

We believe there is a need to increase overall retirement security, which must include leveraging of private sector dollars by expanding pensions. The Portman-Cardin bill knocks down barriers to savings by raising limits for all Americans, allowing Americans to set aside more of their earnings tax free. It untangles complex and irrational rules and cuts through red tape that burdens retirement plans and their participants, and it creates new incentives for small businesses to establish plans.

The Portman-Cardin bill also allows a special catch-up contribution for older Americans who have been out of the workforce for a while perhaps, working in part-time positions, particularly important for working moms who have returned to the workforce after raising their children and want to have more of a nest egg for retirement. We also respond, as I mentioned earlier, to the new realities of a mobile workforce by allowing portability.

If enacted, all these changes will expand retirement savings and make the difference between retirement subsistence and real retirement security for millions of Americans. I urge the Congress to focus on this issue and to address this problem through the Portman-Cardin bill and other legislation to reform and expand our private pension system.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JACK KINGSTON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JACK KINGSTON, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 7, 1999.

Hon. J. Dennis Hastert,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII (8) of the Rules of the House that I received a subpoena (duces tecum) issued by the Superior Court of Bulloch County, Georgia, in the case of Griffin v. Zimnavoda.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

JACK KINGSTON,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CRISIS IN KOSOVO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to address the crisis that is ongoing now in Yugoslavia. For a war to be moral, we must have a reason to go in. National defense is a moral justification. If we are attacked, it is a moral war. Getting involved in any other kind of war is not considered to be moral.

A legal war in this country is one that is declared, declared by the Congress. Any other war is illegal. The war in Yugoslavia now pursued by our administration and with NATO is both immoral and illegal and it should not be pursued. We will be soon voting on an appropriation, probably next week. There may be a request for \$5 billion to pursue the war in Yugoslavia. I do not believe that we should continue to finance a war that is both immoral and illegal.

It has been said that we are in Yugoslavia to stop ethnic cleansing, but it is very clear that the goal of the NATO forces is to set up an ethnic state.

□ 1945

It is totally contradictory. There is a civil war, and it is horrible, going on in Yugoslavia today, but this is no justification for outsiders, and especially United States of America, to become involved without the proper proceedings.

I believe that our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), deserves to be complemented because he is making a determined effort to put the burden on the Members of Congress to vote one way or the other. Since World War II we have fought numerous wars, and they have never been fought with a declaration of war, and it is precisely for that reason, because they have not been fought for truly national security reasons, that we have not won these wars. If a war is worth fighting, it is worth declaring, and it is worth winning.

I am delighted that this effort is being made by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and others here in the Congress because for so long, for 50 years now, we have permitted our Presidents to casually and carelessly involve our troops overseas. So I see this trend as putting more pressure on the Congress to respond to their responsibilities. I think this is a very, very good move and going in the right direction.

It has been asked why in the world might we be there if it is not a concern for the refugees, because obviously we have hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of refugees in many, many places around the world. We do not go to Rwanda to rescue the refugees, we did not go into Yugoslavia to rescue the Serbian refugees when they were being routed from Bosnia and Croatia, but all of a sudden the refugees seem to have an importance.

Most people know why we went to the Persian Gulf. It was not because we were attacked. It was because of a financial commercial interest: oil. But

what is the interest in this area in Yugoslavia? I am not sure exactly what it is. There has been a lot of postulations about this, but I am not convinced that it is all of a sudden the concern for the refugees.

Yesterday in the Washington Post an interesting article occurred on this subject, but it was not in the news section; it was in the business section. There was a headline yesterday in the Washington Post that said: Count Corporate America Among NATO's Staunchest Allies. Very interesting article because it goes on to explain why so many corporations have an intense interest in making sure that the credibility of NATO is maintained, and they go on to explain that it is not just the arms manufacturers but the technology people who expect to sell weapons in Eastern Europe, in Yugoslavia, and they are very interested in making use of the NATO forces to make sure that their interests are protected. I think this is not the reason for us to go to war.

There is talk now of calling up all our Reserves or many of our Reserves at the same time there are hints now that there may be the institution of the draft. So this is a major problem that this country is facing, the world is facing, and up until now we, the Congress, have not spoken.

On February 9 of this year I introduced a bill that would have prohibited this by prohibiting any funds being spent on a war in Yugoslavia. I say it is too bad we did not pass that legislation a long time ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER
TIME

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time previously allotted to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? There was no objection.

NEW DEMOCRATS FOR FISCAL
DISCIPLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the Republican budget that the House passed this afternoon.

As a member of the New Democratic Coalition when I came to Congress, I was very proud of the vote that I made