

was well short of the \$9.9 million in applications received and rather than funding all renewals at a prorated level, HUD quietly selected some applicants through a lottery and rejected others.

Although this may simply seem like an inconvenient administrative glitch, to the residents of the St. Paul public housing agency which have thrived under this program, it is devastating. That is because St. Paul PHA was one of the fifty or so PHAs which were passed over by HUD. As a result of HUD's blunder, the St. Paul public housing agency will have to release three of their service coordinators within the next month, resulting in the disruption of countless elderly and disabled residents' lives.

In order to correct this problem, my amendment transfers \$3.4 million from the Department of Housing and Urban Development administrative expenses account to fully fund the applications which HUD rejected due to their miscalculation. I believe this amendment appropriately keeps our promise to the elderly and disabled public housing residents with the burden being borne by the agency which created the problem.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 10 minutes, and that this period expire at 11 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

KOSOVO

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I had not thought to address this subject, but the opportunity presents itself here and I find that I have reactions to this morning's newspaper that I would like to share with the Senate.

There were two things that happened yesterday, both of which are reported in this morning's paper. I think they come together with an interesting connection. The first one was a briefing held here in this building, on the fourth floor, on the issue of Kosovo and what the United States is about to do there. Attending that briefing, appropriately reported in this morning's paper, were the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, the President's National Security Adviser and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Basically, they told us we are on the brink of going to war; that is, that the United States is prepared, with its NATO allies, to attack a country within its own borders to resolve a dispute among its own people in a way that the United States feels is appropriate.

There are those who have advised us to stay out of a civil war, not go in the

borders of another sovereign nation in order to resolve the dispute within that nation. But let us assume the stakes here are high enough to justify disregarding that advice. The second piece of advice that we are given is, if you do go into a civil war, pick a side. It is not entirely clear to me, from attending the briefing, that we know exactly which side we are for and what outcome we want. Because the third advice that comes along is, if you are going to go into a civil war and you are going to pick a side, make sure it is going to win. Again, in the briefing we had yesterday I was not satisfied that those four representatives of the administration had demonstrated a compelling case.

But I do not rise to issue a challenge to them on those grounds. Instead, I rise because of the connection, as I say, between two events: No. 1, a briefing of the Senate of the United States on the eve of the United States committing an act of war; and, No. 2, a report as to what the President of the United States was doing last night. In this morning's newspaper we are told that the President conducted a boffo performance before a dinner made up of representatives of the press, that he received three standing ovations, and in the Style section of the Washington Post we are told some of his best one liners. This is why I find such a jarring disconnect between the President preparing one liners in the White House for a reporters' dinner and the President's advisers talking to the Senate about going to war.

During the briefing that we had in this building yesterday, prior to the United States committing an act of war, we were told that one of the reasons we had to go ahead with this action was because we had gone so far down the road, in consultation with our allies, it would damage our treaty obligations with our allies if we did not proceed. I must confess I was offended—indeed, perhaps outraged by that logic—not because of what it said about what the administration had done with respect to our allies, but because of what it said about what the administration had not done with respect to its constitutional responsibilities. In the Constitution of the United States, the power to declare war is vested in the Congress of the United States. Very clearly, very specifically, without equivocation, Congress shall declare war.

We are on the verge of actions that are the equivalent of the United States going to war. The justification we are receiving for taking those warlike actions is that the administration has made commitments to foreign governments. Why is the administration entering into conversations, consultations and other relationships with foreign governments about going to war and not talking to the Congress of the

United States about going to war, instead, preparing one liners for a dinner with members of the press so the President can get standing ovations for his comedic abilities, the President competing with Bob Hope and David Letterman, while the United States is on the verge of sending its young men and women into harm's way in a situation which, according to the President's advisers, will "take casualties"?

The phrase, "we will take casualties," is a euphemism to say that Americans are going to be killed. They are going to come home in body bags, and they will be killed in a war that Congress has not declared. They will be killed in a war that takes place because the administration has consulted with our allies and is worried about embarrassing themselves with our allies but cannot bother to bring themselves to fulfill their constitutional responsibility to come to the one agency that, under the Constitution, has the authority to declare war—that is, the Congress of the United States.

Indeed, in that briefing we were told that American forces will face the most serious challenge militarily that we have faced since the gulf war, and some said the most serious air defenses we would face since the Second World War. Yet the administration does not bother to talk to Congress about this and gain congressional authority for these actions. Instead, the administration spends its time talking to our allies.

Don't make any mistake, I am not objecting to the fact that the administration has consulted with our allies. I think that is right and proper that we should do that. Don't they have any sense of proportion or constitutional responsibility in this White House? Don't they understand that the Constitution says Congress has the right to declare war, not the President?

The last time we went into major military confrontation was over the gulf war. At that time, the White House was in the hands of a Republican President. That Republican President, whom I consider a good personal friend and for whom I have the highest affection, was going down this same road. He was preparing to take America to war without a congressional authorization to do so. There were those in this body who stood and said, "Mr. President, you cannot take us to war without the approval of Congress."

President Bush and his advisers resisted that logic for a while. Interestingly enough, one of the Senators who spoke out most vigorously, saying to the President you have no right to take us to war without congressional authorization, is now the Secretary of Defense. Then-Senator Cohen said repeatedly, to his own administration and his own party, you cannot take us to war without congressional authorization.