

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

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

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF DR.
DAVID J. CANTOR

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, after this week we will be losing a trusted friend at the Congressional Research Service (CRS) who has been instrumental in providing timely and accurate information to Members of the Congressional Steel Caucus and to our staffs regarding the U.S. steel industry and its workers. I am speaking of Dr. David J. Cantor, who is retiring at the end of this month after spending 18½ years with CRS as a specialist in industry economics.

Dr. Cantor brought to CRS a distinguished academic and professional background when he joined the staff in 1980. Dr. Cantor has a Ph.D. in Economics from Harvard University and held faculty positions at Boston University, Nasson College and Golden Gate University. He spent several years with the U.N. Industrial Development Organization in Vienna, Austria and worked as an Energy Specialist with the California Energy Commission.

At CRS, Dr. Cantor has followed energy economics and the pharmaceutical industry, but his primary specialization has been following the steel industry. In the early 1980s, Congress enacted an enforcement mechanism for the Voluntary Restraint Agreements (VRA), which allowed the domestic steel industry and its workers to take actions to modernize the U.S. steel industry and make it world competitive. Throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, Dr. Cantor authored numerous reports monitoring the Steel VRA program which allowed the Steel Caucus to closely monitor the Administration's enforcement of this program.

Dr. Cantor also authored a report demonstrating that import limitations of the steel VRA program were not responsible for rising steel prices. More importantly, Dr. Cantor authored a series of reports that defined the steel industry as a basic industry, and not just as a supplier to steel using sectors of the economy. As Chairman of the Congressional Steel Caucus, Dr. Cantor's work has been instrumental in our work to maintain this vital U.S. industry and the important jobs associated with it.

Most recently, many of us have worked closely with Dr. Cantor to understand the current steel import crisis and to formulate legislative proposals that respond to this import crisis.

We in Congress who work closely on issues relating to the U.S. steel industry and to workers in this important industry have come to trust and value Dr. Cantor's analysis of steel issues. We have come to expect the clear and unequivocal conclusions that he has provided to us. To his tribute, he has earned the trust of not only Members of Congress and their staffs, but also of the steel industry, the unions and steel users. On behalf of the Members of the Congressional Steel Caucus, I would like

to thank Dr. Cantor. We wish him and his wife all the best when they begin their retirement in Phoenix, Arizona this summer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2100

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE'S OB-FUSCATION OF ISSUES SUR-ROUNDING GULF WAR ILLNESSES

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the GAO recently presented me with results of a year-long investigation regarding reports that the presence of antibodies for squalene had been discovered in the blood samples of 6 Gulf War veterans. I am deeply troubled over the Department of Defense reply to the GAO recommendation. The GAO simply stated that since scientifically-credible research produced these findings, it would behoove the Department of Defense to conduct their own test to replicate or to dispute the results. We owe this to our veterans.

The DOD response to the report has been unconscionable. In the department's official letter of comment Dr. Sue Bailey accused the GAO of being, and I quote, scientifically and fiscally irresponsible. That is a reprehensible statement, and I can not allow that accusation to go unchallenged.

The recommendation reflects the scientific community's conclusion that the squalene antibody research is based on well-established principles. The lead researcher at Tulane University is widely respected. Tulane and the researchers have offered their assistance to DOD. Considering this, the Department of Defense cannot accuse the GAO of scientific irresponsibility.

What is irresponsible is for the DOD to conclude that it can afford to wait for the lengthy publication process before conducting its own inquiry. Over 100,000 Gulf War era veterans are now afflicted with a tragic assortment of health problems. We have a moral obligation to aggressively pursue any legitimate research that may provide hope and answers.

Further, the DOD challenged the GAO's recommendation on fiscal grounds. I find this stunning. Over \$100 million have been spent researching Gulf War illnesses with little to show for the effort. DOD officials admitted to the GAO that they could develop such an assay at minimum cost and test it on a sample of sick veterans. This first step could be funded for as little as \$10,000.

GAO's investigation was hindered repeatedly by DOD's refusal to provide forthright and truthful answers to investigators. They misled the GAO regarding when they began the research of the experimental squalene adjuvant, how many studies they did and how many personnel were involved. While assuring the GAO that investigational vaccine were not used, DOD officials were not able to provide documentation on the process and results of the decision-making related to the administration of vaccines during the Gulf War.

These actions mirror the continual difficulty that has been encountered in trying to get the truth regarding risk factors during the Gulf War. There has been a pattern, a consistent pattern, of denials. For example, DOD initially refused to even acknowledge that many vets were having serious health problems.

With this kind of track record and a tragic past history of experimental medical research, the DOD cannot expect us to simply accept their denials and refusals. Our ability to recruit and retain has been compromised by the department's obfuscation on many issues surrounding the Gulf War illnesses. They must act immediately and with integrity to resolve whether or not squalene antibodies may be contributing to the illnesses of Gulf War era veterans. It would go a long way in helping the DOD to restore its seriously damaged credibility and restoring the trust of our men and women in uniform.

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

Mr. BEREUTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MORAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL WARS MUST BE FOUGHT IN SELF DEFENSE

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from several Members already about being unhappy with the legislative process today. The votes did not go exactly the way I wanted, but I am not all that unhappy with what happened because there was a serious effort for this House to restore some of the responsibility that they have allowed to gravitate to the administration and to our Presidents over the many years.

Today's legislative process was chaotic, but I think it was chaotic for a precise reason. We are trying to rectify something that has been going on for more than 50 years, and it is not just this President. It is every President that we have had since World War II.

We have in the Congress permitted our Presidents too much leeway in waging war.

This was an effort today to restore that responsibility to the House. It was done sloppily, but considering the alternative of doing nothing, this was much better.

So I am very pleased with what happened today. I am disappointed that there was such strong feelings about the outcome. But I suspect they were not unhappy with the process as much as they were unhappy with not winning the votes.

But nevertheless the votes were very important today. One of the most significant, if not the most significant: we on this House floor today voted up and down on a war resolution. This is not done very often and under the circumstances that exist today, probably the first time.

But that was an easy vote. The House overwhelmingly voted not to go to war. This makes a lot of sense. This is a very good vote. Why should we go to war against a country that has not aggressed against us?

So this was normal and natural and a very good vote. The problem comes with the other votes because they do not follow a consistent pattern.

I think there are too many Members in this House who have enjoyed the fact that they have delivered the responsibility to the President. They do not want war, but they want war. They do not want a legal war, they want an illegal war. They do not want a war to win, they want a war that is a half of a war. They want the President to do the dirty work, but they do not want the Congress to stand up and decide one way or the other.

Today we saw evidence that the Congress was willing to stand up to some degree and vote on this and take some responsibility. For this reason I am pleased with what happened. So voting against the war that has no significant national security interest makes a lot of sense to me.

Another vote, the vote to withhold ground troops unless Congress authorizes the funding for this; this is not micromanaging anything. This is just the Congress standing up and accepting their responsibilities. So this in many ways was very good. This means that the people in this country, as they send their messages to the Members of Congress, are saying that this war does not make a whole lot of sense. If the people of this country were frightened, if they felt like they were being attacked, if they felt like their liberties were threatened, believe me the vote would have been a lot different.

But I am very pleased that this House stood up and said:

Mr. President, you have overstepped your bounds already. Slow up. Do not get this notion that you should send in ground troops. It makes no sense to this House.

Now the interesting thing is that was a resolution, it was a House Resolu-

tion, that probably really does not have much effect other than a public relation effect because it would have to be passed by the Senate, it would be vetoed by the President, we would have to override his veto. So, in the practical legislative sense it does not mean a whole lot, but it means something in the fact that we brought it to the floor and we were required to vote on it.

Another resolution that was defeated unfortunately, and it was defeated by a two-to-one margin; this would have said that the President would have to cease, we should have told him to cease, because we have not given him the right to wage war. As a matter of fact, even today we said there will be no war, there will be no declaration of war, so we should consistently follow up and say what we should do is withdraw and not fight a war.

Likewise, when we come to the endorsement of the military bombing, fortunately it went down narrowly. But it in itself, too, does not have any legal effect. That is a House Concurrent Resolution that has no effect of law other than the public relations effect of what the Congress is saying.

But I think it is a powerful message that the American people have spoke through this House of Representatives today to not rubber stamp an illegal, unconstitutional and immoral war. The only moral war is a war that is fought in self-defense. Some claim that this is a moral war because there are people who have been injured. But that is not enough justification. The moral and constitutional war has to be fought in self-defense.

LET US PURSUE A DIPLOMATIC SOLUTION ASAP TO END THE SITUATION IN KOSOVO

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this evening the House had an emotionally charged debate about our policy in Kosovo, and contrary to remarks made after the vote, this was not a vote against the troops. This was a vote against the policy of this administration. All of us support the troops and the young men and women who are doing their duty.

But I think it is also sad. I understand that people become so emotionally charged that, if they lose, they automatically say this was a partisan vote, and I understand that. But I think it is important to remember that these are very serious issues, and all of us have very strong feelings about them, and we may not all agree with the views of others.

But I think, as we debate U.S. involvement in Kosovo, it is important to remember that there has been political and religious turmoil in Kosovo since at least 1389. The Muslim forces of the Ottoman Empire defeated Serb forces on the plains of Kosovo at a

place called the Field of Black Birds, and Kosovo has been a sacred place for Muslims and Orthodox Serbs for generations. It is unimaginable really that either group would ever be forced to leave a place they consider their homeland.

Now today in the New York Times and other national magazines our military commanders of NATO acknowledged that 5 weeks of intensive bombing has failed to reduce the size of the Serbian forces in Kosovo or in their operations against Albanians. The 4,423 bombing sorties may have rendered Serb air defenses ineffective, but air strikes have not accomplished the stated purpose, to stop the ethnic cleansing of the Kosovars. However innocent civilians in Belgrade, in Kosovo and other locations throughout Serbia and Yugoslavia have been killed by NATO air strikes, and the number of civilian casualties and incidents of misdirected weapons continues to increase. Relentless bombing has become ineffective, and the more it continues, the more innocent civilians are going to be killed and injured in Kosovo and in Serbia, and certainly a military action in which the only victims are civilians will not be long supported by the world community.

Now I do not think we should mislead the American people. We already are in a quagmire in Yugoslavia, and there is no easy way out, and it is very complex.

But in my view, and the reason that I have voted against the resolution this evening, because we have all sat by and we have watched these relentless air strikes that are totally destroying the infrastructure of Yugoslavia, and in the near future they are going to be coming back to America to help rebuild the country; but the reason I voted against the resolution tonight giving the President authority to continue these air strikes is because I believe that at this point America only has two options. One is an all-out ground war with air support to recapture Kosovo.

□ 2115

Now, this option would require over 75,000 ground troops, casualties would be inevitable, and troop presence would be essential to protect Kosovars for a long time once the war was completed.

The other option is a diplomatic solution. The goal of NATO should be to return the Kosovars to Kosovo. A military presence will be required to assure their safety, and, of course, Serbian forces must be removed. Now, there have been some indications recently that Mr. Milosevic may accept and be willing and required to accept the presence of foreign troops in Kosovo. In fact, he alluded to that in a recent interview with C-SPAN.

So I think that we have a real opportunity here through the Russians, through our NATO allies, through others that have contacts with Mr. Milosevic, to push this opportunity. I