

hope the President and his advisers will pursue a diplomatic solution as soon as possible to end this situation.

#### INPUT FROM CONSTITUENTS ON ISSUES OF CONCERN TO AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WAMP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to be recognized tonight in this special order. This special order is one that I hold for a number of members of the majority. I know there are some who are monitoring tonight's special order, and, for those who have something they would like to add to this hour, I would invite them to the floor now.

Mr. Speaker, being from Colorado, I want to take the opportunity to discuss just briefly before I move on to my other remarks once again the tragedy that took place a week ago yesterday in Colorado, and just express for the people of Colorado our profound gratitude for all of those throughout the country who have expressed their support, their concern, who have supported us through prayer and in so many other ways.

It is a tragedy that has really gripped our state, as it has the whole Nation, and it is encouraging for all of us in this time when we need a lot of courage and strength to know the rest of the country stands with us as a State and thinks daily about the families and the victims and all of those involved, young children, not only in Colorado but throughout the country, that are trying to make sense of a situation where I am afraid there is no logical conclusion that can be drawn as to what allows this kind of thing to occur in America.

Nonetheless, it has, and a great Nation such as ours will emerge from such a tragedy stronger in the long run, I am fundamentally convinced of that, and I believe that is possible because of the strength and support and the prayer of all those who have given considerable thought to our State in the last few days.

This is a topic that also emerged, Mr. Speaker, at a town meeting that I had last week. I go home to Colorado every weekend and visit with constituents and hold town meetings as often and as frequently as I can. The Fourth Congressional District of Colorado, which I represent, is a very large one. It represents approximately half of the State of Colorado, the eastern plains, and 21 counties in scope. So I use the opportunity of the weekends to get back home and talk to as many constituents as I possibly can.

I have a standing town meeting every Monday morning halfway between Fort Collins and Loveland, Colorado. Monday morning is a breakfast meeting. Naturally, the focus and concern ex-

pressed from the audience there was about the shootings in Littleton and the tragedy at Columbine High School. A number of suggestions and solutions and theories were suggested, of course, but, once again, just the feeling of helplessness, the feeling of just devastation in the wake of something so tragic as the death of so many young people and their teacher is something that we will never, ever forget.

Another topic that comes up at the town meetings frequently is the issue that was at the heart of the debate that took place on the floor today, and that is of the U.S. involvement in Kosovo. I have to say I have run across in the last three weeks one constituent in my district who believes the President has acted properly in committing our armed services and our armed forces to carry out his war in Kosovo, that out of literally thousands of constituents that I have had a chance to meet with over the last three weeks.

The concern of those that I represent is certainly for the troops and is certainly for the most positive outcome we can possibly salvage from the operation in Kosovo, but their paramount concern is for the integrity of our Constitution.

There are many interpretations, I suppose, that can be made of the votes that took place here. Some of our colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle were seen not too long ago flailing their arms and speaking in elevated voices about their disappointment with the outcome of today's votes.

Some believe that the Congress, standing up for the Constitution, is an embarrassment. I would disagree entirely. He think that when our great founders 223 years ago, not just in launching a great country through the Declaration of Independence, but a few years later constructing a Constitution, were correct in suggesting that the authority to declare war should reside within the Congress, this House, as well as the other body, and should not be a function, certainly not a unilateral function, of the chief executive.

There are those today that disagree with that premise, and, after a month and a half of debate and deliberation, this Congress spoke forcefully and reasserted its authority and its constitutional role in deploying troops around the world and expressing its opinion about the constitutional basis for warfare.

One of the things I do in my district, Mr. Speaker, is ask for a lot of opinions. I ask people to write letters. I ask people to attend these town meetings that I hold. I ask people to fill out public opinion surveys that I distribute throughout my district and at these town meetings, and I want to share with you and the other Members tonight some of the results of some of those public opinion surveys. I want to go through some of the responses that I have heard from many people, because it really deals with those first two topics that I addressed at the start of this special order.

One of the questions that I asked in this survey, I asked 8 questions, and some of them rather open-ended. I asked, number one, what is the single most important issue facing the country today? Number two, I asked what is the single most important issue to you or your family? It is remarkable to see some of the responses that came in in response in answering this survey.

The number of times that the issue of morality and our national integrity came up was just astounding. It comes up as the number one issue more often than I would expect it, until you read the full descriptions of people's concerns, and then it becomes more apparent.

Here is one that I want to share. Again, what is the single most important issue facing our country today? Morality and the deficient educational system is the answer. Lack of old fashioned basic educational skills.

Please tell me why, this writer asks, and this writer is from Fort Collins, Colorado, please tell me why our children are cheated out of learning the very exciting history of our great country. This is the greatest country ever conceived, and we do not even teach these children why it is the greatest. They are kept completely in the dark. They are not taught that this is a constitutional republic instead of a democracy, the writer says. They learn nothing about the Founding Fathers, the greatest thinkers of all time. They know nothing about the Revolutionary War that was fought for 6 years to give the American people liberty and the pursuit of happiness. They know nothing about the suffering that the soldiers went through to save this country for liberty. Every other civilized country in the world teaches their children the country's history but ours. Instead, our children are taught socialism. It isn't until we are out of school that we realize how little we know, but it takes years for us to figure out why we have been taught so little.

Here is another writer who writes about his experience in Vietnam and talks about our history as a country and what we stand for as a Nation, why soldiers are deployed around the world and for what purpose. He speaks about getting back to a constitutional framework from which we exercise public policy.

Here is one that wrote about taxes as the number one issue.

We recently finished our kids tax forms for 1998. One of our children is 22 years old and has lived at home half of the year. The other is 19 and has lived at home for the full year. They both attend college full-time and work. They also have the maximum tax withheld from their paychecks. The 22-year-old had to pay in \$89 and the 19-year-old had to pay in \$181. We feel if government wants to help these kids, quit taxing them so much. College is so expensive, and then to tax them so much is truly unfair.

This is from a husband and wife with two children. They are also from Fort Collins, Colorado.

Here is another one. Again, the first question I asked in the survey is what is the single most important issue facing the country today? Moral decline is the answer from this woman from Wellington, Colorado. What is the single most important issue facing your family? The respondent says strong families for us and America.

When I asked what do you think is the biggest challenge for our schools, I put a number of boxes. Not enough funds reaching the classroom, class size too big, violence and drugs. This respondent checked none of those. They checked the "other" box and wrote in weak families as being the issue that has their greatest level of concern.

They wrote a special note that they attached. Congressman SCHAFFER, we are watching, we are listening. Hang tough on your moral convictions. Vote strong for the family. A strong family is a strong Nation. Keep up the good work. We pray for our Nation.

I receive lots of letters like this. I know many other Members of Congress do too. I want to assure all those who observed today's proceedings that it is worthwhile to write to your Congressman, it is worthwhile to pick up the phone, to attend the town meetings, to let us know what you think. There are legions of people here in Washington who read these and respond to them and take them to heart and make them become part of the direction we move in Congress.

There are several here. I see the gentleman from Texas has joined me on the floor, but before I yield time to him, I have to share this one response I received from an attorney who wrote, and please think about this.

Once again, the single most important issue to him, according to his response and return survey, is the breakdown of the family. He asks to see the attached letter, a handwritten letter that he placed on his letterhead.

It says Honorable BOB SCHAFFER, regarding the survey attached, breakdown of the family. There are a number of statistics he included.

Over 85 percent of my criminal case clients come from divorced or single parent families. Every school shooting incident nationwide that I am aware of, except one, involved children from broken homes. Both incidents in Colorado last week of young kids bringing guns or ammunition to school involved kids from broken homes.

Timothy McVeigh's, the Oklahoma City bombing, in parentheses, parents were divorced when he was in his teens. Most of my non-personal injury civil case legal work involves problems people face as single parents or divorced spouses, debt, bankruptcy, child support, child welfare, these kinds of actions and others, and I don't ever handle actual divorce cases, he says with an exclamation mark. There are about the same number of divorce cases as

felony criminal cases filed in Larimer County each year, 1,600 cases. We would not need a new courthouse or nearly as large a local, state or national government budget if not for all the broken families.

□ 2130

So there is a connection between social and fiscal issues, he says.

Here are some suggestions he gives us as far as causes. Number one, judges who legislate to set aside State laws, and he gives an example: the right of minors to get abortions, contraceptions without parental involvement, creating an atmosphere of no family responsibility and sexual license, and he is referring of course to the Title X clinics, which is a legitimate concern that all Americans should have. This is the program where the Federal Government provides funds for local health clinics to provide contraceptive services to children without the knowledge, much less the consent, of their parents. He cites that as an example of the authority of families being undercut.

Number two, the number two cause he cites: No-fault divorce and other family-ignorant legislation. Treating non-married parents like real parents regarding custody and visitation.

Three, government welfare programs without goals. This at least is being turned around. Thanks for letting me air my views.

Again, this is from an attorney and one who I happen to know is very involved in many local charities and community activities in the northern Colorado community. I have lots more input from constituents and things that are on people's mind, but I want to yield the floor to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to participate with him in his special order. The gentleman takes, as I do, great faith in learning from our town hall meetings. Meeting with the people we represent, we never fail to learn when we listen carefully to their thoughts, when we listen carefully to the burdens they are under, whether they are just struggling to make ends meet or just trying to get their business going and keep it afloat, or just to have dreams for their kids that they want to make happen and how difficult it is when government gets in the way; even when the government is trying to help, it gets in the way. It is so important.

Like the gentleman, I also consult my constituents whom I represent at my cracker barrel sessions, my town hall meetings, which we have always called cracker barrel sessions around the tradition of meeting around the cracker barrel, talking about what is going on in the community and talking about politics, and we do the same thing today because we have a traditional district. Issues like Kosovo, the war, the shootings in Colorado, Social Security, there is much to discuss, and

we had some of our best cracker barrel sessions ever, and I am looking forward to a new round we are holding in the next 6 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, on Kosovo, I want to talk a bit about that. I had a moment, a brief moment this afternoon to start to discuss it, and time was short, and I wanted to go back to it because it is such an important issue.

Mr. Speaker, Americans have big hearts. That is one of our best traits. Whenever we see killing, whenever we see injustice anywhere, we want to stop it, whether there is a national interest in it or not. Well, Kosovo, having good intentions, but a bad plan of proving to hurt the very people we are trying to help; rather than stopping the human suffering, we have increased it. Rather than stabilizing the region, we have made it more unstable. And now, it appears we are ready to pour more fuel on a very deadly fire in this very volatile region.

It seems tragic to me that with the lessons of the Vietnam War barely cold on our plates that we have not learned from it. Like Vietnam, we are waging a war today almost by the seat of our pants, driven not by military expertise, but by polls and what is politically correct and what are the overnight focus groups saying. As the gentleman would guess, results are predictably fatal, and failing.

Worst of all, I think we forget the most important lesson of Vietnam. It is fatal to enter any war without the will to win it. Those who most sought this war have shown that they lack, unfortunately, the political courage to aggressively target Slobodan Milosevic, his leaders and the Serbian army he commands. As General Douglas MacArthur said in a speech to Congress back in 1951, I believe, he said, "War's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision. In war, there is no substitute for victory."

Well, if a lethal criminal entered our neighborhood today, our schools, our hospitals, and began to shoot our families and innocent children and victims, the first responsibility of law enforcement would be to bring them down, to stop them cold, now. How would we feel if that responsibility, the law enforcement officers flinched, reluctant to take the shot, reluctant to do what it takes to stop the killing? Well, history will record in Kosovo that America flinched, that the allies flinched. The lives of innocent people, young and old, were lost because the commanders in chief somehow found it immoral or were reluctant to bring the shooters down and end these atrocities.

Last Thursday as I read The Washington Post, I read in one section about the atrocities and the fresh graves that had been dug, and I also read a NATO admission that they were, by design, leaving large sections of the Yugoslav Army untouched in the desire or the strategy that perhaps someday they can be part of a peacekeeping mission. So what I realized was that on the

same day we were describing how young American fighter pilots were heading into Yugoslavia, led and being cleared the way by young American pilots leading the process and clearing the path with overhead reconnaissance planes, again with young American soldiers in them, all risking their lives in this conflict, yet, at the same time, we were, by design, preserving the lives of the Yugoslav Army, the ones who were committing the atrocities.

I find nothing humanitarian in a policy that allows young American soldiers to lose their lives, but lets Milosevic live. I find nothing moral or just about a policy, a strategy where the lives of innocent Kosovars die lonely and cold and hungry by the side of the road while we leave the Yugoslavian Army untouched, those who committed the atrocities, remain untouched.

Today in *The Washington Post*, and in many papers across America and in Texas where I live, NATO updated the war, and they went through a pretty impressive list of the aircraft that they destroyed and the airfields and some of the hangars and office buildings, and some of the infrastructure. But when it came to talking about the Serbian Army and what damage we had done to those who have committed the atrocities, they were silent.

Unfortunately and tragically, we now have pilots, young American pilots who risk their lives, and not in the hopes of preserving the American Army, but in preserving the Yugoslavian Army, and their targets are picked not by military experts, but by pollsters, and that is a failure. In this war, our humanitarian effort unfortunately has failed the Kosovars and failed the allies miserably. And now, like a desperate gambler who will not acknowledge their losses, we are thinking, if we can just gamble a little more, if we can just bomb a week longer, if only we can send in Apache helicopters, if only we put American ground troops in, just one more roll, just one more gamble, and perhaps we can win it all back.

Well, we cannot win back the lives of the Kosovars that have been lost and we cannot bring back together the refugee families that have been torn apart. But surely we can save the hopes and dreams of Americans and allied soldiers whose lives have yet to be gambled with.

A short walk from this Chamber, the Vietnam War Memorial lies half buried, silent, below the green grass of the national Mall. Mr. Speaker, 58,000 lives and names are engraved on the wall, 58,000 fathers, brothers, sons and some daughters gone because America's leaders then would rather lose the lives of soldiers than lose face as a Nation. Mr. Speaker, 58,000 teenagers, because the average age of those fighting on the front line in Vietnam was 19 years old, barely out of high school. Mr. Speaker, 58,000 Americans who lost their lives in a war we were not willing to commit to victory to, and it is eerily like the war

we are in today, because as America and allied political leaders flinched, Kosovars fell down around us, and we can never get that back; that opportunity for victory in saving those lives is gone.

We have a moral obligation today, to our young soldiers and their families, to prevent another Vietnam War. We have a moral obligation to our soldiers' mothers who love them like no one else can, to their fathers who harbor dreams for them, can barely talk about without getting emotional; to the brothers and sisters and family members of every American soldier and their spouses and their friends, we have a moral obligation, because it is unconscionable to allow young Americans to give up their life and die while we allow the shooters, all of them, to live by design.

I care a great deal about Kosovo and Kosovars. I am concerned about NATO. But my duty is to our American soldiers. I think that is our highest moral obligation and duty, to prevent another Vietnam War and all the destruction, all the lives and all the families that have been damaged and hurt so much by it because we did not have the courage and the will that when we started the war to conclude it, in victory. It is hard. It is hard to do that, and that is why war should be the last resort, because it is so damaging.

I think before the President pours more deadly fuel on this fire, I think and I would respectfully ask that he exhibit what I would call battlefield leadership. And it means first being honest, truthful to oneself about the failure of the current strategy. It means putting the troops you command first, not yours, worrying not about your record, not about NATO's credibility, not about your legacy, but caring about the troops under your command.

I think probably the toughest battlefield decision has been made many times by those who recognize that a hill cannot be taken, that sacrificing more lives and sacrificing more young people will not accomplish that goal, and to put them first, to do no more harm to them, and to determine what in real life can be done to advance our just and moral cause. I think the President needs to be totally honest with the American people about the steep price, and I mean staggering price, that we will pay, already we must pay, in lives, in resources, in years, to even attempt to secure a temporary peace in that civil war.

My exit strategy, unfortunately, the time has gone for that. My exit strategy was simple. Although I opposed the intervention, once in, my belief is that we bring the shooters down and end the atrocities, or we do no more harm and negotiate an international peace treaty, attempt to secure what we can of Kosovo, attempt to relocate; how many refugees really want to go back to a region they can no longer call home; and to attempt to contain the damage we

have now done in the neighboring regions. I believe it is time to do no more harm. I am not willing to sacrifice young American lives to a war we are not committed to win. That is my duty. That I think is Congress's duty, and I look forward to the day when we can complete that duty.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, that comment, that phrase about winning is usually something that one side or another could understand in the case of some military conflict or the engagement in warfare. But the definition of winning with respect to this conflict is very nondescript. The President and his spokesman, in announcing this war to the American people, in moving forward in an act of warfare in the Kosovo province, failed to identify the clear objectives and the national interest that is at stake when it is impossible and the President is incapable of clearly laying out the objectives to be achieved. It is by definition impossible to determine when one has won and when it is time to declare victory and go home.

□ 2145

That is the real dilemma that the President has put us in, because it has set off a whole cascade of problems that stem in all directions, and does so without the clear definition of what victory means for the United States of America. Without that definition, I am afraid this is an engagement to which we will be committed for a long, long time.

I am curious, at the cracker barrel sessions that the gentleman has back in Texas, this notion that there is a lack of a clear objective and an exit strategy. And it seems to be, at least in my part of this country, and I am curious to find out about the gentleman's, the source of a tremendous amount of anxiety and concern.

I might also point out, before I yield the floor back to the gentleman, from the perspective of the best interests of our troops it is unconscionable in my mind to send troops in harm's way; to send our soldiers, sailors, and airmen to conduct their duty in Kosovo without clear objectives, without knowing when the job is going to be done, and expect them to accomplish this mission.

They will do it. These folks, you give them a mission and they will do it, they will do it proficiently. They are literally the best in the world, and they do the American people proud. But they are Americans, too, and they deserve to have answers about what objectives are being achieved. There are no answers to that question.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. The gentleman from Colorado is right on target and people know it. Every time we go into a classified briefing on this war I am always hopeful to hear more, to hear that there is a plan I am not aware of, a hint of a mission that is so clear that I know that we can achieve it. Because the gentleman is right, the military,

they will achieve any objective, no matter how difficult. They will lay their lives on the line.

But in fact, it is just the opposite. I come out thinking, at each of those sessions, and believing that we ought to give the military right now every medal possible and every acclaim possible, because they seem to be fighting this with two hands tied behind their backs, and a leg, perhaps, as well.

It is interesting about objectives. I went back and took a look at America's intervention in our world wars and our intervention in Korea. The clarity of our missions in Germany and in the world wars, and the vagueness of our mission in Vietnam and here, is eerie.

I looked back and I read a statement by President Johnson from Texas, as a matter of fact, as he addressed the Nation in 1968. Tell me if this sounds familiar:

"Our objective has never been the annihilation of the enemy. It is to bring about a recognition in Hanoi that its objectives could not be achieved."

If that sounds much like the President's objective, not to defeat Milosevic in Yugoslavia but only to degrade their ability to conduct their activities further, the gentleman is right.

And with a mission so vague, and without a commitment, unfortunately, with a lack of courage to do what war requires us to do for compassion and humanity, that is why we do not get into wars until there is no other resort, because it is destructive to us and the enemy, and we must have the courage and will to win.

My concern, and I think it has already been proven, is that we have lacked that. The Kosovars have paid the price. The question will be will American soldiers be the next to pay the price. I am not willing to wager their lives in this war, because that is what it is, without a clear objective, and in fact, without that will to win.

I always use, and perhaps the gentleman does, as well, I use a test for our conflicts: If a young soldier were killed in this battle, could I go to the family and tell them, look them in the face and tell them they lost their son or daughter, their brother or sister, their wife or husband, and that they did it to defend America, in the best and highest cause of American interest?

In this case, I cannot tell them that that death would be justified. It is a high standard, but I think it ought to be any time these young people are sent into battle on our behalf.

We have a war memorial just at the bottom of this hill, the Vietnam War Memorial, where every time you go, and every other memorial is so lively and so inspiring and you get a sense of history, and it is people talking, and there is an enthusiasm and inspiration by our memorials. But when you go to the Vietnam War Memorial, it is stone cold quiet.

Every time I go, and I walk from the base of the memorial, and you start to

look, as you look at the names and you begin to walk up and out of the memorial and up into the sunlight, my thought every time is, never again. Never again will we put bright young American lives with wonderful hopes and dreams, and those of their families, never again should we commit them to war where our political leaders and our Commander in Chief do not have the will and the courage themselves to win. That, unfortunately, is where we are at today. I wish there were an easy way to say it.

I like to believe the best in everyone. I hope and try to believe the best in our Commander in Chief, even as disappointed and upset as I get at times. But this time, we have lost that opportunity. We can never bring those people back. We can only save Americans and learn from the Vietnam War, never again.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The folks back home, when this topic comes up, are insistent that warfare is sometimes necessary and sometimes it is the only option, but that is the standard, that it is only something we should resort to when all other options have been exhausted.

The President is convinced that all diplomatic solutions have been tried and none of them worked. But I want to make it clear that, in looking back over today's debate and even responding to some of the discussion that has taken place here, no single one of us who opposes the President's decision to commit an act of warfare opposes our involvement in trying to resolve the terrible situation that exists in Kosovo, this ethnic cleansing that is taking place at the hands of Slobodan Milosevic.

This is a topic which we are very concerned about, and we want to spend American resources and spend America's diplomatic might and economic leverage and do whatever we possibly can to honor the dignity of human life, and the lives of all those who are involved, victims or otherwise, in the Kosovo conflict.

But this is not a new conflict. This official policy of ethnic cleansing by Milosevic is about 6 years in the making now. What is most distressing is the length of time that this struggle has gone on and has been allowed to fester and grow without any real concern coming out of the White House until a few months ago, when the President at that point suggested to the country that now there are no options.

I submit that the President of the United States and the office of the presidency should be held up and he maintained as the most forceful leader for liberty and freedom around the planet.

The rest of the world does look to the United States of America for guidance and leadership in precisely these kinds of situations. They look to us to be the mediators, the negotiators, to exercise our leadership position and authority,

to bring leaders of democracies around the world together to stand against the tyranny of dictatorships and tyrants of the sort Milosevic is a part.

But that really did not happen over that 6-year period. Again, the White House all of a sudden and suddenly became concerned just a few months ago, and left the United States at quite a disadvantage. The relationships that we have lost and have been set back with respect to emerging democracies in Eastern Europe with Russia, with the Ukraine and other former Soviet Republics, are setbacks that are going to take many, many months, if not years, to regain.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman makes a point that is real critical here. Today, and in much of this debate, people will try to convince Americans that it is between those who care for humanity and those who want to isolate America. It is a rhetorical trick, a way to wedge people onto different sides, as opposed to talking about reasonable approaches.

But the fact of the matter is that America does have a role in peace in this region. We do have a role to play. But the world has changed. Now that we are the strongest world superpower, while the world has changed, we are confused about our role in it today.

We still respond by wanting to fight the disputes and fights of every one of our brothers, older or younger, around the world. And we will. We will jump to any battle, to any fight, and we will fight every one of our brother's and sister's fights for them.

But at some point, because we have so many around the world, we simply cannot. You can fight other's disputes until you are so weak yourself that you lose your own fight when called upon to protect your own family, your own interests. That is where we are today.

I think our new role, America's new role, is not to fight every one of our brother's fights, but to help teach them and work with them so that they can fight their own disputes, settle their own conflicts.

America's role in peace, I believe, is to not lead others in what is principally their challenges but to support them, to help, to advise, to provide technology, to back them up in their challenges and their responsibility, but to not be always taking the lead in their fights; because frankly, we have new challenges here in America, such as the terrorism challenge, where the smallest rogue nations can develop biochemical weapons. International drug cartels have a distribution network literally to every community in this country.

Then on top of those two, we have organized crime which finances instability because it is profitable to do that. So now America faces a challenge where literally biochemical weapons, weapons of mass destruction, can be brought into literally every community in America. We have not changed our security to respond and prevent that.

We have nuclear missiles and the capability by countries to reach the continental United States that we are not prepared for, although thank goodness this Congress is taking the leadership role in doing that. So I think we do have a role to play in peace.

Peace is always, almost always, less costly and less damaging than war, but there are times when your interest, your defense, and national security will quite compel you to do that.

But I notice that Dwight Eisenhower, our former commander and president, made a statement in 1946 that I think rings true today. He said, "Men acquainted with the battlefield will not be found among the numbers that glibly talk of another war."

Those who have been to war, who have seen the blood, who have been part of all of that, understand the need to explore their options first; to know that when you launch that hostility, just what type of courage it takes, and the blood that will always be on your hands.

Unfortunately, in this foreign policy, in the advisers, in the Commander in Chief, I think perhaps we talk too glibly of war when in fact Europe and others around the world urged us to try to find another path to peace in Yugoslavia. Unfortunately, their predictions of the damage have been just terrible.

Mr. SCHAFFER. If we contrast the response to the events that led up to this military conflict with the Gulf War when President Bush presided, we see a wide difference in approach.

President Bush was successful at bringing the entire world and global leadership together to stand against the Iraqi government and Saddam Hussein. He was successful at putting in place various economic sanctions, and using all of the political leverage and diplomatic might of the United States and the global community to stand against a tyrant.

Even when that all seemed to fall apart and the Iraqis moved in to attack a sovereign Nation, it was the response to that form of naked aggression that instantly brought the entire global community together to stand against Saddam.

□ 2200

Very, very different than what we have seen in the case of Milosevic. Again, this is an episode that is many, many years in the making and very little effort to try to use their political position to leverage economic sanctions against Milosevic.

We see some of our strongest allies continuing to sell oil and other technology and weaponry to our enemy now in Kosovo. Yet what is the response from our President? We had all of the leaders of these same countries right here in Washington, D.C., just last week. I did not read one word of our President objecting to this economic exchange that is going on between our allies and the government that we are bombing right now and the regime that we are bombing.

As I say, what America needs right now is a foreign policy, and out of the White House we have none today. I just shudder at the prospect that any of our troops will come home in body bags and find themselves buried in what one of my staff members today coined the "tomb of the unknown policy." This is a prospect that all Americans ought to be very, very concerned about.

But we do have a role in trying to prevent the violence that is taking place. It is a diplomatic role. It is one that requires real leadership out of the White House. We have to have a President, a Commander in Chief, who is not preoccupied by other things, distracted by less important topics, certainly, at a time when the willing answer of and eager military leader of our country is to commit somebody else's sons and daughters to fight a war for which victory is very hard to define.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thankfully, we live in a country where we have the opportunity to vote our conscience, to raise issues that trouble us, to talk about them, and to unite behind our American troops, to be absolutely a hundred percent behind them. Whatever they need while they are there, financially and funding-wise, we are going to get them.

And in fact, not only that, but we are going to make sure that there are the reserves and the dollars to try to rebuild our military to where we are not costing lives each time we are given a new challenge as we do today.

I was thinking also that our allies have been hurt terribly in this, as well. We have now pushed the ethnic Albanians out into the neighboring regions. And it is almost like taking part of our State and pushing them to other States.

And by nature, if we took a bunch of Texans and push them out to three neighboring States and basically say they cannot come back or they can come back to a small, damaged, torn up, insecure, non-secure area, I will tell my colleagues what they are going to do. They are going to carve out from the three States, they are in a new Texas, a new State, with people they know and values they have and religions that they share.

And this is what is happening now in the Balkans. We have pushed out ethnic Albanians out of their home. As in Bosnia, very few, my guess, will return. That is what history shows us. And they are going to look for a new country, a new independent nation with people whose values they share, and that means we will likely create a greater Albania and perhaps too a Macedonia. And I do not know what other damage we will do to our neighboring countries. So our friends there are paying a very steep price.

And here is Europe who was asking all along, we want more options than just bombing, here is Europe in their biggest year perhaps ever. They launched a new currency, the Euro, created new Federal banks sort of like

our Federal Reserve. They are trying to hire a new foreign policy person to unite the European Union. They had had their whole European Commission resign because of corruption, which was a major blow. They were asked and brought in expanded three new NATO neighbors and costs that are associated with that.

And then we pushed them into not only defending themselves, but America said their new strategy in Europe is going to be to resolve disputes like this and resolve it militarily. We are like a friendly banker who keeps pushing the small business to expand, to expand, to expand, to expand, until one day they expand themselves out of business.

My concern is that at a time when NATO should be reasonably and thoughtfully talking about their new role in Europe and with America in this new world, that we are pushing them into a role they are not ready to play. And while I have to admit, after 24 hours after bombing three of the countries, NATO said, enough, we think that is enough. Stop, that is enough bombing for us.

To their credit, as a group, they have hung pretty tight. But the fact of the matter is that they do not know what victory is anymore. They do not know about if they can shoulder the costs of it. They do not know if they can survive this NATO expansion. So each of our closest allies we have pushed into a terrible position that will hurt them economically, politically, culturally for many years to come.

And I just think again, war ought to be the last resort. We have so many pressures. We have so many tools that we ought not to ever glibly talk of war or to enter one. And whether we today declared war, which we did not but we know we are in it, and now have the responsibility to face up, to be held accountable ourselves for our actions, and what is sad is the price that we will all pay, but at least we ought to commit and have the courage to sacrifice no American lives in this terrible mess.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether we are at war or had to declare it, and so on, is one that now is going to be resolved in the courts. This is a question that has been at the center of the relationship between this Congress and the presidency for a great number of years, and it has been a point of dispute for quite a long time.

And each military incursion that we have undertaken as a country seems to take one more step or one more bite out of that constitutional responsibility that the Congress has to declare war, and there are various reasons that that is so.

With respect to NATO or U.N. operations over the years, we have granted huge amounts of authority to the President to act unilaterally within the context of our relationship to the NATO treaty or U.N. charters. When it

comes to peace agreements that disintegrate and erode, it is our relationship and response to these agreements, the fact that we have formally taken part as signatories to these agreements, that compels us and authorizes Presidents to step into war. Even under those circumstances, constitutional authority to declare war has been questionable.

But this case is different altogether. It is different because we are talking now about a sovereign nation, a nation that did not act as an aggressor to a neighbor or some other jurisdiction around the world. We are talking about a conflict that does not involve an attack upon any of our NATO partners. NATO, being a defensive organization, its charter does not envision attacking sovereign countries as it has now been used to do.

So this profound question that needs to be answered, and I guess at this point Congress has asserted its authority, has denied the President a declaration of war to carry out his war in Kosovo.

The President now continues to carry out an act of war without the consent of Congress. And the only remedy remaining for us now is to test this question of the War Powers Act before our great courts. As a country, I think we need to certainly be concerned about the conflict that is the heart of the debate. But, also, we need to be very, very concerned about the status of our Constitution, that the War Powers Act maintains its integrity clear through to today's point in time, and to ensure the American people that this Congress will find the courage, as it has today, to stand for and assert its constitutional authority. And that is what we did.

I guess some Members in Congress just an hour ago were here on the floor lamenting the fact that we stood up for our constitutional responsibility and the fact that we honored that constitutional responsibility, in their opinion, is the cause of some kind of personal discomfort for them. I am sorry about that. But we swore an oath to that Constitution to stand up for it when called upon.

We were called upon to do it today. Some of us did. Others did not. And this is a matter to be sorted out now by the American people at the next election.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I think, too, that as the gentleman from Colorado has pointed out our constitutional duty, I always try to support the President, any President, in military action and we have in every case in Congress. But my duty and the duty of my colleague is not to the President, it is to the Constitution. And I think we have a higher moral duty to our young American soldiers.

And they are young. I mean, they are young, bright, wonderful people who are serving our country and think that if they fight and risk their lives it will be for freedom, not to allow Milosevic

to live, not to allow a Serbian army to go untouched, not to flinch when sent into war because of their constraint on them as individuals.

Our duty today was not to cover the President for a terrible decision. That would have been disloyal, in my opinion. Our duty was to our American soldiers who are over there right now and the belief that we ought not sacrifice their lives when we do not have the courage, when our commanders in chief of this whole operation politically do not have the courage that we are asking of them.

No one should ever ask more of their troops than they ask of themselves. And in this case, we ask too much.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Stepping forward to a conflict such as this requires preparation, requires considerable forethought, and to allow to prepare our armed services.

And again, over the last 7 years in Congress, this has been a point of clear debate between the Congress and the presidency. This President has cut the funding of our armed services year after year after year, to the point where our soldiers, sailors, and airmen express legitimate concern for the resources for the equipment, for the backup, and for the training that they receive.

And there may be times when they need to be deployed. This is not one of them. We are not prepared to win and win decisively. And winning, as we have pointed out earlier, is a nebulous term in and of itself with respect to this engagement.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to be recognized for this special order hour. I am grateful to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for sharing in this special order hour.

I want to once again urge all of our constituents, people throughout the country, to write their Congressman, call their Congressman, let us know what is on their minds, help us lead the country. The voice of the people is the most powerful force in our political system, and all American citizens should be compelled to exercise it to-night.

□ 2215

#### MANAGED CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WAMP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to use the entire hour this evening. I wanted to spend some time, though, talking about HMO reform, or managed care reform.

One of the things that I want to really stress is that there is a major difference between the approach that the Democrats have been taking on the issue of HMO reform versus the approach of the Republican leadership. A

lot of times I worry that Americans and our constituents think that what we are proposing on both sides of the aisle is essentially the same and that everyone is trying to do something to protect patients' rights during this managed care reform debate. But I just think it is important to stress the differences. I really feel very strongly that the Patients' Bill of Rights, the Democratic bill that has been put forward and is cosponsored by almost every Member on the Democratic side, really protects patients' rights, whereas the Republican leadership bills that have been put forward both in this Congress and in the previous Congress really do not do an adequate job of protecting patients and too often look towards the interests of the insurance industry instead.

Mr. Speaker, in the last session of Congress, in the last 2 years, in 1997 and 1998, there was some debate on the issue of HMO reform, but the issue was essentially left unfinished in the 105th Congress, in the last Congress. On the House side, the Democrats' Patients' Bill of Rights was defeated by just five votes when it came to the floor. It was considered on the floor as a substitute to the Republican leadership's managed care bill which did pass and which in my opinion was really not a good piece of legislation and did not do anything significant to protect patients. In fact, the Republican leadership in the House has reintroduced a bill in this session of Congress that is virtually identical to what it moved last year. On the Senate side, the Senate Republicans in the so-called HELP Committee approved a managed care bill which really in my opinion is a sham reform bill and does not allow patients to sue the insurance companies but does allow the insurance companies and not the doctors and patients to define what is medically necessary, what types of procedures, what length of stay, what kind of operations would be performed and would be acceptable under an individual insurance policy.

I just wanted to, if I could, take a little time this evening to talk about why this Republican bill that passed the Senate, the Republican leadership bill in the Senate, really does not do an adequate job of trying to protect patients' rights. If you look at the bill that passed the Senate or that came out of committee, I should say, in the Senate this year, it leaves out more than 100 million Americans, two-thirds of those with private health insurance. It fails to grant key protections needed by children, women, persons with disabilities and others with chronic conditions or special health care needs. And it allows medical decisions to continue to be made by insurance company executives instead of by health care professionals and patients.

Mr. Speaker, the main difference that I have tried to point out between the Democrats' Patients' Bill of Rights and the Republican leadership bills that have been sponsored in the House