

in Kosovo which will lead to only greater violence and bloodshed.

We must not allow this to happen, Mr. Speaker. The world community can prevent this if it has the will to do so.

CONGRESSIONAL TRIP TO KOSOVO

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I joined the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) over the weekend. Our intent was to go to Kosovo because we were aware of the brutal violence that the Milosevic regime had imposed upon the Kosovo people. They went into villages and wiped out the village. The Interior Minister of Kosovo, who was acting under the orders of Mr. Milosevic, said that if there are even two terrorists opposed to our regime, we consider the entire village opposed and are justified in eliminating it.

They killed 87 people, innocent men, women, children. They lined them up. Many of them they only killed after torturing them. These people were not a threat. Virtually all of them were unarmed. They wiped them out because they were afraid that they might at some point pose a threat to their regime. Why would it be a threat? Kosovo is a country of 2.2 million people. About 2 million of them are Albanian Muslims. A little less than 10 percent of the population is Serbian. Many of those Serbs have been sent there by Mr. Milosevic, who is the head of the Serbian government, that now calls itself the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, sent to populate Kosovo. Most of the Serbs there did not want to be there. Some of them had been driven out by Croats, out of the Krajina region in Croatia, but the reality is that the vast majority of the Kosovo people want to have their own representation. They had a vote in 1991, overwhelmingly elected Mr. Ibrahim Rugova as the President. That presidency was not allowed to take effect, that government was not allowed to take effect. Mr. Milosevic took over control of the country. The way he maintains control over 90 percent of the population is through the most brutal repression, the same kind of brutality we saw in Bosnia.

□ 1900

I can tell you one instance when I visited Kosovo earlier, there was a school that was fit for about a thousand students. Half of the school was reserved for a handful of Serbian children, the other half, a thousand Albanian Muslim children were consigned to. The government bricked over the bathrooms. One of the parents who had two daughters there complained about the conditions. That man had his body mutilated, was slit from head to toe

and dumped on the doorstep of the family. That is the kind of brutality that enables a very small portion of the population, through a reign of terror, to control 90 percent of the population.

That is why we went there, in defense of human rights, of democracy and, in fact, of free enterprise because the Serbian regime out of Belgrade seized control of the private businesses. The majority of the population are not allowed to own their businesses. They seize the assets of the banks, they deprive people of the means of livelihood. You have an 85 percent unemployment rate in Kosovo. What you have is a landmine that is going to explode.

President Rugova believes in non-violence. The six Americans who were imprisoned believe in nonviolence. In fact they were there to preach non-violent conflict resolution, and yet they were arrested by the police under a phony charge that has never been used before, that they had not registered their exact location with the police. They had moved from one home to another, apparently, and so they had their heads shaved, they were sentenced to 10 days.

This is an untenable situation. It cannot continue in the way it is. We are going to have a press conference tomorrow. We will have a rally tomorrow. I hope that free peoples around the world will join in unison against these repressive tactics, restore independence to Kosovo.

THE MISUSE OF EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last week the President reportedly asserted executive privilege over conversations the President had with his longtime aid Bruce Lindsey as well as conversation the First Lady had with White House aide Sidney Blumenthal. This is the first time since President Richard Nixon, during Watergate, that a President has asserted executive privilege in a criminal proceeding. This stunning misuse of executive privilege is one of the White House's many delay tactics designed to drag out investigations.

As the New York Times editorialized this morning, Mr. Clinton's attempt to block grand jury testimony by two important White House aides, Bruce Lindsey and Sidney Blumenthal, is an alarming attempt to extend presidential power. Even former Clinton advisor George Stephanopoulos recognizes the absurdity of this claim of executive privilege when on This Week with David Brinkley he said, "They cannot win this fight on executive privilege. It has been tried before in the Whitewater case and eventually they turned over the documents." That was a quote from This Week on March 22, 1998.

The President initially raised executive privilege with the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, my committee, in a deposition of Bruce Lindsey last fall. The President's White House counsel directed Bruce Lindsey not to answer questions regarding conversations Lindsey had with the President about campaign contributor James Riady.

When we challenged the White House on these claims, the President's counsel informed the committee last week that the President would not assert these claims over Mr. Lindsey's conversations. It is important to note that the committee could have held Mr. Lindsey in contempt for refusal to answer the questions if the committee determined that there was no basis for a valid claim of privilege.

The President's former White House counsel, Lloyd Cutler, wrote in a 1994 executive privilege memo, quote, "In circumstances involving communications relating to investigations of personal wrongdoing by government officials, it is our practice," the White House's practice, "it is our practice not to assert executive privilege either in judicial proceedings or in congressional investigations and hearings." End quote.

The President is not following his own order on executive privilege when it comes to the grand jury. Since these proceedings are all behind closed doors, the White House raises frivolous arguments to delay the proceedings. In the light of day with Congress the White House has backed down.

Executive privilege is supposed to be used only rarely when national security would be significantly impaired, conduct of foreign relations would be impacted, or the performance of the President's constitutional duties would be impacted.

This is not Bosnia, this is not the Middle East. These are scandals about possible personal wrongdoing by government and political officials. It has been White House policy since the Kennedy administration not to invoke executive privilege when allegations of wrongdoing are at issue. In contrast to Mr. Clinton, President Reagan declined to claim executive privilege over any matters in Iran-Contra where sensitive foreign policy decisions and negotiations were at issue. Executive privilege is not supposed to be used as a shield against responding to criminal proceedings. This is a clear misuse of the executive privilege.

As George Washington University Professor Jonathan Turley recently stated, quote, "It is ironic to see the extent to which the Clinton administration has adopted executive privilege arguments far beyond those made by the Nixon administration." End quote.

Mr. Speaker, this administration and the President has no basis to claim executive privilege on matters before the grand jury that Mr. Starr is conducting, and, Mr. Speaker, I believe they