

to be in the peacekeeping force. The Serbs propose that it be under a U.N. flag. America has indicated maybe the U.N. flag is acceptable.

Both sides have agreed that the killing should stop. Both sides have even said the Kosovars should go home. The disagreement is over the makeup of the force. The Serbs want to see a lightly armed force of Russians, Greeks and others who have not waged war against them recently, and America and NATO insist on a NATO-led force that is heavily armed.

One possibility is to have two peacekeeping forces patrolling two different separate peacekeeping regions within Kosovo. One region could be patrolled by Russians, Greeks, and others acceptable to the Serbs. And it could be said that the Kosovars would be reluctant to return to that region, and I will get to that in a bit, but that first region could include the areas of Kosovo which are most sacred to the Serbs and are the reason or the stated reason they are fighting so hard to retain that territory.

That area, which I would think would be maybe 20 percent of Kosovo, could include the famous monasteries, or at least the most important famous monasteries. The City of Pec, where the Serbian Orthodox church began, could be included. We could negotiate, others could decide, whether the mines in northern Kosovo would be included, and of course the battlefield at Kosovo Polje, the famous battlefield where the Serbs were defeated by the Turks in the 14th Century, could all be included in an area where Serbs would feel they had not given up their rights, where the territory would be patrolled only by friends, or at least countries with whom they continue to have cordial relations.

The other 80 percent of Kosovo should be patrolled by heavily armed, NATO-led, perhaps U.N.-flag-flying troops where Kosovars could feel very safe. This would allow them to return to Kosovo and, with some American and European economic aid, to rebuild their lives.

If we insist on totally crushing all Serb claims to Kosovo, we insist that this war will go on until they are forced to give up. And I am not sure that is even 2 or 3 months away, and I am not sure that that does not involve ground troops over those Almadian mountains, and I am not sure that it can be done at a level of casualties that are acceptable to the NATO countries involved.

Because keep in mind, if a multilateral NATO military ground force is deployed, perhaps a British unit suffers casualties or a German unit or an Italian unit or an American unit, and the country that sent those particular soldiers demands an end to hostilities, then we will have the domino effect as each NATO nation says, well, if one

NATO nation is pulling out, the others must. So it is important that we try to set our objectives consistent with the real humanitarian reason for our being involved in the Balkans.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address an issue that has been addressed on this floor several times, and that is the role that Congress should play in making our foreign policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our constitution clearly provides that it is Congress that can declare war. And I believe that once and if we declare war, at that point all Americans should support that war, and Congress at that point has signed the blank check and should butt out and let the Commander in Chief proceed. But unless that happens, we have a decision-making process. If we are not at war, if we have not declared war, if it is not an all-out war, then there is a decision-making process as to what level of hostilities should exist and what we should demand for peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am told that dictatorship is efficient; that dictatorship is silent and secret and does not show its enemies what it is thinking. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not our government. Even decisions within the administration are subject to public input, public discussion and a press leak every day. But our Constitution does not vest all power in the administration. And contrary to popular belief, virtually every U.S. Supreme Court decision says that it is Congress, not the President, that has the primary role of determining what our foreign policy is, though not, of course, of determining how our troops should be deployed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know that there are those who have come to this floor and said that our enemies would tremble in fear if they thought that one man could deploy 100,000 American soldiers without the consent of this Congress. But, Mr. Speaker, I would tremble in fear, the founders of this Republic would tremble in fear, if they thought that one man could send 100,000 or more men and women into battle without the approval of the United States Congress.

I call upon the President to modify his equivocal letter. There was a letter addressed to the Congress just a couple weeks ago saying, in essence, that ground troops would not be deployed without congressional approval. But those of us who looked very carefully at that letter realized that it did not say what it seemed to say at first reading, and that in fact the President had not promised what he should promise, and that is that before deploying American troops in a battle that may cost hundreds or thousands of lives, that he should come to this Congress and ask for approval.

Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, I have even other observations from my trip. This issue deserves a full debate. There

is, believe it or not, even more to be said, but I notice that it is nearly midnight, it is time for this House to adjourn, and so I will yield back.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today before 12:30 p.m. on account of official business.

Mr. LUTHER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 4:00 p.m. on account of family matters.

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. SIMPSON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for May 4 and 5 on account of a death in the family.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of family medical reasons.

#### 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. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SANCHEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAUL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, on May 12.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGLISH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITFIELD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, on May 6.

Mr. TALENT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 453. An act to designate the Federal building located at 79 West 9th Street in Juneau, Alaska, as the "Hurff A. Saunders Federal Building."

S. 460. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 401 South Michigan Street in South Bend, Indiana, as the "Robert K. Rodibaugh United States Bankruptcy Courthouse."

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.