

One thing that we have to look at today is the fact that we have cut the shipbuilding budget from a budget that supported almost 600 ships in the U.S. Navy to a budget that, if we build it out by 2020, we are only going to have a 200-ship Navy.

Ammo shortages, we have about a \$3.5 billion ammo shortage in the Army, a \$193 million shortage in the U.S. Marine Corps, and the list goes on. So we passed this supplemental today that had a \$4 billion military package in it that added spare parts, it added training time, it added health care for our retirees and our active duty people that they desperately need. It added a lot of the critical things that we need to make our military work.

It was absolutely necessary. I commend my colleagues for this first small step to rebuild America's defenses.

#### AMERICA'S ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed at the end of the business day today when there was a discussion on the floor as to whether or not the failure to extend the law that authorizes the strategic oil reserve, and the concerns that many Members have about the Energy Department, somehow means that the Congress of the United States is responsible for the failure to have an energy policy for the last 7 years. It is exactly the kind of wrong-headed thinking that has allowed us to lull ourselves as a Nation into where we are today with gasoline prices, with heating oil prices.

Certainly nobody is going to release the strategic oil reserve if that authorization is not extended for a few days. I think there is a very legitimate question as to who should control the strategic oil reserve. Should it be the Department of Energy or should it be the Department of Defense? What is the purpose of a strategic oil reserve? Is it militarily strategic, or is it strategic in some other way?

In fact, what has happened for the last 7 years is that on all three fronts that we needed to have an energy policy, we have not had an effective energy policy. We have not dealt with the oil-producing nations that we have come to rely too much on for oil and gasoline. We have done everything we could to discourage domestic production. We have not done anything to encourage alternative sources of energy, and in fact, the Secretary of Energy on February 16 said that we were caught napping at the Department of Energy. The administration really did not expect to see these oil prices go up.

That is the same Department of Energy that there were Members on this floor just a few minutes ago saying should unquestionably be given an extended ability to manage the energy policy of the United States. It is part

of the same administration that, for 7 years, has really managed to perform the governmental hat trick of looking at the three areas that we ought to be thinking about for more energy independence and doing everything possible to insure that we would have more energy dependence.

We saw the Secretary of Energy in the last few days and weeks going to those oil-producing nations that in the past have been our dependable allies, certainly we have been their dependable ally, and acting as if it was a huge deal to have a small concession of increased production from those countries.

Whenever those countries, some of those countries, came to us and said, we would like young American men and women to come over and defend our country, we did not have the response that, well, we will see if we can do a little something, and we will do it, and we will let you know when it might happen. It will be out there sometime.

That was not our response. Now to assume that that is an acceptable response, something is wrong. Either something is wrong with our relationship with those countries, or something has been wrong in maintaining that relationship.

In terms of alternative sources, the Secretary of Energy just a couple of Sundays ago said maybe the answer is wind power. Well, the answer may not be wind power, the answer may be brain power. The answer may be looking at what we can do to ensure that we are not caught in this same situation 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 years from now, to become increasingly dependent on foreign oil, to do nothing to encourage alternative energy sources in this country, to do everything to discourage domestic supply.

To do everything to really put the internal combustion engine at risk without coming up with any alternatives is an economic travesty. Our economy has some jeopardy right now because of a failure of policy.

For our colleagues to stand up here and say that the Department of Energy needs to be congratulated for what they have done in energy, or the Department of Energy needs to be extended into the future without any question, or that if this Congress questions the Department of Energy, somehow the Congress becomes automatically responsible for the failures of that department and this administration for the last 7 years in this area, does not really meet the test of credibility on this floor or in the country.

I think we need to look very carefully at where we are, how we got here, and what the Department of Energy has had to do with those results that are likely to lead to \$2 gas prices and significant challenges to our economy this summer.

OPPOSING CONTINUED U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN THE BALKAN CONFLICT

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, we have no business in Kosovo. We have no overriding national interest there.

We have heard much vaunted allegations of human rights violations leveled against the Serbian government. Unfortunately, once again, we come to find out that an administration determined to mire us in overseas turmoil has greatly exaggerated the situation to win over a skeptical public and stampede the Congress.

In this case, we were told several months ago that as many as 100,000 Albanian Kosovars were brutally murdered. Now we are looking at a figure closer to 1,000.

What of our continually expanded bombing that eventually included not only public transportation but medical facilities, nearly 100 schools, churches, and homes? What of the innocent deaths we inflicted with tax dollars of the citizens of the United States? What have we done here? What were the objectives of our President's most recent adventure? What are the results?

We were told when we went into Kosovo that we went there to stop ethnic cleansing. It continues with a vengeance, this time with the acquiescence of our own forces.

The KLA, not 2 years ago classified by our own State Department as a heroin-financed terrorist organization, soon to be vaunted by the Clinton administration as freedom fighters, now roams the countryside brutalizing innocents, not only Serbs but gypsies, Muslims, Slavs, and Albanians opposed to their thuggishness.

1515

Bishop Artemije of the Diocese of Kosovo stated one month ago before the Helsinki Commission, and I quote, "More than 80 Orthodox churches have been either completely destroyed or severely damaged since the end of the war. The ancient churches, many of which survived 500 years of Ottoman Moslem rule, could not survive 8 months of the internationally guaranteed peace. Regrettably, all this happens in the presence of KFOR, the NATO peacekeeping force in Kosovo, and the U.N."

Yes, we have cast our lot with the KLA and its affiliates, an organization dedicated to its own version of ethnic cleansing. Removal of all non-Albanians from a region that not only includes Kosovo, but also southern Serbia and Macedonia, with its Albanian minority.

We were told we went into Kosovo to "stabilize the Balkans." Initially, the ambiguity of our policy gave the green light to separatist movements around the region. Today, in both Bosnia and Kosovo, we are committed into the future as far as the eye can see. When I

was able to cause a vote on the floor of the House on the incursion into Bosnia, a vote the administration did not want to take place, I stated on this floor, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Clinton would not keep his promise to us.

What was his promise? That he would send our American troops home from Bosnia by December 20, 1996. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what stability have we achieved in the Balkans? And at what price to this Nation? Can anyone share with this Congress a realistic exit strategy from this quagmire?

In the Kosovo region, yesterday's Washington Post tells us that Kosovar militias still refuse to disarm and are now destabilizing southern Serbia. A new confrontation with Milosevic and a new refugee crisis is feared. And what will we do with a violent KLA we empowered when it turns its sights on Macedonia, which also has an Albanian population?

I agree with Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON's assessment of our Balkan interventions recently published in the Financial Times. She said, "NATO has got to get off of this merry-go-round. It must acknowledge that imposing multicultural democracy at the point of a gun is not working."

Mr. Speaker, we were told we went into Kosovo to thwart the Serbian ruler there, Milosevic. What have we accomplished here? Milosevic is more firmly in place than ever; hard-liners in Serbia in a better place than ever before due entirely to our intervention; the bombing of civilians; the vilification of the Serbian people; and, the destruction of the Serbian culture under our occupation.

We were told we went into Kosovo to ensure the credibility of NATO. But did we do this by violating the first section of the NATO charter by launching a war against a sovereign Nation that has committed no aggression against any of its neighbors? NATO's strength was that it was a shield, not a sword. Some skeptics say that NATO actions were one of justification, considering their original mission was to protect Europe from a Soviet Union that no longer exists.

The costs of Kosovo? Displacement of hundreds of thousands of Kosovars. Displacement of hundreds of thousands of Serbs and expansion of conflict into Serbia proper. The potential instability of Macedonia and a new and probably undying hatred for the United States on the part of Serbians, and from what we have recently seen, Albanian Kosovars as well, as a result of this foolhardy intervention.

Mr. Speaker, we need to bring America home. We can be a light to the world. We cannot be agents of violence as enforcers of one dubious cause after another without accumulating some frightful costs and terrible consequences.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New

Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 2 p.m. on account of personal reasons.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHAYS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, April 5.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title

On March 29, 2000:

H.R. 5. To amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the earnings test for individuals who have attained retirement age.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 3, 2000, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6863. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Olives Grown in California; Revisions to Handling Requirements [Docket No. FV99-932-3 FR] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6864. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bifenthrin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300963; FRL-6485-2] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received January 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6865. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Emamectin Benzoate; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300958; FRL-6398-5] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6866. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the Chief