

through some of the highlights of the Patients' Bill of Rights: Guarantees access to needed health care specialists. Most people probably think they have a right to see a specialist, but they do not necessarily right now.

Provide access to emergency room services when and where the need arises. Most people are shocked to find out they cannot go to the local emergency room because their HMO says they have to go somewhere else.

Provide continuity of care protections to assure patient care if a patient's health care provider is dropped. Give access to a timely internal, independent, external appeals process. Ensure that doctors and patients can openly discuss treatment options.

That is a great one. The gag rule. When I explain to constituents that under many managed care plans now that a doctor cannot give them information about a course of treatment that is not covered by the insurance company, they cannot believe it. Most people view that as un-American because they figure we all should have a right to free speech. And to imagine that a doctor cannot tell a patient about a treatment option because it is not covered by the insurance plan is un-American is unethical and just incredible.

These are simple things. We are not really talking about anything that is terribly abstract. These are just common sense protections.

If I could just conclude by saying that I just think it is very unfortunate that we just cannot bring this measure to the floor and have a vote up and down. And the worst part of it is that this is the second year. Last year we had to do the same thing; go through the same petition process, have 200 some odd Democrats and a few Republicans come down here and sign a petition to get this considered on the floor. And here we are about to do the same thing next week in order to bring this to the floor.

It just should not be that way. That is not the way people expect this Congress to operate. But we are going to make sure it happens and we are going to make sure that we have an opportunity to bring the Patients' Bill of Rights to the floor of the House of Representatives because it is the right thing to do and it is what Americans want and expect from all of us.

KOSOVO PEACE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a few minutes rebutting the previous comments that we have all just heard. I will summarize it like this, and then I will move on to the subject that I really came to speak about this evening.

Do not misunderstand. Members on both sides of the aisle, both Republicans and Democrats, want to get a medical system out there, health care out there that is effective and delivers a good product to help America stay healthy.

It is amazing to me sometimes that some of my colleagues, strictly for political purposes, will stand up here in front of everyone and preach about how some on both sides of the aisle must not want health care for America. It is kind of like when we hear the education arguments up here, as if somebody on this floor really truly does not care about children. I have never met anybody that truly does not care about children. I have never met anybody that truly does not care about health care for America. I have never really met anybody that does not care about patients' rights. Of course, we all care about it, but we all have different approaches. And in order to fairly hear those different approaches we have to have some type of process. We have to have some type of order in the House.

The complaint that we have heard in the previous hour is that they just would prefer not to follow that order of the House. They would like to go out of the process. They would like to have it their way. Well, I do not blame them for wanting it their way, but in the House Chamber we have to follow the process. We have rules. If we all follow those rules, we have a chance to be heard.

My gosh, how many hours every day does the American public listen to us talk. Of course, we have freedom of speech. I was surprised, disappointed, even somewhat amused that in the last hour someone had the audacity to stand up and say we do not have freedom of speech in this country. Oh, my gosh, being on the House floor, which by the way is one of the highest privileges an individual can get in this country, but they say they do not have freedom of speech. Of course they have their freedom of speech.

Both Republicans and Democrats in education, in health care, in transportation, in military, they care about those issues. Of course they care about those issues. And I think it is just plain wrong for somebody to stand up here and imply or directly state that one side or the other, like the Republicans tonight, the Republicans must not care about patient health care, the Republicans must not care about freedom of speech.

Come on, grow up, folks. We have a lot of responsibilities out there to the American people, let us appreciate and let us respect the right that we have to stand on this floor without worrying about government oppression and speaking our minds, and that we also have the obligation to follow some type of process to have that order.

Well, enough said about that. This evening I really want to visit a little more specifically about a couple of areas. Number one, about Kosovo.

As we all now know, the news in Kosovo is good news. We have heard some good news in the last few hours. The peace treaty, if that is what we want to call it, has been signed. That is good news, regardless of where we all are on Kosovo. I, for example, do not believe we should have been there in a military sense. I think we had a humanitarian obligation. And I objected to the strategy that has been used by the administration, their approach to the problem in Yugoslavia, but despite that fact, regardless of where we may stand, we all ought to be happy that some type of peace agreement has been signed in the next couple of weeks. Hopefully, it will be executed in such a way that the death and the raping and the burning will come to a stop over in Yugoslavia.

But while many people tonight will celebrate what happened with this peace agreement, we have to remember that old saying that the devil is in the details. What are the details of this peace agreement? What do we have in Kosovo? What is the situation? There are a number of areas that we should look at.

Remember what is very important about any action taken by a government, really any action taken by anyone, and that is that intent cannot be measured. We must measure results. The intent here was probably well-founded. I have never criticized the President for his intent. I think it was well-founded. Or the administration and the other officers in the administration. It is the results that I question. What are the results of what we have done?

Now that we are about to go into Kosovo with military forces on a peace-keeping mission, we need to see what were the results of the last 78 days of bombing. Take a look at the Yugoslavian economy. We are discussing our defense budget. To give an idea of the total gross national product of Yugoslavia, the total gross national product of Yugoslavia is one-fifteenth of our defense budget. In Colorado, that is my home State, our gross State product is about \$95 billion a year. Ninety-five billion dollars a year in the State of Colorado. In the entire country of Yugoslavia it is about \$17 billion. It took us 78 days to get to this point. What is the result of that 78 days of warfare?

There are some questions we need to ask, and I hope we get satisfactory answers. I do not like being a person who constantly criticizes, but I do have an obligation as an elected Member of the United States Congress to stand up and ask questions where I have doubt about the strategy that is being deployed.

□ 2200

There are a number of questions that we should ask. And we should not let this peace agreement, which will be spun extensively, the spin doctors are already at work tonight, I can tell my colleagues they are burning midnight

oil to spin this as a huge victory for the American people, a huge victory for the freedom of this world.

Well, maybe so. I do not think so. But maybe so. But let me say the way we measure, remember, we measure results.

Let us take a look at what we have accomplished. Let us talk about what is going to happen now. Remember that the United States, in effect, chose sides when the administration decided to go into the sovereign territory of another country, which, by the way, just a couple of years ago, about 7 years ago, we went to war over.

As my colleagues will remember, when Iraq invaded the sovereign territory of Kuwait, we, as a country, said you should not invade the sovereign territory of another country so we will go to war with you to push you outside that sovereign territory. Well, now the United States, through the auspices of NATO, is doing exactly the same thing. They invaded the sovereign territory of Yugoslavia.

Now, do not take me wrong. There were some very atrocious things going on in Yugoslavia. But they were not only being committed by the Serbs. They were also being committed by an organization called the KLA, the Kosovo Liberation Army.

Do we know anything about the Kosovo Liberation Army with whom we sided in this conflict? The answer is yes. Do my colleagues know how we knew of them? They are terrorists. These people, this organization, was listed by our State Department as terrorists. They committed acts of terrorism. Our country recognized them as terrorists.

So what our administration consciously decided to do was to go into the sovereign territory, to go into the sovereign territory of another country to take sides with an organization that we ourselves label as terrorists and to go to battle.

Well, now that we have apparently pushed the Yugoslavian Serbs out of the territory of Kosovo, I can tell my colleagues that the Kosovo Liberation Army will not stop there. They do not want the Serbs just out of Kosovo. They want an independent State of Kosovo.

If the United States were to grant that or NATO or the world were to say that is what should happen, in effect we would have given our sign of approval and actually participated in the invasion of a foreign country by a defensive organization. Remember, NATO is a defensive organization. So we have NATO go on offense. We go into the sovereign territory of another country. We portion out a part of that country and turn that portion over to an organization called the Kosovo Liberation Army, which we know are terrorists.

Well, let us think about what is going to happen. Who is going to disarm the Kosovo Liberation Army? Who is going to control them? We have controlled the Serbs. But remember, this

latest conflict started when the Kosovo Liberation Army people started assassinating Serb police officers.

How are we going to disarm the Kosovo Liberation Army? In my opinion, we are not going to disarm them. This is the onset of a new problem that will last for a long time. And I can tell my colleagues that our European allies will expect the United States to resolve it. I am going to talk about burden sharing a little later on in my comments. But the United States is going to be the one in the future that is looked upon to resolve this.

We have got some other questions. How are we going to police these areas? This is what we want to see in the details of that agreement. Again, if we have got an agreement and if we can answer these questions with a positive result, and that is what we want to measure are the results, then this is great. But we ought to ask those questions.

And my colleagues, do not let the spin that is going to come off this agreement tomorrow by the administration or whoever, do not let that spin mask the fact that we all need to look at what the details of this agreement are. Who is going to police the areas? How are we going to set up a judiciary system? What are we going to do about the economy?

Remember, in Kosovo they did not have any time to plant the seeds. They did not get in their spring plantings. They do not have an economy. My colleagues, many of those refugees, who, by the way, I think will claim political asylum and ask to stay in the United States, many of those refugees will not go back into Kosovo. Many of those refugees who do go back into Kosovo are going back to burned bridges, destroyed schools, destroyed clinics, destroyed roads, destroyed fields, no economy, no health care, no type of welfare system, no transportation system, no heat for the winter, no air conditioning for the summer, no water that is kind of like the water we have, purified and clean water.

This is a huge problem over there. Who is going to pay the tab of that? Well, you got it. In my opinion, the United States will. But I am going to address that a little later on.

We also know that the Serbs have destroyed all these legal documents. I mean, let us face it, the Kosovo Liberation Army and the Serbs are both bad characters; the leaders, not the citizens. The citizens are innocent and they are good people. But the leaderships of these two organizations are murderers, both sides of them. They are murderers. They are criminals. They are bandits. They are crooks.

Well, what the Serbs did is they made sure that for the innocent citizens in Kosovo, they destroyed all their legal documents. Who is going to set up the judiciary over there, the judicial process? Remember, our military, our soldiers are not judges. They are not police officers. And there is a difference

between a police officer and a soldier. I used to be a police officer. I have a little understanding of that.

How are we going to set up the judiciary system? How will command and control work? What will Russia's role be in here? What is the future of American foreign policy? What we have done is set a legal precedent here. As I mentioned earlier, we have entered the sovereign territory of another country to resolve a civil war.

Now, some people will tell us that this was a genocide, that this is like Adolf Hitler, that the United States of America had a moral obligation to step in and stop this. Well, number one, it is not like Adolf Hitler. Number two, there are in fact atrocities. But three, they are driven more by civil war than by a dictator who is intent on destroying a population. It is a civil war dispute that we are getting into.

I am very appreciative of my good friend from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) coming to join us, because as he and I have discussed, these are very critical issues. But let me wrap up this legal point.

What is going to be our policy? This is an abrupt change for the United States and for NATO. NATO has never carried out a mission like this. Nor has the United States ever broken with legal precedence and done this.

What happens now if Quebec decides to vote for independence in Canada? Should we go to war with Canada to defend Quebec? What happens if some people in Mexico want to become U.S. citizens in the State of Texas and decides that Texans should seek independence and become part of the country of Mexico?

My colleagues, these are not imaginary questions. These are issues we should address.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON). As the gentleman knows, the peace agreement has been signed. I am asking questions about, you know, the devil is in the details; what do we really have in these details? I have not seen the details. The briefing I got indicated it has been signed, but we have not been presented with any details.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I appreciate his basic opposition to our operations over there. And I have shared that opposition.

It is interesting to see where will this be as opposed to the previously tried agreement. I hope that it works. I am optimistic anytime we have a peace agreement. But, at the same time, my colleague is asking all the pertinent questions. He had asked our reason for being there to begin with.

Here we are now, 70 days of bombing, and I am still wondering, as a Member of Congress, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, as somebody who sat in hearings and listened to Madeleine Albright and Secretary Cohen and General Shelton and Ambassador Pickering and all these other

folks, and I have asked them and I have heard other Members ask them, What are we doing there to begin with? And we got very vague, nebulous answers.

My colleague has raised the point about a civil war. What is going on in Sudan right now? Is there not a civil war? Is there not persecution of Christians over there?

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, in fact, in Sudan and Rwanda there is not a civil war. That truly is a genocide. And that is the difference. And if our policy is going to be to stop genocide, we ought to be in Rwanda tomorrow or, as my colleague said, Sudan. There are hundreds of thousands of deaths, many, many, many multiples of the kinds of deaths that we have in Yugoslavia.

Yugoslavia was a civil war, as the gentleman has correctly pointed out. In Rwanda and Sudan, there is truly a genocide. But we do not see that on CNN. We do not see the administration going ho about doing that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, no, we do not. And there is also a border war between Eritrea and Ethiopia. Will we be over there? What is going to be the policy?

And where will NATO come to play? As my colleague pointed out, NATO is a defensive organization and yet this was an offensive operation. Are we going to be seeing NATO doing that all over the world? And then what are they going to do about the Middle East? Is NATO going to have a role in that? We probably will not see that. But what kind of precedent does that set?

In any case, as the gentleman has alluded to many times, in terms of the details, let us assume everything that he has mentioned to this point, everything works out. The big question then is how is it going to be paid for?

One of the things that has shocked me as a Member of Congress is that on peace agreements it is usually good ol' Uncle Sam, our hard-working taxpayers back home, our money basically buying off both sides. But over there, and it might be the President hosts something and you have all the heads of state and you have a big fanfare and it is in some strange and unusual place we have never heard of. And yet, at the bottom line, they all have one thing in common; and that is that the American taxpayers have paid both sides to quit fighting.

There can be a great advantage to that. It might be cheaper than to continue fighting. And it certainly may save American lives. And yet how much of this out of 19 NATO countries will we be paying?

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Georgia, I think that point is a very valid point and I think it is something that everyone on this floor has an obligation to explore.

Six hundred out of the 800 towns in Kosovo have been destroyed. There has been mass destruction, mass refugees who have exiled from that country who are going to have to go back.

I mentioned earlier the economy. This is going to cost a lot of money. The United States has already carried by far the vast majority of the financial obligation of this war. There are American forces. It is American equipment. And it is the taxpayer, every one of my colleagues in this Chamber, all of our constituents that are employed out there, we are carrying the burden for this.

So far it is \$16 billion. But that is not very accurate. I think it is much higher than that. I think the tab to repair this is going to be around \$100 billion.

Now, does that mean that we should not repair it, that we should not provide these people with heat in the winter, that they should not be provided with food, that we should not try to boost their economy? No. Just the opposite. I think there is an obligation to go in there and help these refugees rebuild their country, help maintain peace.

But I am tired of the taxpayers of the United States of America always carrying the burden. Where are our European allies? This is a problem in Europe. But I know what is carrying the burden. It is the United States taxpayers.

Now, as my colleague knows, I do not have any objection to helping out somebody; we help people on welfare; if we can help out a neighbor. That is why America is great. That is what makes our country great. But we also believe in sharing, sharing the burden. And that is the big question.

I am fully committed as long as I serve in this Congress to standing up to this President and this administration and drawing a line in the sand and say, look, Mr. President, we have got to have burden sharing here. What share are the Europeans going to carry in this? Is it going to be the United States taxpayers that for many, many years into the future will spend a lot of money that otherwise would go to our Social Security, that otherwise would go to our schools, that otherwise would go to our health care programs?

My colleagues, do not kid yourselves. If we do not have burden sharing by our neighbors and the other members of NATO, and I mean fair, proportionate burden sharing, it will be a sacrifice in this country.

Now, we are all willing to make a sacrifice to help a hungry person get food. But after a while, when we have got neighbors that can help feed them too, we cannot sacrifice our families. So this is a hot issue for me.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, just to put it in Georgia terms, I represent coastal Georgia from Savannah to Brunswick to St. Mary's, Georgia. I also have, a little west of there, Vidalia, home of the Vidalia onions; Statesboro, Georgia, home of Georgia Southern University. You take all the 18 counties of the First District of Georgia, it is about 600,000 people. Go down just south of that to Jacksonville and we are talking about approxi-

mately 855,000 people, the entire coast of Georgia and part of the coast of Florida. That is who the refugees would constitute if we put numbers to it. We would have that many refugees.

□ 2215

You take all those people out of coastal Georgia and let us say a hurricane came and the hurricane destroyed all the roads, all the bridges, all the factories so there are no jobs, there are no schools, there are no hospitals, there are no homes, and you have got to rebuild all that.

And then as you have pointed out, our NATO allies have not been carrying their fair share in this war effort. I seriously doubt that they are going to be willing to do this in the peace effort. But as the President obligates us to rebuild Yugoslavia, think about what also is on the table. Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, children's health care, immunizations, research for multiple sclerosis, for Parkinson's disease, for cancer, all this.

Now, in an ordinary household, the American taxpayer is saying, "Okay, I understand, you got to spend some money in Kosovo so you're going to reduce spending over here, and these are good programs but I understand choice, because I the American worker have to do that. I have to choose between a new dryer or a new set of tires for the family van. And so I understand that."

But that is not the case. Here in Washington what happens is you just continue spending in both places. That is one of the things that just drives us crazy with this administration, as conservative Members of Congress, is that if the administration wants to obligate us to spend all the money in Kosovo and let NATO not carry their fair share, then you would think they would at least say, "Okay, but we are going to spend a little less elsewhere," but they do not do that. They continue to spend at extravagant and high levels of other causes, both worthy and wasteful. There again, the hardworking American families of middle class taxpayers who are already putting in 50 to 60 hours a week, two-income families and they are running back and forth, they are paying taxes, one more time they are going to get stuck with the tab.

Mr. MCINNIS. My district is Colorado. In fact the gentleman from Georgia comes out to Colorado and vacations out in the Colorado mountains. I happen to feel like him, I feel very lucky about the district that I represent. But we camp out a lot in our district, out there in the mountains. We kind of have a rule. It gets cold almost every night, even in the hottest day of the summer it still gets cold in the Colorado mountains at night. It still cools down, so you build a fire. We have a rule. "If you want to sit by the fire, you got to help gather the firewood." That is just a basic obligation. In the morning if you want to eat breakfast, you too got to get out of

your sleeping bag when it is darn cold and help get things put together for breakfast. If we have got somebody who has got a broken leg or injured or is otherwise incapable of helping gather the firewood, then the rest of us pitch in and there is no complaint. Where the complaints start is when somebody is capable of pitching in and they simply say, "Hey, let Jack do it. Jack's good at gathering firewood. I'd just as soon sit by the fire and not have to go out and do the work."

That is what I am concerned about here. I want a peace agreement. I want this thing resolved. I think there are a lot of details we have to talk about, and I think we should all seriously assess what are the legal precedents that have been set. But at the same time I think this administration, and I hope they are doing it, but I think this administration has an absolute obligation to the citizens of this country to say, "Hey, we've been gathering all the firewood," and I can assure you that on this war in Yugoslavia, all of the firewood or 90 something percent of the firewood that has gone into that fire was gathered by the United States, not by the other 19 people at the campsite. There are 19 people at that campsite. One of them gathered 90 something percent. Our good allies and good friends, the United Kingdom, who have always been good, solid allies for us, they gathered a proportionate share, about 10 percent or a little less, they have been putting in a little firewood, but they have had their arms full when they were coming in so they are working. But what are the others doing? They are not carrying their fair share of the firewood. Now that the real expenses are going to come into play here, now I think it is absolutely critical that a couple of us stand up. We are not going to be popular because at this campsite there are 19 people, 17 who really are not contributing too much, so the two of us who stand up to the other 17 and say, "You got to pitch in," you can imagine those 17 are going to say, "Be quiet, what are you moaning about?" and so on. But we have a responsibility to the American taxpayer to stand up and say to our European allies, "You're going to have to pitch in on this rebuilding. You're going to have to help too. You're going to have to help gather that firewood."

Mr. KINGSTON. I think the point is that what we need to do as Members of Congress is to make sure that the President does everything he can do to get everybody to, I guess, pass the hat fairly, because if this is truly a European peril and Europe has the primary interest in it, then Europe has to also have the primary obligation to help funding in it.

Mr. MCINNIS. I think we are at a real advantage tonight because our colleague from California has come in with some more details that have happened just in the last few minutes or have at least been released. I thank the gentleman for coming out. I think it is

a great opportunity for us to send this message out.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

Mr. OSE. I thank the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Georgia for their generosity. As many of the Members know, we have access over the Internet to any number of things. I have taken the time this evening to track down off the Internet the draft text of the proposed peace agreement. I found it at msnbc.com/news/277886.asp.

It is the text of the U.N. draft on Kosovo. While this is the draft, and it was put together yesterday, it does contain a number of things that I think merit our attention in line with the gentleman from Georgia's comments about our commitments here and our obligations as we go into the future. I would just like to highlight a couple of those in particular. There are three parts to this agreement. There is the 21 paragraph preamble, if you will, then there is Annex 1 and then Annex 2. I do not recall which of the gentlemen referred to it, but the phrase was the devil is in the details. I would particularly commend to your reading Annex 1 and Annex 2.

In Annex 1, the document calls for a political process towards the establishment of an interim political framework agreement providing for a substantial self-government for Kosovo taking full account of the Rambouillet accords and the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Now, what I am concerned about is what does that mean? It says a political process towards the establishment of an interim political framework. Now, I thought we were trying to find a political framework that would allow the solution, not work towards a political framework. The consequence of this is that we still have doubt and uncertainty as to our ultimate goals.

There are three other points I would like to make about this draft text. Again, that was in Annex 1. In Annex 2, paragraph 5, there is a statement, "Agreement should be reached on the following principles to move toward a resolution of the Kosovo crisis," item number 5 being an establishment of an interim administration for Kosovo as part of the international civil presence under which the people of Kosovo can enjoy substantial autonomy within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to be decided by the Security Council of the United Nations.

Take note, if you would, please. We have been there as NATO. Now we are transferring to the United Nations the responsibility for establishing interim administration and an international civil presence. Again in Annex 2, paragraph 6, there is agreement to allow an agreed number of Yugoslav and Serbian personnel to return to Kosovo to perform various civil and security functions after the agreement is made.

Now, that is all well and good. But then, going back again in Annex 2, the

last one, is a comprehensive approach to economic development and stabilization of the region, including a stability pact for Southeastern Europe.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have agreed to autonomy for Kosovo, self-government for Kosovo, an international civil presence in Kosovo to protect the Kosovars and their autonomy, the return after their initial withdrawal of Yugoslavian and Serbian personnel for limited civil and security purposes, deployment in Kosovo of an international and civil security presence, and a blank check for economic development and stabilization. Well, who is going to bear the burden here? It begs the question. Who is going to pay for this? I am serious about this. We have spent \$2 billion at least to date. Between now and the end of the fiscal year, we are scheduled to spend an additional 3 to \$4 billion. And we have opened the door to a draw because we are the only country that can do it, to a draw on the United States Treasury to reconstruct what we just finished destroying.

Now, the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Georgia are correct. At what point do we make a choice as to the best interests of the United States and its residents? Do we in fact spend the money in Kosovo and Yugoslavia for reconstruction? Or do we spend the money on education and health care and infrastructure here in the United States? That is a true and unavoidable choice.

I regret to say, and I do want to say, I mean, I have been an opponent of our activities in Yugoslavia. I think the President made a serious mistake. I want to make sure that I am clear about this. I commend him for his behind-the-scene efforts in getting us to this point where we at least have the draft, as yet unsigned, of a treaty, a peace agreement that will allow us to terminate our activities there. I commend the administration for that. Mr. Speaker, it is a great thing for us to get to this point. But there is substantial uncertainty that remains here. As Members of the House exercising our constitutional oversight authority, we need to be cognizant that the United States remains the bank, if you would, on which the rest of the world will ultimately come calling to fund all of these measures that lack specificity, that are not well defined, that would not be used in private industry for any transaction whatsoever. This is a step in the right direction. I hope between now and the time when the United Nations Security Council adopts this and the members of NATO affirm it that definition is added to this agreement sufficient to answer these questions as to what the various phrases in here mean about substantial autonomy, substantial self-government and the like.

Mr. MCINNIS. I think the gentleman from California's points are very well made. He says the choice. Is the choice that we take, and I think actually the

costs run about \$1 billion a day. I spent a lot of time in business and in cost accounting. In fact back here I like to track the numbers. I like to figure out where we are. There is a lot of money shifting, not illegally but they put it in this account or take it out of that so it is hard to get a true, accurate reflection of what this is going to cost us. My estimation is by the time it is all rebuilt, it will cost somebody about \$100 billion. Now, I think militarily we have probably spent about \$16 billion, would be my guess. Now, they only got the supplemental appropriation for an amount but there are other moneys that they have drawn upon. But, that said, the question that the gentleman from California asked, which is a very sound question and, that is, do we take away from Social Security and from the programs, domestic programs of the United States? I think the people of the United States are willing to help make a contribution. Or the other option is, do you completely ignore the needs of these refugees? Do we ignore the fact that these villages have been destroyed primarily by NATO military aircraft? I am not saying it is NATO's fault, I am just saying that is the fact, that is how they were destroyed. Do we ignore the fact they do not have electricity for the winter, they did not put in their spring crops, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera? No, we cannot ignore that. What is the answer? I think the answer is a third option, that is, we go to our European partners and say, "Look, this wasn't supposed to be a one-sided deal. You weren't supposed to get a free ride. You're supposed to help on this thing. You've got to help gather wood for the fire. If you want to sit by the campsite and sit by the fire, you've got to help gather wood."

So I think the option that we have to be very aggressive about and reach out and grab hold of is the fact that our European partners, our colleagues in NATO, have an obligation to pitch in.

□ 2230

They have got to help pay for this. They have to have their taxpayers help with this. Not just the American taxpayers, but the European taxpayers. And do not just make American programs like our schools, our Social Security, our transportation, our Medicare, et cetera, et cetera, do not make just the American taxpayers go up to the bar and throw money on the bar; make the Europeans. They are our allies.

Frankly, I think they have gotten a free ride. Ninety percent of our military force over there has been American. Now, the British, let me make one exception when I say European allies. The British, the United Kingdom, they have been wonderful. They are as solid as you can get.

Frankly, the other allies we have over there are not gathering enough firewood. I am one of those people, and the gentleman is one of those people who have been doing a lot of gathering.

I am saying to the other 17 people out of the 19 at this campsite, I am saying guys, gals, I am stopping. You are going to help pitch, or we are not going to have a fire. Now, obviously we are going to have a fire, but it is not going to be warm enough for all of us. You have to pitch in.

Mr. OSE. If the gentleman will yield, the United States has a long list try, as recently exhibited in the early nineties, of going to our allies and asking them to pitch in, as the gentleman suggested.

It is curious, we have received from one ally a contribution, that being the ally from Taiwan. They have put up significant money, and I apologize for this, I don't recall whether it is 300 thousand or 300 million, but the money they have contributed has gone towards medical and assistance, other assistance, with our refugee and humanitarian aid. So it is not a question of whether or not there are countries, allies of ours, even non-NATO Members, to whom we can turn for assistance. That exists. There are people who will help us in this challenge that we all face. It is a question of are we asking them? Have we asked them for their contribution?

Mr. MCINNIS. You know, we are about to face some tough budget decisions coming up this summer. We are the Republicans, we are in the majority, it is our decision. Somebody has to lead the charge. We have got to make tough decisions. I am not running from a tough decision.

But the President in his budget has all kinds of program requests which in my opinion will greatly exceed the budget caps, or so you are familiar with it, the budget discipline that we put upon ourselves.

We figured years ago, as the gentleman knows, that in order for this economy to stay solid, for the government to not continue to go into annual debt, we already have the national debt, to reduce the national debt and avoid the annual deficits, we have got to exercise some fiscal discipline that has not been exercised in the past. So we got an agreement out of the President that we would all live within what we call the caps.

Well, the President's budget, what it does is it raises taxes so it allows expenses to go way up, but he says it is within the caps, the administration, because they raise taxes. We are saying you are not going to raise taxes, we have got to control spending.

Now, out of this, it is going to be tough. We do not have a lot of money laying around back here. While you hear the word "surplus" a lot, when you really take an accurate picture, we still have that national debt.

What is going to happen is if we do not go to our European allies, then this amount of money we have in the pot for American domestic programs, which is going to be tight as it now exists, in other words, it is going to be a really tough year fiscally, we now are

going to have to make additional contributions out of our programs, out of the programs that are the highest priority for us as American citizens, to pitch in.

As I said earlier, the gentleman has talked about this off the floor to me, we have an obligation to pitch in. We have a humanitarian obligation. That is what made our country great, is the fact that America always stood up to the plate. The United States was always there to help the underprivileged and to help the needy. We will fulfill that obligation. But, by gosh, I do not want it always coming out of the hide of the American taxpayer and out the hide of the people who benefit from our domestic programs.

So my message tonight, as is shared by my colleague from California, is you all, European allies, we all need to say hey, pitch in. No free rides. We have got a problem out there, let us get the solution. And if we all pitch in, by the way, it is not going to be too heavy a burden on any one of us. We can all help carry the pack up the mountain. But so far it is you and I, speaking of the United States, that have carried it this far up the mountain.

I am getting tired of it. I want to give some benefit to our taxpayers.

Mr. KINGSTON. I wanted to shift gears with the gentleman, if it is okay. One of the issues which the gentleman and I have spoken about, the gentleman being from Colorado, me being from Georgia, we have had shootings at schools recently, is what is the cause of this? I hope the gentleman from California stays, if he can.

But I go back to my Clark Central High School in 1973. It was a large public school. We had the usual share of problems, of teens. We had love, we had breakups, we had couples, we had drugs, we had alcohol, we had DUIs, we had fast cars, we had the pressures of the post-sixties generation and long hair and hippies and good times and bad times associated with that. We did have school violence, we had fights and we had inner-city problems and some racial tension here and there. But we did not have random shooting of children.

You ask yourself as a parent, I have four children, and I ask myself, what is it in 1999 that is different than 1973 that causes children to randomly shoot each other? What is it out there? Is it in the air? Is it in the entertainment business? Is it in education? Are we missing something in early childhood development? What can we do?

One of the things which the gentleman has been a leader of is pointing out the amount of time that children spend before violent TV shows or before violent video shows.

One of the statistics, interestingly enough I wanted to share with the gentleman, if I can put my hand on it right now, well, this is not the statistic I wanted to share right here, but the gentleman has brought this chart, and if the gentleman wants to explain it, I

will bring it down there to him, but here is one of the I would say typical video games which our children are exposed to.

If you go to just about any shopping mall, they are going to have a video arcade parlor. The gentleman and I growing up, we thought okay, that is football and air hockey and maybe one of those games where you go inside and drive real fast.

But this is what they have. This game is it is made by Interplay, who is a big donor to political causes, but the name of the game is "You're Gonna Die." It is actually Kingpin. "Kingpin is the life of crime."

In it are children. This is not adults who play this game, this is children at the shopping mall on Saturday. They can decide who their gang members are going to be, they can decide who they are going to shoot. They can steal a bicycle or hop a train to get around town. Even when you are in jail, you can recruit gang members to your side. You can talk to people the way you want to, from smack to pacifying, and then you can shoot and have actual damage done, including exit wounds to specific body parts.

This is the cheerful manna that American children are exposed to over and over again. Because these kids, to play this game, you do not just walk in. Frankly, I do not think an adult could walk in and plunge a quarter or two down and start playing it. You have to develop the expertise. So this game is geared for kids who play lots of video, and, as we know, kids who play lots of video have a kind of addiction to it, and they play many hours worth a week. It could be football, it could be hockey or basketball, but, for some kids, unfortunately, it is Kingpin, Life of Crime, talking about "You're Gonna Die" and all these cheerful things. We wonder what kind of message we are sending to our children.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman, you know what has been exciting though the last couple of weeks. As you know, Mr. KINGSTON, you and I a couple of weeks ago talked about this very specific problem we think exists out there with society, and that is go to your local arcade. You will be surprised. These games are actually murder simulators.

As I spoke a couple of weeks ago, it is very similar to the simulators that we use to train pilots how to fly an airplane, to teach drivers how to drive a car. These simulators teach people how to kill.

Now, if you do not believe me, I know how it sounds. "Come on, Scott." Go into the arcade and see it for yourself. I had not been to an arcade for a long time. My three children, Daxon, he is 22, Tess is 21, Andrea is 17, so I hadn't been in an arcade. So I went into an arcade and I was surprised.

But what was exciting to me as a result of our conversations here on the floor was, number one, we came to the conclusion, we do not need more laws.

That may not necessarily be the answer. Let us go out and be consumers. Both the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and I represent constituents, and I think we have the bully pulpit right here. We can use this to talk about the executives at Interplay Corporation and make requests.

You know what happened, Mr. KINGSTON? Well, you know. But for my colleagues, what happened after Mr. KINGSTON and I discussed it a couple of weeks ago, I had parents start calling me. "What can I do," they said? I said go to your local arcade. If you think there is a game in there that is a murder simulator or is too violent for young people, the age of people playing it, tell the proprietor of that shop and demand that they remove it. Ask them to remove it and if they do not, demand they remove it.

I followed that. I went to the Denver International Airport, right in the Denver International Airport Denver, Colorado, there were violent, horrible games in their arcade located on city property. I called the mayor of Denver, Wellington Webb. Within an hour those games were yanked. That is cooperation.

Disney Corporation, Knoxville Farms, Six Flags. There are a number of people. Even the Video Association came in and expressed cooperation. They are concerned about this.

So what I think is an important message here for us to get out, because you and I are not proponents of more laws, that is not automatically the answer, we will pass more laws and then we will all be satisfied.

The answer is getting out there, get swift action, which you do not get with the United States Congress just because of the way the system is set up. Go out there, use consumer demand, go into the private marketplace, use the leverage we have and tell the producers, the manufacturers, the advertisers in the magazines and the people, retailers that put these games out there, look, no more. The game is over. Get those things out of here.

A couple of the executives I talked to, I asked them, I said, "Do your kids play these games? Do you have this game at home, the one you just showed us?" I said, "If you do not, do you not have an obligation to the rest of the children in our society?"

We are going to make it out there so consumers do not want this product, consumers are going to want this product out.

Mr. KINGSTON. Under the title of Rapid Response, let me give our viewers a web page so they can look this up. It is interesting, I think this web page has been cleaned up in recent days since the pressure you have put on them, but I checked it out and it does not really say that much. But you can get a little bit of a feel.

Mr. MCINNIS. If the gentleman would yield, if the gentleman would give the web page to the colleagues on the floor, that would be helpful.

Mr. KINGSTON. Absolutely.

WWW.INTERPLAY.COM/
KINGPINCORPSE.

So it is WWW.INTERPLAY.COM/
KINGPINCORPSE.

Now, the music is provided by a group called Cypress Hill the 4th. That is their album. The band is Cypress Hill. They have a web site also. You can reach that by just going CYPRESSONLINE.COM you can get a feel for where our kids are.

One of the things that the gentleman and I as parents have done from time to time is sit down and talk to our kids deliberately about alcohol or drugs or sex or violence or whatever is going on in the teen world, and it is amazing to me what you find out when you take that time.

As a father of teens, you have to wait until they are ready to talk. You cannot just walk in there and say "Hi, I am dad of the year, I am feeling guilty. I want to interface with you." It does not work like that. You have to be available to them. But when they want to talk, you can get it out of them.

It is shocking the exposure they have to violent lyrics or CDs or violent TV shows and R-rated movies where people are slashed from the very first frame to the final frame.

□ 2245

Then this arcade stuff, where they do it just over and over again. You know, if you start with small children, the desensitizing, by the time they are 10 or 11 years old, what a message we are sending them.

The pastor, in Paducah, Kentucky, they had a tragic school shooting about a year ago. The kids were praying. The pastor pointed out who was presiding over one of the funerals of the kids, and I am paraphrasing; he said: We live in a society where we tell our children it is okay for us to kill our unborn children, so why are we surprised when our born children start killing each other? We should not be surprised.

What he has done with that statement is raise this whole issue of violence to a different plane. What is the signal we are sending out here with the various messages that we are pummeling our children with over and over again?

It could be irreligious, it could be video entertainment, it could be movies. It might be the way we as parents say something. It might be something altogether different.

But what bothers me is we look at the actions by the U.S. Senate as they rushed on the blood of these children to pass strict gun control. For those who have no children at home, in most of the cases, to pretend that they have done something to protect my children or your children is absurd.

In Columbine, Klebold and Harris broke 23 existing gun control laws. In Georgia, the 22 which the student grabbed was locked up. He broke into it and went out and shot kids.

It sounds good, okay, we are going to pass gun control, but nothing that has been done by the Senate would protect my kids or the gentleman's kids or future grandchildren from anything that could happen at their school, which is similar to Columbine or what happened in Rockdale County, at Heritage High School.

I think we as parents and we as a responsible culture need to examine everything that is out there. What is the toxin that is getting into our kids? As I said in my opening statement, what was it in 1973 when I was in a large public high school with all kinds of tensions and all kinds of influences, what was it that is different than 1999, when kids just randomly start shooting each other?

Mr. MCINNIS. I appreciate the gentleman, Mr. Speaker. I want to read a couple of letters here, but I do want to thank the gentleman. I appreciate the gentleman, I would like to point out, as a father of several children, and I think he has a great family.

The key here is we can do something as consumers. As consumers we can do something about some of these products. Let us go out into an arcade. If we see a violent game, talk to the proprietor.

What I found is when we talk to these people, for example, when I talk to the mayor's office in Denver, I am not sure they were aware of that. I will tell the Members, they were really cooperative. They got right on it. They did something about it.

I think Members are going to find a lot of positive reaction within our community without more laws being passed by the Congress, being imposed upon citizens of this country. Without more laws, I think as a consumer we have some leverage.

Let me conclude first of all by thanking my colleague from the State of Georgia. I appreciate very much his participation this evening, and my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

I am going to shift gears completely. I had the opportunity a couple of weeks ago, I make it a point when I go back to my district to try and go teach classes in the schools. Before the schools got out for the summer I went and taught some young people.

I wanted to read some of their responses in the thank-you letters. I like to leave this speech with a high note. We talked about Kosovo, we talked about violent video. Now let us leave it with a high note and talk about a few cute letters.

Dear Mr. MCINNIS, I enjoyed you coming to my class. Thank you for giving us the books, and thank you for saying I have a beautiful smile. Don't I look exactly like my mom? Your job sounds pretty exciting. I was really impressed with all those questions, and you

could answer all of them. Thank you for coming. Your friend, Kyra. P.S., Josh was kind of cute.

Josh was my legislative assistant.

Dear Mr. MCINNIS, how are you? I hope your trip was great. I never knew that we had the freedom of speech. On your 11th birthday, what did you want to be? Thank you for coming to our classroom. Kyle Webster.

Dear Mr. MCINNIS, I didn't know that in some States you had to smoke in your house or outside your house. Thank you for coming. I think your job sounds fun. You taught us a lot, your friend, Matt.

Dear Mr. MCINNIS, I like you. I like how you taught us the tree. Thanks for the books. Thanks for coming. Thank you for teaching us. Your friend, Amber.

The tree means the branches of the judiciary, the executive, and the legislative branch.

Dear Mr. MCINNIS, thank you for telling me about the three branches of government, the executive, legislative, and judiciary. I didn't know anything about the three branches, but now I do. I really liked it when you talked about all the freedom of our country. Thank you for coming. From Derrick.

Mr. MCINNIS, I'm glad you taught me about the tree. I like the legislative branch the most. Thank you for teaching me what they mean, too. I'm glad you got to come in and show my class and me about all you showed us and taught us. I will remember what you taught us. Your friend, Brandon.

Dear Congressman MCINNIS, thank you for coming to our class. I enjoyed it. I learned a lot of things. One of them is that you are trying to make new rules. Your friend, Guy.

Dear Mr. MCINNIS: I never knew that Wyoming had the least people and California had the most people. My dad says that alcohol is like pouring fuel on a fire that's already burning. Thanks for coming to our class. Love, Alanna.

Dear Mr. MCINNIS: Thank you for teaching me things I never knew. I am still thinking smoking is not a law. Thanks for telling me about the three branches of our government. I never know there was such thing. I am surprised that in some places you can smoke.

Dear Mr. MCINNIS, thank you for coming to our classroom. I liked it when you talked about the population. Your schedule must be busy traveling all over. Have a safe trip! That was from "Your friend, Lindsey."

Dear Mr. MCINNIS, thank you for coming. We know that you have a busy schedule but we are very lucky to have you come to our class. I didn't know that the most population is in California, and the least population is in Wyoming.

Is it fun being a Congressman? Do you like to travel a lot? I think you are a very nice man. I hope you come again. Thank you for coming. Love, Joya L'Ecuyer.

Dear Mr. MCINNIS, thank you for the book. How does that money get to you? Does all that money go to you or do you share some of the money? I will miss you. You are a good teacher. I will never forget the lesson on the three branches. Thank you for coming, love Megan Mueller.

Dear Mr. MCINNIS, I learned the three branches and the names of them. I didn't know you had to travel a lot and go so far. On the tree the branch on the left is called the Executive branch. The one on the right

is called the Judiciary. The one in the middle is called the the Legislative. Thank you for coming. From Daniel.

Dear Mr. MCINNIS, I never knew that California had the most people in it. I thank you for coming. Your friend, Gary.

Dear Mr. MCINNIS, thank you for coming to our classroom. I liked it when you talked about our freedom. It was very interesting. Thank you for the books. Morgan.

Mr. MCINNIS, I think our class is very lucky to have you come. Thank you so much, really. Oh, yes, by the way, thank you for the books. Thanks for teaching us all about the Constitution, laws, and tree branches. I think it must be hard to do the stuff you do. Your friend, Brittany.

Mr. MCINNIS, thank you for coming and telling us what it is like in Washington. It is cool how there are three branches of government. I never knew there were so many different ways to have freedom. Your friend, Brittany.

Dear Mr. MCINNIS, I didn't know that that is how taxes worked. Thank you for coming. Thank you for the book. From Douglas.

Mr. Speaker, as we talk about some pretty tough issues up here in the Capitol, we should never forget how many times freedom is mentioned in these letters from these young people, how proud these young people are to be Americans.

We often talk about what has gone wrong. I spent most of my speech talking about some things that were going wrong. But we should not forget the fact that most things are going right. If Members want to feel good about what is going on in this country, if they want to feel refreshed, go to a classroom. I have nothing but good things to say about a lot of teachers. It must be exciting every day to have these kinds of young people in their classroom.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time I had this evening to speak to my colleagues, and I want to thank all my little friends that sent a letter to us.

REFLECTIONS ON THE WAR IN THE BALKANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TOOMEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is recognized for half the time remaining until midnight, which is approximately 30 minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, we are told tonight that we are at the beginning of the end of the war in the Balkans. But before the ink has dried on the agreement there are a few reflections that I think are in order, because we cannot just sign this piece of paper and pretend that we can move on, pretend that we have peace, because the truth is that problems could arise and we could end up in a multi-party land war right in the middle of the Balkans,