

comment on letters like this. We are receiving thousands and thousands of letters from constituents. I view these letters to be very, very important. They provide for me the encouragement and the direction from my constituency to help me be a more forceful leader on the House floor and to speak more clearly about the interests of my constituency that I propose to represent here and believe that I do.

I think it is a healthy thing for all Americans right now, if they have ever considered writing a letter, showing up at a town meeting, calling a Member of Congress, submitting a letter to the President, this is the time to do it. We have not had a crisis of this proportion in a long, long time. This is not a time for inaction among the constituents.

I would like to hear in the minute or two that we have left from the others their opinions on the value of constituent input.

Mr. OSE. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

I, too, had town hall meetings this weekend. In fact, I had one last night in a community called Carmichael. It was probably a 95 percent opposition to what we are doing in Yugoslavia.

The characterization that you lent to your constituent I think is extremely accurate. The American people have a very clear understanding of what America is all about. America is not about being undefined, ill-equipped and undirected towards an objective. America is about figuring out what we want to do and then doing it.

We are not in that situation today by virtue of a lack of leadership from the administration. The voters of this country understand how America works, and they are looking to us to conduct our affairs in accordance with that clear thing. That is, identify the objective and then go do it.

I thank the gentleman for including me in this hour tonight. I am pleased to reinforce the sentiments that he has seen in his constituents.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Let me just ask one more question. How important are letters like this in your office and among your constituency? What happens to these letters when they get to your desk?

Mr. OSE. The gentleman from Colorado brings up an interesting point. We probably receive upwards of 5 to 700 letters a week, some by e-mail, some by Postal Service. We respond to every one. The subject matter is all over the map, depending on what happens.

We find that an absolutely credible means of identifying things that are affecting our constituents directly. It is an immediate thing. It is like squeezing a water balloon in my district. If something happens, bam, I have got a letter. Something happens, bam, I have got an e-mail.

I want to encourage everybody, as we have for 220 years, to stay in touch with their representatives and continue to write. In fact, now would be a very timely period to write because of

our difficulty with the administration in Yugoslavia.

I thank the gentleman for that point.

Mr. HILL of Montana. As the gentleman knows, certainly there are well-informed Members of Congress on most every issue, but I find that there is greater wisdom in my district than there is wisdom here in this Capitol. Very often, my constituents write to me and give me special insights into how an issue or how a matter would impact them.

□ 2100

Certainly people have, I think, a personal view of the situation in Kosovo. They have sons and daughters who may be called upon to fight, or they have neighbors who will or friends.

But also I think that there is an issue here about who we are as a country and how we are governed as a country. I do not think that the American people are comfortable with the idea that one person can make a decision to put this Nation at war, put our men and women at risk and the treasury of the country at risk without the consent of the American people and their Congress.

The letters that I have received are overwhelming in opposition to this war, but I have found some of them very insightful. Even had one member of the Armed Services send me a letter resigning his commission as a consequence of this.

But the fact is, is that I find that extraordinarily valuable. Like my colleagues, I think we received 40,000 or more letters a year. We respond to them all. It is a challenge for us to get that job done. But the value to me, of course, is hearing from my constituents, having their input, having their ideas and their views. I always learn from them, and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. SCHAFFER. We are all part of the Republican majority here in Congress, and many people wonder how it is that we have two divergent viewpoints in Washington about how to lead the country, that which is represented by the President and that which is represented by the majority here in Congress, and I think tonight's special order by Republicans, Members of the majority party, is one indication of how it is we come to differences of opinions on such important matters of public policy.

I am proud to be a part of the party that takes its direction from the people of the country, that reads the mail, that listens to the phone calls, that responds to the opinions that come to us at town meetings, and, as we all know, there are legions of special interests whose lobbyists parade through the halls of Congress trying to leverage every bit of influence that they can on politicians, but it is the voice of real people, ordinary Americans who will commit to 10, 15, 20 minutes to sit down and put their thoughts in writing and communicate to their Congressman that, if they continue to do so in

great numbers and reach out and realize the tremendous difference that a Republican majority has made in this Congress for the American people, it is not only possible but, I believe, imminent that the voice of the people will rise up over and above those of the special interests that have so much influence at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

So I am very, very proud to be associated with the colleagues that have joined me here tonight, Mr. Speaker, in this special order. I am grateful for the indulgence in yielding to us an hour for the majority party, and for those members of the majority party we try to reserve this hour every Wednesday night, and we will be back next week.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). The Chair is concerned about a couple of remarks made by previous speakers earlier this evening and will remind all Members that the rules of decorum in the debate prohibit the attribution of unworthy motives to the President. That standard applies both to debate and to extraneous material read into the RECORD.

A NECESSARY EVIL?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on the previous set of speakers and talk about the Kosovo burden, the Kosovo burden and decision-making in the 106th Congress, how it impacts and will impact on everything we do in the rest of this Congress.

I might begin by stating that I previously stated already that Kosovo is, in my opinion, a campaign of compassion. I think that it was important to confront Slobodan Milosevic. He gave the civilized nations no choice. I think this war is a necessary evil.

All wars are evil, necessary evils, but the word "necessary" becomes very important. "Necessary" is a vital word that many of my constituents are questioning, and like the gentlemen before me, I have gotten many letters and many comments, and I welcome those comments and those letters, both those that agree with me and those that do not agree with me. It is important that we discuss and have a dialogue about whether or not this war, like all other wars, it is an evil, but is it a necessary evil?

I think it very important to note that I, too, have had a series of town meetings, and in three or four town meetings, the first three, unanimous agreement when I asked do they support the present actions in Kosovo. Ninety-five percent of the people in the audience raised their hands. One meeting I had 200 people. I was shocked to

see that kind of percentage. When I got to the fourth meeting already, less than half of the people raised their hands. That was on April 27. So it is obvious that the conduct of the war, the implementation of the war, has a great deal to do with the opinions that people now have of the action, and I would like to separate the blundering conduct of the war from the cause, the fact that we are confronting what I call a sovereign predator.

Slobodan Milosevic is a sovereign predator who has given us no choice, if you want to accept a new kind of morality in the world. The old morality was you never, you never interfered with the internal affairs of a country. If they want to do things within their boundaries, then you do not get involved. You let them destroy their people if they want to. I suppose, as my colleagues know, following that reasoning, Adolf Hitler, as long as he was murdering Jews in Germany, the world had no basis for condemning him or no basis for challenging him. As my colleagues know, as long as you do things within your borders, the sovereign Nation can do whatever it wants to do. That is the old morality, international morality.

I like to believe that in the Kosovo action that is now underway we have challenged that old morality and said you cannot do whatever you want to do to people within your borders and not have the condemnation of the international community, and beyond the condemnation they may take some action in some cases and have taken action in this case. So I welcome and applaud the actions of my colleagues who are questioning how we can get out of this mess.

I support what the President is doing. I support the initial action. I certainly do not support all the blunders that have taken place. But despite my support for the action, I also welcome and applaud the actions of many of my colleagues in Congress, those who have taken upon themselves to initiate their own kinds of diplomatic initiatives. This is an unprecedented action, and so I think the dialogue and the debate and the methods ought to also be unprecedented.

I think that the journey that the Members of Congress took to Vienna was a remarkable initiative, especially since it was led by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE). As my colleagues know, they are two Members of Congress which everybody generally would acknowledge are different ends of the spectrum with respect to ideology, if you can still put old labels on people in terms of who is conservative, who is liberal, who is progressive, and who is militaristic, and who is a dove and who is a hawk. The joint delegation led by Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. WELDON certainly defy all of those descriptions.

I think it was a great initiative. I do not know the details of it. I have heard

the reports that were made on the floor, and I applaud what they did.

I think we should always bear in mind what Robert McNamara has been saying for the last decade. Robert McNamara was the Secretary of Defense under President Johnson during most of the time of the Vietnam War, and McNamara has come out with some revelations and confessions that are really astounding. We ought to pay close attention to the unfortunate experience and the grieving of Mr. McNamara, who has now spent a lot of time in Vietnam, of all places, talking to the Vietnamese who were in charge of the war in Vietnam and, through that dialogue, trying to leave a legacy for mankind so that we will not make the same kinds of mistakes in the future.

In this particular war, in this particular situation involving Kosovo, it would be good if we were to take many of those things into consideration. One of the things Mr. McNamara said was that both sides greatly misjudged the intensity of the others in terms of their conviction and what they were willing to do in order to prevail, and I think that it is important, if we are going to get out of this present situation, that that be remembered by both sides. We should not have any more slaughter, any more deaths than are necessary, and maybe we have already had too many and more than are necessary, but we still have a situation that there is a basic moral problem here, and, unlike the behavior of nations in the past, the NATO nations have chosen to take a moral action.

Agreement with the basic moral thrust does not mandate that we blindly obey the total policy, although we blindly submit to the total policy or to the implementation and execution of a policy, but I think it is important to discuss thoroughly the basic moral thrust of what we are doing in Kosovo.

All the NATO nations, and, as my colleagues know, we are talking about very mature nations who have citizens who have elected their leadership in a democracy, and, as my colleagues know, they are not taking reckless actions, they are not the kind of nation that would trivialize what they are doing; as my colleagues know France, Britain, Germany, the Netherlands, you know the NATO nations, are civilized nations with histories of seeking justice, they are democracies, and they have to answer to their people. So, if they are taking an action with these dimensions, then we ought to stop and seriously consider what they are doing, why they are doing it before we proceed any further and discuss the unfortunate execution of the war, establish whether or not we really think it is necessary.

I have been disappointed by the fact that certain kinds of things, actions that I assumed would take place or had taken place have not, did not take place before the bombing began. I was shocked to learn that economic sanctions and the oil embargo were not

thoroughly considered before we started the bombing, that that came after the bombing. As my colleagues know, I would expect that that would be the kind of actions that would have been put in place and we would have tested whether that would have an impact on the actions of Mr. Milosevic and his warlords or not.

I had the experience of being the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Task Force on Haiti during the time when we were trying to return the democratically-elected President of Haiti to Haiti, and you had at the head of the Haitian government two sovereign predators of the type of Milosevic, as my colleagues know, and they were not budging at all. These were Army men who had taken over the government with tanks and guns after Mr. Aristide, Bertram Aristide, won by an overwhelming landslide in a democratic election. They took over the government, and with guns and tanks they were intending to stay there forever.

Now we did try sanctions, we tried an oil embargo, we tried a number of things. Over a 3-year period we tried a number of things that did not work because these sovereign predators did not understand anything except the language of force, and only when the troops were in the airplanes and on the way to Haiti did they agree to sign an agreement to step down and return Haiti to democratic rule. But we had tried every possible diplomatic maneuver. They had agreed several times to do things and then reneged on those agreements.

I assumed when we started the bombing in Yugoslavia that all diplomatic maneuvers had been exhausted. It is unfortunate that that was not the case, and I felt a bit betrayed to find that only afterwards did they consider an oil embargo and economic sanctions.

□ 2115

I thought we had done that already.

I am also baffled by the failure of the NATO powers and the U.S. to charge Mr. Milosevic as a war criminal. Why are we going to war, taking such extraordinary measures, bombing a nation, running the risk of killing large numbers of civilians, as we are doing, a very serious matter? War is hell.

There is no way to avoid the hell of war. Once one gets into it, things go wrong. Most modern wars have found that it is the civilians, innocent civilians, who die in the largest numbers. In most modern wars, the innocent civilians die in the largest numbers, and it is the most unfortunate. It is one of the other reasons why we should at all cost try to avoid war.

Here we are, in a war action, and the head of the nation, Mr. Slobodan Milosevic, who was there 10 years ago when the breakup of Yugoslavia started, the ethnic cleansing started, the massacres started, the rape, the pillage, all of the things that they are doing in Kosovo they have done it before already in Bosnia.

Sarajevo, one of the great metropolitan cities of the world, was almost destroyed. We saw on television the bombardments. Then after we finally got some kind of peace agreement and outside forces went into the territory, all of the charges that had been made before about massacres and rapes and so forth was confirmed. It happened. We were not the victims of propaganda, as Mr. Milosevic would have us believe now that it is really not his forces that are driving the people of Kosovo out of the country but it is our bombing that is doing that; that they were quite content to stay before.

All of it is a little ridiculous, but a lot of people are believing it, so we must address it. We have already heard from this same man and his regime in Yugoslavia the same tales which he tried to paper over and camouflage barbarity on a mass scale, modern barbarity backed up by tanks and machine guns. Milosevic has done it already. Why did not we go ahead, as a nation, this Nation and the other members of NATO, and call him a war criminal, brand him as a war criminal and begin to move in the world as if, no matter what he does in the future, he will be punished in some way? Certainly, locked out of any kind of recognition and unable to travel in any other nation in the world and try it in The Hague.

Whether we are going to fight our way into Belgrade or not, certainly let the whole world know what we are dealing with.

I think it is unfortunate that NATO and the U.S. have sort of taken a fuzzy-minded approach to the menace of a sovereign predator. He is a sovereign predator, a killer, a murderer, with the authority of a nation behind him, and there ought to be a new way to deal with these people, at least label them clearly as to what they are. If we are going to take a drastic and extreme step like bombing the nation, then we ought to clearly let our people understand why we are doing it, and one of those ways to communicate the necessity of war is to clearly describe who the instigators are.

I think that there is room for creative intervention by the Members of Congress as a result of some of these unfortunate gaps and lapses in our own foreign policymaking and even though there are very experienced people involved in the diplomacy, there are the diplomats of France, the diplomats of Great Britain, the diplomats of all the European nations, as well as we have the diplomats here.

I do not think the kind of criticisms that have been leveled at Madeleine Albright are justified. They are right there in the middle of a very difficult situation. The question is, are we going to stand by and allow the massacres to take place so that in the future we can tell our children, well, it did happen, it was most unfortunate but never again? Do we want to be able to boast never again when now we have the oppor-

tunity to make certain that it does not happen right now? The challenges, why do we not make certain that it does not happen now? Let us not be in a position of repeating the slogan, never again.

We sat by and allowed 6 million or more Jews and other people to be massacred by the Nazi powers and now we say that is most unfortunate. We build museums, we have films made, and we write books, and we look at the horror that was perpetuated while civilized nations stood by. Some of it could have been prevented. Finally, the civilized nations, of course, united; and the Hitler regime was defeated in order to stop what was going on.

Even then, it took some actions which if we had CNN on the scene, if we had the kind of press coverage now that we have of wars, where the enemy, that is propaganda-wise, allows one behind the scenes, I do not know whether we would have prosecuted the war that defeated Hitler in Germany the same way and it would have come to the same conclusion. We might have negotiated a peace with Hitler and he might still be around if we had CNN filming the cities of Hamburg and Cologne and a number of other places in Germany that were bombed to rubble because Hitler refused to surrender. The bombing of Germany was one of the ways that was undertaken to break the back of the resistance of the people who followed Hitler. That was most unfortunate.

War is barbaric, but if we had been able to see the large numbers of civilians die then, would we have decided, no, let us make peace with Hitler at any price to end the carnage?

There is room for creative intervention here, and I think we ought to understand that the intervention ought to be creative, that when we interject ourselves and try to influence the foreign policy of our Nation we ought to be thorough about it, we ought to think deeply about what we are doing.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) were very serious, the discussions that they had with the Russians in Vienna. I hope the White House takes it into consideration. I think that perhaps some things behind the scene are moving now, and the diplomatic initiatives that are going on now with the Russians certainly may be helped by what our Members of Congress have done.

We should not stop, but we should reflect deeply on what we are doing. We should remember that it is up to us to try to interpret to our constituents whether or not this war is necessary. When is it necessary? What kind of new morality are we willing to undertake in the definition of necessary?

I welcome the initiative of Jessie Jackson; and I think it is great that three men, three soldiers who were captured illegally to begin with, are now back home. No amount of technicalities and diplomatic protocol viola-

tions should be accepted as an excuse for not doing everything possible to get those soldiers back. We got them back, and I congratulate Jessie Jackson and that initiative, the ministers who went with him and the whole delegation.

I do not think that we should allow that kind of action to let us minimize or trivialize the evil of the Milosevic regime. I do not think we should let Milosevic score a propaganda victory because he releases three soldiers who should not have been kidnapped in the first place. I do not think we should let Milosevic appear to be a reasonable, peaceful guy, willing to talk, when he has been on the rampage for all of this time and continues to be the guiding force behind a brutal war machine, killing and pillaging and destroying whole villages and driving people out of cities.

Ethnic cleansing is not exactly as bad perhaps as the gas chambers of Hitler. Many people are allowed to get out with their lives in the case of ethnic cleansing. They are not systematically destroyed, but large numbers are destroyed, and it is systematic, and it has the authority of the government behind it, and Milosevic is the government.

In other words, what I am saying is that diplomacy should not be business as usual. This is a situation which is very difficult. It is like a snake pit in the midst of quicksand in a mine field. Everything complicated and dangerous that one can imagine is involved in this situation.

The fact that the implementation of the war has gone so badly certainly has destroyed a lot of support for it in areas where there should be support.

I do not want to be in a position of making excuses for the blunders of the military. I do not think we should drop bombs in areas where there is a danger that there is going to be a tremendous amount of civilian collateral. I do not think we should take those chances.

I certainly do not think we should trust the CIA to do our targeting for us if they do not have maps and cannot discern an embassy building that has been there for some time. They say they had people on the ground who double-checked that site as well as whatever we are using in terms of satellite guidance of our bombing attacks. There is no excuse for that.

I have been on this floor many times during the reauthorization and the appropriations process for the CIA, and I have criticized the CIA for its waste of a \$30 billion budget. They have Aldrich Ames who was in charge of the counteroffensive against the Russian spy agency, and we found that Aldrich Ames was on the payroll of the Russians, and at least 10 of our agents were executed as a result of Aldrich Ames sitting there as the head of the CIA counterspy operation against Russia.

We had other people who defected from various positions who showed

that the CIA is quite a shabby organization. Why the President has not dismantled the present CIA and reorganized it totally, I do not know. There is certainly a good basis for it, even before the bombing of the Chinese embassy by using the wrong maps.

It is a ridiculous explanation to have to offer to the world. The CIA is a multibillion dollar agency. Their budget is probably more than \$30 billion. Surely they can find a building on the map and pinpoint it properly if they had any kind of integrity.

The CIA in Haiti was my first close-up experience with the CIA and why I moved from the position of questioning the CIA's existence on the basis of the fact that it could not tell that the Soviet Union was collapsing.

Senator MOYNIHAN once made a speech and I thought it was very interesting because he was on the Intelligence Committee, and he should know. He said that the CIA never informed them. They had no idea that the economy of the Soviet Union was collapsing. With all of the agents, the money and analysis, et cetera, the CIA was caught by surprise when the economy of the Soviet Union collapsed. The whole government of the Soviet Union sort of collapsed, and we were caught by surprise. I thought that was startling.

Then up close, as the chairman of the task force, Congressional Black Caucus Task Force on Haiti, I saw how the CIA worked against the policy of its own government. During the course of our negotiations with Haiti, we reached the point where we thought we had an agreement where the military junta in charge of Haiti would allow us to begin to take some steps toward normalizing the situation by allowing the delegation to come into Haiti. One part of the delegation would be a group of Canadian policemen who would help work with the law enforcement agency in Haiti and some other people who were going to do some other things, and they were all on a ship going to dock in Haiti.

□ 2130

And on the day they were supposed to disembark from the ship, there was a huge demonstration on the dock in Haiti, and guns were fired. The American embassy personnel were threatened, and a number of things happened that caught us by surprise. It made the President withdraw the people who were supposed to be part of that contingent.

It turned out later that the people who organized that demonstration against the delegation sent by the President of the United States to begin to normalize the situation in Haiti, those people were on the payroll of the CIA.

Emanuel Constant was the head of the organization funded by the CIA. He was on the payroll of the CIA. We do not know the full story yet because they refuse to release all the docu-

ments and papers connected with Emanuel Constant. They refused to allow him to be tried by the present government of Haiti.

So the CIA is an animal that we ought to take a close look at. It may be obsolete, extinct, and begging for retirement. It ought to be done away with and something new should be organized using somebody different, because the blunders continue. They become more and more dangerous.

I think that our government and the NATO alliance is now in an almost untenable position, having bombed the Chinese embassy and giving the Chinese, who opposed the action in Yugoslavia all along, giving them an excellent excuse to take us to the United Nations and to raise the actions of NATO up for the whole world and indignantly protest the fact that they were victimized. It is totally unnecessary. A CIA that would do that needs to be certainly examined closely. Some heads ought to roll. I agree with the Chinese, somebody ought to be severely punished for what has happened.

But the CIA, of course, is a very political animal. It is an agency of government which professes it has nothing to do with politics, of course. They are there for the national security. They report to the President. But during my sojourn on the task force for Haiti, I learned different.

There are people in Washington who belong to something called the intelligence community. The intelligence community protects the CIA. There are a number of characters in the CIA who can almost do anything they want. We saw some of them do almost anything they wanted to do in Haiti, and there was no accountability.

There were CIA reports that were total lies. They had the duly elected president of Haiti, Mr. Aristide, almost a drug addict, a psychopath. All kind of things were charged. When we examined the basis for their charges, there was nothing there. He was placed in hospitals for psychiatric treatment that did not even exist, and all kinds of fabrications we found that had been accepted by the CIA.

The prosecution of this war just brings to light the fact that we have some serious problems in a very expensive governmental operation. The gentleman who preceded me was talking about waste in government and the expenditures, and how so much of our tax money goes into wasteful government. I assure Members, there are many places where there is waste, but I never hear the majority party talking about the real waste.

In fact, we saw last week that when we had a bill on the floor presented by the President calling for \$6 billion to conduct the activities related to the war in Kosovo, the majority party added to that and the \$6 billion price tag was raised to \$13 billion.

We saw before our very eyes in bold relief an example of how the waste gets accumulated. Most of what they were

doing was going to go into weapons systems and activities that are not related to the Kosovo war, but they do make for very high profits in terms of the productions of certain weapons systems, some of which are questionable.

One of the things that the Kosovo war maybe brings into bold relief, again, is the fact that our high-tech weaponry has a lot of shortcomings. The precision bombing, precision bombing turns out not to be so precise.

Strange things are happening with our helicopters. The Apache helicopters were coming, and the way the press played up the helicopters, they did them a great injustice, because they kept hyping, the Apaches are coming, the Apaches are coming.

One got the impression from hearing over the news day after day that the Apaches are coming that the Apaches were going to turn the situation around and win the war. I do not think that the Army had asked for that kind of publicity, but for some reason, there it was. Even Ted Koppel on several shows had people dealing with the way the Apache functions and how the pilots think. It was all this hype about the Apaches, the Apaches.

Now two Apaches have crashed in training sessions. It is just one more reason why the public, the voters, the American citizens have real doubts about this war, when we have blunders of that kind which are placed under a magnifying glass and raised to a level of visibility that destroys the effectiveness of whatever we are going to do afterwards.

The Apaches are there now. It looks as if the Apaches are going to work no miracles and make no great differences, but they are high-tech weapons. We have learned these high-tech weapons are so loaded down that they cannot fly over the mountains. They have so much on them until they have difficulty flying over the mountain ranges, and Yugoslavia has mountain ranges. Every night that I listened to the discussion of the Apaches I was appalled at the kind of facts we pick up in terms of why our high-tech weaponry fails.

Now is the time for every Member of Congress, and indeed, every American citizen, to think seriously and deeply and thoroughly about the activities that are going on. Kosovo and the burden of the war in Kosovo will impact on all the decisions we make in Congress for this 106th session of Congress.

We are going to be saddled with discussions about the fact that \$13 billion was appropriated when only \$6 billion was requested by the President, and many of the same people on the majority side who advocated and voted for those appropriations are going to tell us now that we have no money for education, we have no money to deal with prescription drug benefits for people on Medicare. They are going to tell us we have to have tremendous across-the-board cuts in any program that is a domestic program that is nondefense.

We should expect all of this and get ready for it because of Kosovo becoming an excuse for certain people who have always wanted to cut back drastically on the spending by the Federal Government to help the people in America who need help the most.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to think deeply and thoroughly about all of it. I greatly regret that now, in my pursuit of greater funding for education, of greater funding for school construction, that I am going to have to deal with the Kosovo burden. I deeply regret that. I think all American citizens regret that, in a situation where we have a tight budget already, we have to also now deal with additional expenditures for Kosovo.

I have thought deeply about this. I understand all the implications. I would like to invite my constituents who disagree with me about why, despite all this, I still support the actions of the President and the NATO alliance, I would like for them to follow my thought processes for a moment, those among my constituents who disagree.

The first consideration is my experience with Haiti, the experience with Haiti. At least 3 years of negotiations brought me face-to-face with an example of a sovereign predator. There were two of them, Raoul Cedras and Michel Francoise.

We looked at their faces in negotiation after negotiation and they seemed like rational, reasonable people at the time, when you were negotiating, but they went back on agreement after agreement. They broke agreements. They were determined to squeeze from their country as much as they could for themselves.

Haiti had a thriving drug-running business. Drug transshipments were feeding the coffers of the same men we were negotiating with. They did not mind the deteriorating conditions of the economy, the misery. They did not mind that. They added to the misery by killing large numbers of people every night. The total went up to about 5,000 people killed during that 3-year period.

Negotiations, discussions, diplomacy, sanctions, embargo of oil, none of it worked. It was not until a determination was made to pursue a course of military intervention in Haiti that we got some real action.

As we know, we did not have to fire a shot. There was just the threat of the troops, the understanding that they were on the way, that led Raoul Cedras to step down. Force, however, had to be the threat to do that. We had to be willing to do it.

In the case of Saddam Hussein, I was against the Gulf War, I was against bombing, I was against the ground war, and I watched as Saddam Hussein allowed his own people to be pulverized, his own armies to be destroyed, and he stubbornly held on.

The bombing did have a great effect in the desert. It was a place where you

could impact greatly upon the armed forces. His forces were ravished. They were destroyed long before the ground war began, but he was a sovereign predator who did not care about his own people, and not until the ground war started and the tanks were rolling did we see Saddam Hussein willing to yield.

He played some tricks, and at one point there was an announcement that he was trying to seek asylum in another Nation. For that reason I think the calculations of the Bush administration were thrown off and they did not pursue Saddam Hussein's army to the point of destroying the army. That is most unfortunate. This sovereign predator still sits there, like the sovereign predator in Yugoslavia.

We had an encounter with him, but we did not go any further. We did not go far enough to destroy him and his powers; not the Nation, but a single person surrounded by his own cronies, who becomes the perpetrator of large-scale dislocation and death in the world.

Stop to think of it for a moment. When we add up all the people in the last 50 years, and let us take the last 100 years, because World War I was in the last 100 years, World War II, all the hurricanes, tornadoes, the earthquakes, if we add up all the people who have died in all the natural disasters in the last 100 years, yet it will come nowhere close to the people who have died in wars perpetrated by the Adolph Hitlers and Saddam Husseins of the world.

Millions died in World War II as a result of Adolph Hitler and his Nazi regime, millions died. The authoritarian totalitarian regime in Tokyo, millions died; in China, millions died. They were ready for more millions to die if we had to invade Japan. They were going to hold on at all costs. Too many died in Okinawa, too many died in Iwo Jima.

The sovereign predators do not yield, and they are the cause of more death than nature or God has ever caused. It is a serious consideration. It is a serious thing to think about. Should they be allowed to wreak havoc?

In Rwanda, the Hutus who were in charge of government went on the radio and used all the methods of communication to raise their own population, the Hutus, who were the vast majority of the population, to a high level of anger, and they went out and savagely slaughtered at least a half a million people. Some say it approaches a million. We saw the bodies on television. We saw the churches full of people hacked to death. We saw the people, bodies floating in the river.

The sovereign predators of Rwanda were demagogues who wanted power. It is all about a demagogue who wants power, becomes a sovereign predator, because the best way to achieve that power is to use the tribal, ethnic, or racial card against his own people to throw them into turmoil.

Maybe there are some ancient instincts that make us all distrustful of

each other, but people do not attack each other in large groups. We do not have ethnic wars, tribal wars, automatically. They are instigated by somebody. The demagogues instigate the wars for the purpose of their own power.

Netanyahu, Benjamin Netanyahu is the prime minister or president, I am sorry, of Israel right now. His father wrote a book about anti-Semitism and the ancient origins of anti-Semitism, the history of anti-Semitism. And in the discussion of anti-Semitism in Egypt, he talked about the fact that for so long there was a peaceful existence there. Jews existed along with everybody else, and there was no problem.

□ 2145

Antisemitism arose. And studying the origins of that antisemitism and using his ancient sources and analyzing it, he came to the conclusion that that antisemitism that arose out of Egypt and led to the Exodus and the kinds of cruel things that preceded the Exodus is similar to a pattern that takes place in the world whenever these things happen. That is that a minority is always at risk because a minority by simply being a minority is in a position to be victimized if a demagogue finds it convenient to use the fact that that minority is there to incite the majority and get the majority into a mode of thinking which supports the demagogue.

So demagoguery by sovereign predators has caused more death and destruction of the world than any natural calamities, all the natural calamities put together. Think about it.

Here we have a demagogue, Slobodan Milosovic, like the demagogues in Haiti, the sovereign predators, demagogues that become sovereign predators. They become sovereign predators because they have the authority of the government and they can command the guns and the tanks. Although the majority of the people may be against them, they have no way to counter-attack against modern weapons so the demagogues prevail.

It may be that sometimes they have the majority of people on their side after they have captured all of the propaganda machinery and they are in the control of the mass communications. They brainwash people to the point where they do sometimes, maybe many times, command the majority. But the sovereign predators are in charge, and something has to be done to counteract them.

My framework for thinking was shaped by this development that I saw up close in Haiti. When one is dealing with a sovereign predator, force is the only thing that they understand. War, force becomes the necessary evil. It is necessary. I want to get back to the point. It is a necessary evil. The burdens we bear as a result of the war in Kosovo are a necessary evil.

The framework for thinking of all of us are also being influenced by giving

due recognition to World War II and the phenomena of World War II. One man was the driving force behind World War II; Adolf Hitler and his ambitions. Of course he had a German war machine that he made good use of, and it bowed to his will.

It is a complicated situation. People who argue that one man did it all are in danger of oversimplifying, but if Hitler had not been there, you know, like Alexander the Great, would Alexander the Great have died as generals began to fight among themselves. The great war machine that Alexander the Great had created fell apart.

Without Hitler I imagine the great war machine and all that went with that war machine, the propaganda machine, the organization of the whole nation, it would not have been the same without Adolf Hitler.

So the sovereign predator of Hitler and I think that the Hitler syndrome we can see in Slobodan Milosovic, like we can see the Hitler syndrome in Saddam Hussein, as I saw the Hitler syndrome in Raoul Cedras and Michel Francois in Haiti.

There is a Hitler syndrome where they do not care, they reach the point where they have some kind of sense where they are the most important creatures in the world, and they have the power to make the world bow to their desires and their will, and nothing can stop them but force.

So in World War II, we saw it happen right before our very eyes. We later on got a lot of documentation. It was not propaganda that millions of Jews were being put to death. We now have the documentation. We saw the bodies. We saw the gas chambers. We have the files. We have a museum here in Washington which if one does not believe it, one can go look at the documentation and the evidence with one's own eyes. It all happened. It all happened.

Do we respond to that lesson in history by saying that Yugoslavia is a sovereign nation and therefore we should not meddle? Do we respond to that by saying we should not break international law and international tradition by intervening in Yugoslavia. We did that.

In the case of Hitler, of course, he was challenged when he went across borders and started war. When he attacked the nations in Europe surrounding him, he had already annexed a couple of nations before that and some territory. We took it as long as we could, and finally Hitler was challenged.

Slobodan Milosovic does not represent a threat to the United States as Hitler did. He had world ambitions. He moved in a way where, as he destroyed the nations of Europe and brought them under subjugation, he was building a foundation which certainly could have been the basis for challenging any part of the world.

He had his counterpart in Japan. For a while, he had his allies in Italy. It was a movement that threatened all

parts of the world. Certainly it was a situation different from the one we see now.

We are not threatened by Yugoslavia in that same way. They will never attack America. They will not send missiles here. We are not in a situation where our national interests are at stake. I think that previous speakers who made that point over and over again were correct. I agree. Our national interests are not at stake in Yugoslavia. We are in no way threatened by Slobodan Milosovic in terms of our own national security. There will be no military threats, no military problems as far as this Nation is concerned.

That makes it even more important, even more noble the fact that we have gone into a conflict where we do not have a vital interest, we do not have our national interest threatened. This is a moral crusade. This is raising morality to a new level, as I said before, a new level of morality when one engages one's troops, one's resources, one's political destiny. Because anybody who starts a war in America runs a risk of paying a high price politically. Any party that is a part of starting and executing a war will pay a high price, will teeter on a precipice.

The politically expedient thing to do in the case of Kosovo would be to stay away from any conflict that might place the Democrats in a difficult position in the year 2000 as we go into those elections. The politically expedient thing to do would be to negotiate forever, even negotiate away principles, but do not do anything which jeopardizes one's power.

Criticism I hear of the President, criticisms of this administration, but the gamble they are taking is a noble gamble. The risks being taken here are noble risks for noble reasons.

The fact is that our interests are not being threatened. There is no oil. We went to war in the Gulf. The Gulf War, I think there was some principles were involved. One nation was invaded by another, but I do not think that is why we went to war in the desert. We went to war in the desert because the price of gasoline was threatened. The supplies of oil in the whole world were threatened. There was a clear vital national interest.

Is that the only reason we should ever go to war? I think this action taken by this administration by the NATO alliance is saying there ought to be another reason to go to war, especially in a situation where one has been dealing for 8 years, one has been negotiating for 8 years with the sovereign predator, one has been trying to resolve the situation for 8 years, especially a situation where the European nations all agree. They reached agreement about the horrors of what is happening in Yugoslavia. Is it not time to take some action?

My framework of thinking is shaped by what I understand of what happened in World War II with Hitler. My frame-

work of thinking is shaped also by my experiences with Haiti up close. My framework of understanding of what is going on here is shaped also by my preoccupation and concern and understanding of the war to end slavery in America, the Civil War, the War Between the States, whatever you might want to call it.

If ever there was a war that was fought as a moral crusade, then that was a moral crusade war. The war to end slavery was a campaign of compassion. The large numbers of men who fought and died in that war, and more Americans died in that war than have died in all the wars combined. Certainly I speak for the Union soldiers who fought to end slavery.

Some people say it was not a war about slavery. But if ever there was a war that had a clear purpose, then this war had a clear purpose. The war to end slavery was a war for a high moral principle.

If Abraham Lincoln had been a better politician, he would have done what James Buchanan did in his latter part of administration, avoided a confrontation at all cost with his confederates. The war to end slavery would not have taken place if there had not been a principled politician who was willing to take risks in support of that principle.

Yes, there were abolitionist forces in the North who had a great role, and I do not like to see the abolitionists portrayed as fanatics. The abolitionists were people who wanted to end slavery. The abolitionists were people who thought slavery was unjust and that one had to take steps to rid the Nation of that great abominable crime.

There were forces at work that certainly wanted to confront the people who were trying to extend slavery forever. The Confederates wanted to create two Americas. If they had succeeded, we would have had two Americas; one built on slave labor, probably a formidable economic power.

When one has free labor, certainly during that period where the agriculture needed free labor, but when the first industries were formed, if free labor had been available for industries on one-half of the North American continent, and the other half did not have free labor, probably the part of the continent that had free labor would have become the economic power over the part of the continent that did not have free labor through slaves.

So I mean there were many, many possible ramifications of a situation where slavery was allowed to continue because the political powers in charge chose to negotiate and to compromise.

Many of my close, young friends who talk about slavery and the state of African Americans now in America are often unaware of how close we came to a situation where there were two Americas instead of one. The entire strategy at one point of the Confederacy was to prolong the war in order to force a compromise, a negotiated settlement.

The pursuit of the war, the Civil War, required a great deal of serious consideration of the cost. The cost in lives, as I said before, was tremendous. More Americans died in the Civil War than all the wars together. General Ulysses Grant was called a butcher because of his tactics and the number of men that he delivered up in order to win.

If we had CNN covering the Civil War, they would have filmed the burning of Atlanta and some of the other things that were done by General Sherman as he marched across the South and called it barbarity and maybe label Sherman as a war criminal. But, again, it was similar to what happened in Germany. They had to bomb the cities of Germany in order to break the back of the Hitler war machine and the people's resistance, their support for a demagogue who refused to surrender.

□ 2200

In the case of the South, the prolonging of the war was the strategy. And the terrible things that happened as a result of that, the large numbers of civilians, who, if they did not die in those days from the firepower of modern weapons, they died from hunger, deprivation, et cetera. It was a nasty war, a war for a moral purpose.

There would have been no Emancipation Proclamation. There would have been no 13th amendment, no 14th amendment, or no 15th amendment if the bloody war had not been won.

So I say to my constituents who insist that this is a terrible thing we are doing because civilians are dying, it is a terrible thing when we have to bomb cities, it is a terrible thing that we are using our military might to try to get a solution to a problem, but the choice is not ours. The demagogue who is a sovereign predator has determined what the situation should be.

We have been given no choice in the matter, if we care about moral principles, if we are going to lay aside the conventional morality which says that whatever a nation does within its borders, it is their business; that whatever a nation does, no matter how horrible it may be, it is not the concern of the rest of the world. We broke that tradition when we went into Yugoslavia in the first place.

We have been in Yugoslavia a number of years. More than \$7 billion have been spent there by this country alone in helping to maintain a peacekeeping force. We are involved. So, therefore, the moral crusade that we are mounting in Kosovo is a continuation of a new kind of morality that we have established. We are saying that never again will the civilized world stand by and allow people to be destroyed by sovereign predators without intervention.

Sometimes that intervention, most of the time, it will be diplomatic condemnation. Diplomatic condemnation of genocide will always be a certainty, I hope, from now on when that happens. But sometimes military con-

frontation will also be possible, and it will happen in protection of a principle.

I hope that all the other sovereign predators of the world will take heed that they will not be allowed to exist without being labeled war criminals. General Pinochet, who is now sort of trapped in England, I hope we have seen the last of those people who think they can kill and maim and destroy people and then rise up and travel around the world as ordinary citizens and enjoy their old age. There ought to be a condemnation of the sovereign predators, if we cannot go to war with them, do whatever is necessary to make certain they never live among men again as normal people.

So I appeal to my constituents, I appeal to people everywhere to do a thorough analysis and remember the Hitler syndrome. Never again, the phrase we used in connection with the millions of Jews who died, must not be an abstract slogan. It must not be a slogan that our generation uses in the future because we sat by and let things happen and we feel bad about it and say we will not let it happen next time. This is the time. This is the time to stop it.

Each one of us has a duty to take a forceful position, to be thorough in our thinking and to support the most intelligent effort possible to end this war as fast as possible. But we should, in the meantime, be proud of the fact that this indispensable Nation of ours has both the will and the power to reinforce the foundations of a compassionate civilization.

The Roman Empire only dispatched their allegiance to achieve greater conquests and to bring home the booty. This American indispensable Nation has deployed its armies in an unprecedented campaign of compassion.

A CRISIS WE MUST NOT SHRINK FROM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, oft-times I have the privilege of visiting elementary schools in the 6th Congressional District of Arizona, the folks whom I represent, and enjoy reading to elementary schoolchildren a book entitled "House Mouse, Senate Mouse", and it tells the story in bipartisan, or nonpartisan, fashion of the legislative process. It is written in verse, and it follows a letter sent to Capitol Hill by a group of schoolchildren. And as I point out to the students, if they ever want to receive a lot of mail, they need only be elected to the Congress of the United States, and they will receive mail on a daily basis.

Mr. Speaker, this time of year, I am sure my colleagues would concur, among the pieces of mail we get are a variety of commencement announce-

ments and graduation invitations, and I received one such invitation today from one of this Nation's foremost institutions, the United States Military Academy at West Point. The announcement reads as follows:

"Congressman Hayworth, after 4 years, I wanted to write and thank you for the appointment to the United States Military Academy you obtained for me in 1995. I am graduating and will be a commissioned armor officer stationed in Germany. I look forward to this exciting challenge. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to serve my country and fulfill a childhood dream."

And the young man about to be commissioned as Second Lieutenant in the United States Army sent his graduation picture along.

And, indeed, as a previous Member of this Chamber long ago reflected upon this job, indeed one man in American history, the only man thus far to serve as President following the service in that same job of his own father, John Quincy Adams, who, following his service as President, was asked by the people of Massachusetts to return to government service in this role, as a Member of Congress, said, "There is no greater honor than serving in the people's House."

And I would only add to that, Mr. Speaker, by saying one of the great honors of service in this House is the opportunity to appoint outstanding young men and women to our military academies because their sense of duty, honor and country serves as an example to us all.

I have also had an occasion to travel around the width and breadth of the district I represent here, a district in square mileage that is almost the size of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Across the width and breadth of eastern Arizona, from the small hamlet of Franklin in southern Greenlee County, north to Four Corners on the sovereign Navajo Nation, west to Flagstaff, and south again to Florence, including portions of metropolitan Phoenix, North Scottsdale, Central Mesa, and what we call the East Valley, a district of incredible contrasts and diversity. And yet the stories remain the same, stories of proud service to our country.

In Pinal County last month I had occasion to speak at the dedication of a new city hall in Casa Grande, Arizona. And that city hall is a unique design for it is a renovation of the historic Casa Grande High School, and the city hall dedication almost served as a mini reunion for the proud alumni of Casa Grande High.

One of those who joined us that day was a member of the class of 1941, and he brought his school photograph, not unlike the West Point cadet who I mentioned earlier. This year, this alumnus of Casa Grande High School, brought his high school yearbook picture; and he related to me the story of how his dreams were deferred because of his sense of duty and the ominous and momentous acts, acts that have