biochemical weapons, weapons of mass destruction, can be brought into literally every community in America. We have not changed our security to respond and prevent that.

We have nuclear missiles and the capability by countries to reach the continental United States that we are not prepared for, although thank goodness this Congress is taking the leadership role in doing that. So I think we do have a role to play in peace.

Peace is always, almost always, less costly and less damaging than war, but there are times when your interest, your defense, and national security will quite compel you to do that.

But I notice that Dwight Eisenhower, our former commander and president, made a statement in 1946 that I think rings true today. He said, ''Men acquainted with the battlefield will not be found among the numbers that glibly talk of another war.''

Those who have been to war, who have seen the blood, who have been part of all of that, understand the need to explore their options first; to know that when you launch that hostility, just what type of courage it takes, and the blood that will always be on your hands.

Unfortunately, in this foreign policy, in the advisers, in the Commander in Chief, I think perhaps we talk too glibly of war when in fact Europe and others around the world urged us to try to find another path to peace in Yugoslavia. Unfortunately, their predictions of the damage have been just terrible.

Mr. SCHAFFER. If we contrast the response to the events that led up to this military conflict with the Gulf War when President Bush presided, we see a wide difference in approach.

President Bush was successful at bringing the entire world and global leadership together to stand against the Iraqi government and Saddam Hussein. He was successful at putting in place various economic sanctions, and using all of the political leverage and diplomatic might of the United States and the global community to stand against a tyrant.

Even when that all seemed to fall apart and the Iraqis moved in to attack a sovereign Nation, it was the response to that form of naked aggression that instantly brought the entire global community together to stand against Saddam.

□ 2200

Very, very different than what we have seen in the case of Milosevic. Again, this is an episode that is many, many years in the making and very little effort to try to use their political position to leverage economic sanctions against Milosevic.

We see some of our strongest allies continuing to sell oil and other technology and weaponry to our enemy now in Kosovo. Yet what is the response from our President? We had all of the leaders of these same countries right here in Washington, D.C., just last week. I did not read one word of our President objecting to this economic exchange that is going on between our allies and the government that we are bombing right now and the regime that we are bombing.

As I say, what America needs right now is a foreign policy, and out of the White House we have none today. I just shudder at the prospect that any of our troops will come home in body bags and find themselves buried in what one of my staff members today coined the ''tomb of the unknown policy.'' This is a prospect that all Americans ought to be very, very concerned about.

But we do have a role in trying to prevent the violence that is taking place. It is a diplomatic role. It is one that requires real leadership out of the White House. We have to have a President, a Commander in Chief, who is not preoccupied by other things, distracted by less important topics, certainly, at a time when the willing answer of and eager military leader of our country is to commit somebody else's sons and daughters to fight a war for which victory is very hard to define.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thankfully, we live in a country where we have the opportunity to vote our conscience, to raise issues that trouble us, to talk about them, and to unite behind our American troops, to be absolutely a hundred percent behind them. Whatever they need while they are there, financially and funding-wise, we are going to get them.

And in fact, not only that, but we are going to make sure that there are the reserves and the dollars to try to rebuild our military to where we are not costing lives each time we are given a new challenge as we do today.

I was thinking also that our allies have been hurt terribly in this, as well. We have now pushed the ethnic Albanians out into the neighboring regions. And it is almost like taking part of our State and pushing them to other States.

And by nature, if we took a bunch of Texans and push them out to three neighboring States and basically say they cannot come back or they can come back to a small, damaged, torn up, insecure, non-secure area, I will tell my colleagues what they are going to do. They are going to carve out from the three States, they are in a new Texas, a new State, with people they know and values they have and religions that they share.

And this is what is happening now in the Balkans. We have pushed out ethnic Albanians out of their home. As in Bosnia, very few, my guess, will return. That is what history shows us. And they are going to look for a new country, a new independent nation with people whose values they share, and that means we will likely create a greater Albania and perhaps too a Macedonia. And I do not know what other damage we will do to our neighboring countries. So our friends there are paying a very steep price.

And here is Europe who was asking all along, we want more options than just bombing, here is Europe in their biggest year perhaps ever. They launched a new currency, the Euro, created new Federal banks sort of like our Federal Reserve. They are trying to hire a new foreign policy person to unite the European Union. They had had their whole European Commission resign because of corruption, which was a major blow. They were asked and brought in expanded three new NATO neighbors and costs that are associated with that.

And then we pushed them into not only defending themselves, but America said their new strategy in Europe is going to be to resolve disputes like this and resolve it militarily. We are like a friendly banker who keeps pushing the small business to expand, to expand, to expand, to expand, until one day they expand themselves out of business.

My concern is that at a time when NATO should be reasonably and thoughtfully talking about their new role in Europe and with America in this new world, that we are pushing them into a role they are not ready to play. And while I have to admit, after 24 hours after bombing three of the countries, NATO said, enough, we think that is enough. Stop, that is enough bombing for us.

To their credit, as a group, they have hung pretty tight. But the fact of the matter is that they do not know what victory is anymore. They do not know about if they can shoulder the costs of it. They do not know if they can survive this NATO expansion. So each of our closest allies we have pushed into a terrible position that will hurt them economically, politically, culturally for many years to come.

And I just think again, war ought to be the last resort. We have so many pressures. We have so many tools that we ought not to ever glibly talk of war or to enter one. And whether we today declared war, which we did not but we know we are in it, and now have the responsibility to face up, to be held accountable ourselves for our actions, and what is sad is the price that we will all pay, but at least we ought to commit and have the courage to sacrifice no American lives in this terrible mess.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether we are at war or had to declare it, and so on, is one that now is going to be resolved in the courts. This is a question that has been at the center of the relationship between this Congress and the presidency for a great number of years, and it has been a point of dispute for quite a long time.

And each military incursion that we have undertaken as a country seems to take one more step or one more bite out of that constitutional responsibility that the Congress has to declare war, and there are various reasons that that is so.

With respect to NATO or U.N. operations over the years, we have granted huge amounts of authority to the President to act unilaterally within the context of our relationship to the NATO treaty or U.N. charters. When it

comes to peace agreements that disintegrate and erode, it is our relationship and response to these agreements, the fact that we have formally taken part as signatories to these agreements, that compels us and authorizes Presidents to step into war. Even under those circumstances, constitutional authority to declare war has been questionable.

But this case is different altogether. It is different because we are talking now about a sovereign nation, a nation that did not act as an aggressor to a neighbor or some other jurisdiction around the world. We are talking about a conflict that does not involve an attack upon any of our NATO partners. NATO, being a defensive organization, its charter does not envision attacking sovereign countries as it has now been used to do.

So this profound question that needs to be answered, and I guess at this point Congress has asserted its authority, has denied the President a declaration of war to carry out his war in Kosovo.

The President now continues to carry out an act of war without the consent of Congress. And the only remedy remaining for us now is to test this question of the War Powers Act before our great courts. As a country, I think we need to certainly be concerned about the conflict that is the heart of the debate. But, also, we need to be very, very concerned about the status of our Constitution, that the War Powers Act maintains its integrity clear through to today's point in time, and to ensure the American people that this Congress will find the courage, as it has today, to stand for and assert its constitutional authority. And that is what we did.

I guess some Members in Congress just an hour ago were here on the floor lamenting the fact that we stood up for our constitutional responsibility and the fact that we honored that constitutional responsibility, in their opinion, is the cause of some kind of personal discomfort for them. I am sorry about that. But we swore an oath to that Constitution to stand up for it when called upon.

We were called upon to do it today. Some of us did. Others did not. And this is a matter to be sorted out now by the American people at the next election.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I think, too, that as the gentleman from Colorado has pointed out our constitutional duty, I always try to support the President, any President, in military action and we have in every case in Congress. But my duty and the duty of my colleague is not to the President, it is to the Constitution. And I think we have a higher moral duty to our young American soldiers.

And they are young. I mean, they are young, bright, wonderful people who are serving our country and think that if they fight and risk their lives it will be for freedom, not to allow Milosevic to live, not to allow a Serbian army to go untouched, not to flinch when sent into war because of their constraint on them as individuals.

Our duty today was not to cover the President for a terrible decision. That would have been disloyal, in my opinion. Our duty was to our American soldiers who are over there right now and the belief that we ought not sacrifice their lives when we do not have the courage, when our commanders in chief of this whole operation politically do not have the courage that we are asking of them.

No one should ever ask more of their troops than they ask of themselves. And in this case, we ask too much.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Stepping forward to a conflict such as this requires preparation, requires considerable forethought, and to allow to prepare our armed services.

And again, over the last 7 years in Congress, this has been a point of clear debate between the Congress and the presidency. This President has cut the funding of our armed services year after year after year, to the point where our soldiers, sailors, and airmen express legitimate concern for the resources for the equipment, for the backup, and for the training that they receive.

And there may be times when they need to be deployed. This is not one of them. We are not prepared to win and win decisively. And winning, as we have pointed out earlier, is a nebulous term in and of itself with respect to this engagement.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to be recognized for this special order hour. I am grateful to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for sharing in this special order hour.

I want to once again urge all of our constituents, people throughout the country, to write their Congressman, call their Congressman, let us know what is on their minds, help us lead the country. The voice of the people is the most powerful force in our political system, and all American citizens should be compelled to exercise it tonight.

□ 2215

MANAGED CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WAMP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to use the entire hour this evening. I wanted to spend some time, though, talking about HMO reform, or managed care reform.

One of the things that I want to really stress is that there is a major difference between the approach that the Democrats have been taking on the issue of HMO reform versus the approach of the Republican leadership. A lot of times I worry that Americans and our constituents think that what we are proposing on both sides of the aisle is essentially the same and that everyone is trying to do something to protect patients' rights during this managed care reform debate. But I just think it is important to stress the differences. I really feel very strongly that the Patients' Bill of Rights, the Democratic bill that has been put forward and is cosponsored by almost every Member on the Democratic side, really protects patients' rights, whereas the Republican leadership bills that have been put forward both in this Congress and in the previous Congress really do not do an adequate job of protecting patients and too often look towards the interests of the insurance industry instead.

Mr. Speaker, in the last session of Congress, in the last 2 years, in 1997 and 1998, there was some debate on the issue of HMO reform, but the issue was essentially left unfinished in the 105th Congress, in the last Congress. On the House side, the Democrats' Patients' Bill of Rights was defeated by just five votes when it came to the floor. It was considered on the floor as a substitute to the Republican leadership's managed care bill which did pass and which in my opinion was really not a good piece of legislation and did not do anything significant to protect patients. In fact, the Republican leadership in the House has reintroduced a bill in this session of Congress that is virtually identical to what it moved last year. On the Senate side, the Senate Republicans in the so-called HELP Committee approved a managed care bill which really in my opinion is a sham reform bill and does not allow patients to sue the insurance companies but does allow the insurance companies and not the doctors and patients to define what is medically necessary, what types of procedures, what length of stay, what kind of operations would be performed and would be acceptable under an individual insurance policy.

I just wanted to, if I could, take a little time this evening to talk about why this Republican bill that passed the Senate, the Republican leadership bill in the Senate, really does not do an adequate job of trying to protect patients' rights. If you look at the bill that passed the Senate or that came out of committee, I should say, in the Senate this year, it leaves out more than 100 million Americans, two-thirds of those with private health insurance. It fails to grant key protections needed by children, women, persons with disabilities and others with chronic conditions or special health care needs. And it allows medical decisions to continue to be made by insurance company executives instead of by health care professionals and patients.

Mr. Speaker, the main difference that I have tried to point out between the Democrats' Patients' Bill of Rights and the Republican leadership bills that have been sponsored in the House

or in the Senate really come down to two points, and, that is, that the Republican bills really leave it up to the insurance companies to decide what kind of treatment you are going to get, and with regard to enforcement they do not have adequate enforcement because if you want to appeal a decision about your treatment that you felt that you should have a particular operation, you should be able to stay an extra day or so in the hospital, if you try that appeal, there is really no process whereby you can appeal the decision of the insurance company and be successful; and certainly if you suffer damages, you cannot sue for those damages under the Republican bill.

What the Democrats tried to do on the Senate side in committee, in the HELP Committee when this Republican HMO bill came up, they tried a number of times through amendments to improve the Republican bill. All those Democratic amendments were essentially defeated, but I wanted to give you a little idea, if I could, about the kinds of things that the Democrats were trying to do to improve what was essentially a bad bill that did not provide adequate protections for patients in HMOs.

The committee Republicans in the Senate rejected on a 10–8 party line vote an amendment by Senator TED KENNEDY to extend the scope of the bill to all privately insured Americans. As I said, the Republican bill leaves more than 100 million people unprotected because most of its patient protections are narrowly applied to only one type of insurance and that is self-funded employer plans. The committee Republicans also rejected on the same 10–8 party line vote Senator KENNEDY's amendment on external appeals. Again, as I mentioned before, the Republican bill does not create a truly independent external review of plan decisions. So if you feel that you are not getting covered adequately and you try to appeal, there really is no effective external appeal. Under the committee bill, the Republican bill, the so-called external review is controlled by the HMOs and contains loopholes to allow HMOs to delay or prevent patients from appealing a bad medical decision by an HMO bureaucrat. Many HMO decisions could not even be appealed under the Republican bill.

Just to give you another idea of some of the examples, I talked about the issue of medical necessity and how it is defined. The committee Republicans in the Senate rejected, again on a party line vote, 10–8, an amendment offered by Senator KENNEDY to define the term ''medical necessity'' and to prohibit HMOs from arbitrarily interfering with medical decisions. Again just to give you an example of how this operates, this amendment would have prevented insurers from arbitrarily interfering with the decisions of the treating physician on issues relating to the manner, in other words, the length of stay in the hospital, or the setting, inpatient versus outpatient care. It would have stopped HMOs from overruling doctors and going against accepted and best practices of medicine. The committee Republican-passed bill does nothing to protect patients when an insurance company bureaucrat tells them they must have a medical procedure on an outpatient basis or be discharged from the hospital prematurely. The Republican bill allows HMOs to continue to define what is medically necessary, giving them the ability to deny promised benefits.

Another example, the issue of emergency room care. Many of my constituents have complained to me that their HMO policy does not allow them to go to the emergency room when they think it is necessary. Or they have to go to a different hospital that is pretty far away if they want to go to an emergency room. They cannot go to the hospital near where they live or where they work. Well, Senator MURRAY tried to put in an amendment that again was rejected on a party line vote, 10–8, to strengthen coverage for emergency care. Under the Republican bill, it is not clear whether a true prudent layperson standard applies to all of the plans covered. Prudent layperson says that if the average prudent person would think it was necessary to go to the emergency room, then you can go to whatever emergency room is close by and readily available. Well, many insurance policies, many HMOs do not allow that. And so the Democrats are saying, we want to have that prudent layperson standard put into the HMO reform bill. Instead, what happened is that in this case, again the ability to apply that prudent layperson standard was rejected by the committee and what that means is that under the Republican bill there still is no guarantee that you can go to the closest emergency room or that even if you go to the emergency room and later the HMO decides, well, you really should not have gone because it was not really an emergency, that they can just deny coverage and say, ''You shouldn't have gone to the emergency room; therefore, we're not going to pay for the emergency room care.''

Another example that I think is important is with regard to specialists. Many of my constituents complain that their HMO reform bill does not provide them with access to specialists that they may need in a given circumstance. Senators HARKIN and REED had an amendment to this Republican bill that again was rejected along party lines that would ensure that patients have access to needed specialists. Under the Republican bill, patients could be charged more for out-of-network specialty care even if the plan is at fault for not having access to appropriate specialists within the plan. So if you decide that you want to go to a doctor, I will give you an example, perhaps you want to go see a pediatrician but as many people know today, that for children, there are pediatric specialists for different areas of pediatrics. Under the Republican bill if there is nobody that has that specialty and you decide that you want to see that kind of pediatrician for your child, then you can go out of the network but you have to pay for it. Again what we were saying with this Democratic amendment is that access to specialty care should be provided outside the HMO if there is no one within the HMO that has that specialty and is part of the network, but again that was an amendment that was rejected.

I will only mention one more effort on the Democrats' part to try to improve this bad bill, if you will, and there are many others but I will only mention one other one, and that was Senator KENNEDY's amendment, again rejected on a 10–8 party line vote with regard to liability. The Republican bill fails to hold HMOs accountable when their actions result in injury or death. I mentioned this before. You cannot sue. The Republican plan would protect most HMOs from liability even when someone becomes disabled or is killed. Senator KENNEDY's amendment in the Democrats' Patients' Bill of Rights would allow 123 million patients who receive coverage through private employers to hold their HMOs and health insurance plans accountable under State laws for their abuses. This is one of the loopholes, if you will, in the current law, and that is that if you are not covered by certain State laws and your health insurance comes from your private employer, oftentimes you cannot sue. We were trying to correct that as well.

Mr. Speaker, if I could just say that basically what I am trying to point out tonight is that there are major differences here and that when we look at what is happening on the issue of HMO or managed care reform, it is obviously important that we have an opportunity in this session of Congress to get a vote on this issue. One of the criticisms that I have of the Republican leadership is that frankly it is now April, almost May, and they have not even allowed us to have any kind of a vote, there has not been any movement in subcommittee, in the Committee on Commerce that I am a member of or in the full committee to bring any kind of HMO or managed care reform to the floor. So we need to at least start the movement. But when that movement starts and when we do have an opportunity to vote on HMO reform, we have to understand that there is a major difference between the Patients' Bill of Rights which is being brought forth by the Democrats and the Republican leadership proposal.

Now, you do not have to take my word for it. One of the things that I think is important is that we look at some of the commentators and what they are saying about the differences between the Democrats and the Republicans on this issue. But I wanted to read, if I could, all or some parts of an editorial that appeared in the New

York Times on Saturday, April 10, earlier this month, that talked about the differences between the Democrats and the Republicans on the issue of patient rights:

''Just about everyone on Capitol Hill professes interest in producing legislation that protects patients from unfair health insurance practices. But the prospect of actually passing meaningful protections as opposed to talking about it is uncertain. President Clinton tried to whip up support for Democratic proposals but the Republicans are balking at Democratic plans as too burdensome on the managed care industry. Yet it is the Democratic proposals that more fully reflect the recommendations of a presidential advisory commission to improve health plan quality. The Republican Senate bill, S. 326, sponsored by Senator JEFFORDS of Vermont, is too limited to accomplish that purpose. The bill, which was approved by the Senate HELP, or Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee on a straight party line vote of 10–8, contains some consumer protections but it is unacceptable because most of the provisions would apply only to 48 million individuals covered by plans in which large employers act as their own insurers, leaving 110 million Americans in other plans unprotected. The Republican bill would grant appeal rights to an additional 75 million privately insured individuals but those rights would be quite restrictive. Appeals to an external reviewer would be allowed only when an insurer refused to pay for a procedure on the grounds that it was not medically necessary or was experimental. Critics say this would give health plans power to limit appeals by simply asserting that a denial is not based on medical necessity. It would exclude appeals where a plan unilaterally decided that the benefit was not covered under the contract, even if medical judgments were involved in that contract interpretation. The Republican bill does not adequately ensure access to specialty care by allowing a patient to see an out-of-network specialist if the plan has an insufficient number of specialists available. Both the Senate Democratic proposal, which has White House support, and a bipartisan bill sponsored by Senators JOHN CHAFEE, JOSEPH LIEBERMAN and others would be substantially stronger in allowing external review of coverage disputes and defining medical necessity and in giving enrollees greater rights to take health plans to court. The insurance lobby has already embarked on a media blitz to defeat any new regulations as too costly but consumer protections under the Democratic plan would increase health plan costs by only 2.8 percent, according to Congressional Budget Office estimates made last year.

□ 2230

''Health plans should be made to deliver what they promise their enrollees and held accountable when they fail.''

Mr. Speaker, I think that New York Times editorial really sums up what I am trying to say tonight which is the fact of the matter is that if the Patients' Bill of Rights, the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights, would be substantially stronger in almost every aspect of managed care reform over the Republican proposal.

Now I just wanted to briefly mention again the important areas where the Patients' Bill of Rights, a Democratic bill of rights, really provides for a very good protection for patients.

Once again and most importantly, the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights allows doctors and patients rather than insurance company bureaucrats to make medical decisions using the principles of good medicine.

In addition, it would first guarantee access to needed health care specialists. The Democratic bill provides access to emergency room services when and where the need arises. The Democratic bill provides continuity of care protections to assure patient care if a patient's health care provider is dropped. The Democrats' Patients' Bill of Rights gives access to a timely, internal and independent external appeals process, and the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights assures that doctors and patients can openly discuss treatment options and not be gagged because the insurance company says that you cannot talk about something that is not covered.

The Patients' Bill of Rights would also assure that women have direct access to OB/GYN, and finally and almost as important really as the medical necessity issue is that the Democrats Patients' Bill of Rights provides an enforcement mechanism that ensures recourse for patients who have been maimed or die as a result of health plan actions.

Mr. Speaker, I sound very partisan this evening, and I do not mean to suggest that there are not Republican Members on the other side of the aisle that are supportive of the Patients' Bill of Rights or the types of protections that I think that are needed in a comprehensive HMO reform bill. I know that there are Members on the other side that would like to see these types of protections provided under the law. But the bottom line is that the Republican leadership, which is in charge of the House, keeps producing legislation or keeps proposing legislation both in the House and in the Senate that does not adequately protect patients, and I think it is very important that we not only move ahead in this session of Congress and quickly on HMO reform, but that we move ahead with an HMO reform that adequately protects patients' rights, that is comprehensive and addresses what I consider the major issue that my constituents and most Americans seem to be concerned about at this time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today from 1:30 until 3:30 on account of a family emergency.

Mr. TAUZIN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and on April 29 on account of family illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NAPOLITANO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BISHOP, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WHITFIELD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. REGULA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes each day, today and on April 29.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITFIELD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OBEY, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 800. To provide for education flexibility partnerships.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, April 29, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1761. A letter from the Administrator, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department

of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Recourse Loan Regulations for Honey (RIN: 0560–AF62) received March 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1762. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Handling Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches [Docket No. FV99–916–2 FR] received April 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1763. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Almonds Grown in California; Revision of Reporting Requirements [Docket No. FV99–981–1 FR] received April 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1764. A letter from the the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting Cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e); (H. Doc. No. 106–52); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1765. A letter from the Comptroller, Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1766. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the annual certification of the nuclear weapons stockpile by the Secretaries of Defense and Energy and accompanying report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1767. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Oklahoma [OK–18–1–7415a; FRL–6312–5] received March 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1768. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Program Planning Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Computer III Further Remand Proceedings: Bell Operating Company Provision of Enhanced Services [CC Docket No. 95–20] 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review—Review of Computer III and ONA Safeguards and Requirements [CC Docket No. 98–10] received April 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1769. A letter from the Director, Office of Administration, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the Integrity Act reports for each of the Executive Office of the President agencies, as required by the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1770. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the FY 2000 Annual Performance Plan for the Federal Emergency Management Agency; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1771. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the 1998 annual report on the agency's compliance with the Inspector General Act and the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1772. A letter from the Administrator, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1773. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Vessels Greater Than 99 feet (30.2 m) LOA Catching Pollock for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Bering Sea [Docket No. 990115017–9017–01; I.D. 022399B] received March 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1774. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Central Regulatory Area in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 981222314–8321–02; I.D. 021999A] received March 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1775. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific cod by Catcher Vessels using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 990304063–9063–01; I.D. 040999A] received April 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1776. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Adjustments to the 1999 Summer Flounder Commercial Quota [Docket No. 981014259–8312–02; I.D. 040599E] received April 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1777. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Western Regulatory Area in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 990304062–9062–01; I.D. 041299B] received April 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1778. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Aviation Administration Policy on Enforcement of the Hazardous Materials Regulations: Penalty Guidelines—received April 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1779. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the quarterly report on the expenditure and need for worker adjustment assistance training funds under the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 459. A bill to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act for FERC Project No. 9401, the Mt. Hope Waterpower Project (Rept. 106–119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 154. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1480) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the United States Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–120). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. FROST, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. FORD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MOORE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. WYNN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. WISE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SABO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 1590. A bill to provide retirement security for all Americans; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Government Reform, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DIXON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HORN, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs.

JONES of Ohio, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1591. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit States the option to provide Medicaid coverage for low-income individuals infected with HIV; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. POMBO (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BOYD, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. JOHN, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. BISHOP):

H.R. 1592. A bill to establish certain requirements regarding the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H.R. 1593. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the exemption from the self-employment tax for certain termination payments received by former life insurance salesmen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 1594. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve benefits for Filipino veterans of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CASTLE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 1595. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for a national standard to prohibit the operation of motor vehicles by individuals under the influence of alcohol; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 1596. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide, with respect to research on breast cancer, for the increased involvement of advocates in decision making at the National Cancer Institute; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. CANADY of Florida):

H.R. 1597. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for national minimum sentences for individuals convicted of operating motor vehicles under the influence of alcohol; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRYANT (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. BONO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FORD, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HILLEARY, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN):

H.R. 1598. A bill to provide a patent term restoration review procedure for certain drug products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 1599. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the purchase of information technology related to the Year 2000 computer conversion by State and local governments through Federal supply schedules; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SABO, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 1600. A bill to provide that Federal contracts and certain Federal subsidies shall be provided only to businesses which have qualified profit-sharing plans; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EHRLICH (for himself, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. LARSON, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WEYGAND, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HORN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FROST, Mr. DIXON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GILCHREST, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COBURN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BAKER, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. STARK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. KIND, Mr. WISE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. KLINK, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NEY, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COOK, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. REGULA, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. JOHN, Mr. OLVER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. KING, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. SABO, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MINGE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. GANSKE, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. NORWOOD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. WEINER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. POMBO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. ORTIZ):

H.R. 1601. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restore the link between the maximum amount of earnings by blind individuals permitted without demonstrating ability to engage in substantial gainful activity and the exempt amount permitted in determining excess earnings under the earnings test; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 1602. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of depreciable business assets which may be expensed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself and Mr. STUMP):

H.R. 1603. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for permanent eligibility of former members of the Selected Reserve for veterans housing loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RILEY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LARSON, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BOYD, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BAKER, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHN, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HULSHOF, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. TALENT, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. BASS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KING, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAZIO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. OWENS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 1604. A bill to reauthorize, and modify the conditions for, the consent of Congress to the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact and to grant the consent of Congress to the Southern Dairy Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 1605. A bill to designate the United States courthouse building located at 402 North Walnut Street and Prospect Avenue in Harrison, Arkansas, as the ''Judge J. Smith Henley Federal Building''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KANJORSKI (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. OLVER, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 1606. A bill to amend chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, to make certain temporary Federal service creditable for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. KASICH (for himself, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PITTS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. ROGAN, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma):

H.R. 1607. A bill to assist States in providing individuals a credit against State income taxes or a comparable benefit for contributions to charitable organizations working to prevent or reduce poverty and protect and encourage donations to charitable organizations, to prohibit discrimination against nongovernmental organizations and certain individuals on the basis of religion in the distribution of government funds to provide government assistance and the distribution of such assistance, to allow such organizations to accept such funds to provide such assistance without impairing the relegious character of such organizations, to provide for tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts for charitable purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG (for himself and Mr. BARCIA):

H.R. 1608. A bill to reaffirm and clarify the Federal relationship of the Swan Creek Black River Confederated Ojibwa Tribes of Michigan as a distinct federally recognized Indian tribe and to restore aboriginal rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 1609. A bill to amend Public Law 105–188 to provide for the mineral leasing of certain Indian lands in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LUTHER (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SABO, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MINGE, and Mr. GUTKNECHT):

H.R. 1610. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to reinstate the DSH allotment level for Minnesota to the fiscal year 1995 level; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MCCRERY (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. TAUZIN):

H.R. 1611. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for contributions to individual investment accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. OLVER, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. STARK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BONIOR, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H.R. 1612. A bill to establish a comprehensive program to ensure the safety of food products intended for human comsumption which are regulated by the Food and Drug Administration; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1613. A bill to restore to the original owners certain lands that the Federal Government took for military purposes in 1940; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PHELPS (for himself, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. TALENT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FROST, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 1614. A bill to authorize the Small Business Administration to provide financial and business development assistance to military reservists' small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. SUNUNU:

H.R. 1615. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to extend the designation of a portion of the Lamprey River in New Hampshire as a recreational river to include an additional river segment; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FORD, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WELLER, Mr. FROST, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. DUNN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HERGER, Mr. STARK, Mr. REYES, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. CAMP, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. HOUGHTON):

H.R. 1616. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify certain provisions applicable to real estate investment trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. THUNE):

H.R. 1617. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Products Inspection Act to provide for the eventual removal of intrastate distribution restrictions on State inspected meat and poultry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 1618. A bill to amend section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 to improve the housing counseling program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. MURTHA):

H.J. Res. 46. A joint resolution conferring status as an honorary veteran of the United States Armed Forces on Zachary Fisher; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GANSKE, and Mr. LAFALCE):

H.J. Res. 47. A joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the need for a Surgeon General's report on media and violence; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH (for himself, Ms. CARSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. PEASE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. NEY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BOYD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr.

TOWNS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. COOK, Mr. FOSSELLA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. JOHN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Ms. RIVERS):

H.J. Res. 48. A joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the court-martial conviction of the late Rear Admiral Charles Butler McVay, III, and calling upon the President to award a Presidental Unit Citation to the final crew of the U.S.S. INDIANAPOLIS; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COX (for himself and Mr. DICKS):

H. Res. 153. A resolution amending House Resolution 5, One Hundred Sixth Congress, as amended by House Resolution 129, One Hundred Sixth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RADANOVICH (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HORN, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KING, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LARSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN):

H. Res. 155. A resolution calling upon the President to provide in a collection all United States records related to the Armenian genocide and the consequences of the failure to enforce the judgments of the Turkish courts against the responsible officials, and to deliver the collection to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives, the library of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, and to the Armenian Genocide Museum in Yerevan, Armenia; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

26. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of North Dakota, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4024 memorializing Sakakawea to be honored and memorialized with a statue in the National Statuary Hall in the United States Capital in Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. GARY MILLER of California and Mr. SUNUNU.

H.R. 25: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 38: Mr. COLLINS.

H.R. 44: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 48: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 53: Mr. PHELPS and Mr. COBURN.

H.R. 65: Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 73: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. COLLINS.

H.R. 87: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 100: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. KLINK, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. COYNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MASCARA, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 113: Mr. GOODE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 116: Mr. SAWYER and Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 271: Mr. BROWN of California and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 272: Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 274: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. LARSON, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 275: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 303: Mrs. WILSON, Mr. ABERCROMBE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 306: Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 352: Mr. WICKER, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 360: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. POMBO, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. JOHN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. DANNER, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 455: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 491: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 515: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 516: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 534: Mr. BUYER.

H.R. 541: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 555: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 612: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 648: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 673: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 678: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 681: Mr. LARSON.

H.R. 701: Mr. TERRY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FLETCHER, and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 716: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 732: Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 745: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 746: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 750: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 765: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. METCALF, Mr. GOODE, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 775: Mr. MCCRERY.

H.R. 784: Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. COOKSEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 804: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 805: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 827: Mr. DICKEY and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 828: Mr. UPTON and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 846: Mr. CAPUANO and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 860: Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 866: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 894: Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 902: Mr. WU, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 904: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. NEY, Mr. BAKER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 935: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 936: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 957: Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 959: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 964: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 979: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. QUINN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LARSON, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 987: Mr. STUMP, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WATKINS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. LINDER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 997: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. LARSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 1001: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1004: Mr. WELLER and Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 1006: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1055: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1062: Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1063: Mr. WU.

H.R. 1070: Mr. LARSON, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 1071: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 1091: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 1096: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1102: Mr. COLLINS and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 1111: Mr. MCCRERY.

H.R. 1116: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 1118: Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1150: Mr. FLETCHER.

H.R. 1175: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1180: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. VENTO, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. MINGE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. SABO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COYNE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1190: Mr. EHLERS AND MS. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1191: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HYDE, Mr. EWING, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. HASTERT.

H.R. 1195: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. KLINK, Mrs. BONO, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. WELLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1196: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1206: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1214: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 1219: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 1221: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1222: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1232: Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. WEYGAND.

H.R. 1254: Mr. BASS.

H.R. 1256: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 1278: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1286: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1290: Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 1291: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.R. 1301: Mr. PICKETT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FROST, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 1304: Mr. WAMP and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 1326: Mr. HAYES, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, and Mr. GREEN of Texas,.

H.R. 1329: Mr. STUMP and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 1344: Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 1346: Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1352: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FROST, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1354: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 1355: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BAIRD, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1356: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1362: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1363: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1398: Mr. HUNTER and Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 1411: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1432: Mr. WYNN, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1445: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. QUINN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1448: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1462: Mr. FORD.

H.R. 1476: Mr. OLVER AND MR. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1491: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. QUINN, Mr. STARK, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1495: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 1507: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1514: Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1519: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1545: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1581: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. BORSKI.

H.J. Res. 33: Mr. BERRY.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H. Con. Res. 71: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. STEARNS.

H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. SCHAFFER, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. SHAYS.

H. Con. Res. 88: Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. FOWLER, and Mrs. KELLY.

H. Res. 107: Mr. MATSUI and Mr. PORTER.

H. Res. 146: Mr. FROST and Mr. DELAHUNT.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 833: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.