

Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancred
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)
Klecicka
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
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
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
Trafficant
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. GEJDEN-

SON), 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 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 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 Afghanistans, 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, flat-test 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 mili-

tary, 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 geno-

cidal 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 gentleman 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 stand-off 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 thou-

sands 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 Milosevic'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. Milosevic'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, Con-

gressman 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 ever 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 me 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 air-strike 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 Kosovo 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 be-

cause 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 refugees 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 mediate 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