

Today the extremist Afghan Taliban government discriminates and completely controls the life of half its population. Women are forbidden to work outside the home and from attending school, may not ride in vehicles unless accompanied by a male relative and are denied health care in many parts of the country. They have left over 2 million dead and 700,000 widows and orphans. Why are not we bombing Afghanistan and sending in ground troops?

What about Angola, Colombia and Sierra Leone? And the list goes on and on and on.

Clearly, we must have a better foreign policy strategy than this. It is quite obvious that the administration does not have a well-thought-out policy regarding Kosovo. Through NATO, the administration seems to be running this war day to day without any master plan or exit strategy.

Despite efforts to keep our troops away from the Kosovo border, we now have three American POWs. To make matters worse, we are now hearing that the administration went against the advice of top Pentagon officials who determined early that we should not even be engaged in a bombing campaign in Yugoslavia.

It is unrealistic to believe that we can intervene for a few months, a year or 3 years and settle this conflict that has raged for centuries.

Four years ago, or 5, when the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs came before the Foreign Affairs Committee on which I served, I asked the question, you say you are going into Bosnia for a year? I know that you know the history and know that it all began in the 4th century with the fall of the Roman Empire and was exacerbated in the 10th century with the rise of the Ottoman Empire. What are you going to do in 1 year's time that they could not do in all of these centuries?

Of course, the answer is nothing. Four years, \$7 billion, 19,000 troops later, we are still there with the current ground force of 6,200.

I asked the same question when they went into Haiti, asking what is it you are going to do in a year that we did not do the ten times we went in before the last time, staying for 15 years? Of course, the answer is, we did not do anything, other than to spend a billion dollars and send 20,000 troops. We are still there.

There are those who would like to say that this is some comparison with Hitler. That is mixing oranges and apples.

Madam Speaker, I will continue this tomorrow evening.

IF NATO HAS ITS WAY, ALBANIAN KOSOVARS WILL NOT REMAIN PART OF SERBIA

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

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, the U.S.-NATO war against Serbia is illegal by all standards. Congress has not declared war. Therefore, the President has no authority to wage war. Attacking a sovereign nation violates longstanding international law as well as the NATO and U.N. charters.

NATO's aggression is immoral as well. It forces U.S. citizens and others in Europe opposed to the war to pay for it, and some are even forced to fight in it against their will. If the war expands, we can expect the return of the draft to make sure there are enough soldiers to participate.

As ugly as the Yugoslavian civil war may be in Kosovo, and as heart wrenching as the pictures of mass refugees fleeing their homeland is, one evil can never justify another. If one is disinclined to be persuaded by law and morality and responds only to emotions, propaganda and half-truths, then one must consider the practical failure of compulsive intervention in the affairs of other nations.

Prior to NATO's expanding the war in Yugoslavia, approximately 2,000 deaths in the past year were recorded in Kosovo. As a consequence of NATO's actions, the killing has now escalated and no one can hardly be pleased just because now Serbs, our once-valiant allies against the Nazis, are dying. Those who are motivated by good intentions while ignoring facts cannot be excused for the escalating and dangerous crisis in Yugoslavia.

The humanitarian concerns for Albanian refugees is justified, but going to war because of emotional concerns while ignoring other millions of refugees around the world only stirs the passions of the oppressed, whether they are Kurds, Palestinians, Tibetans, East Timorans or Rwandans.

When NATO talks of returning Albanians to their homes in Kosovo, I wonder why there is no reference or concern for the more than 50,000 Serbs thrown out of their homes in Bosnia, Slovenia and Croatia. Current NATO policy in Yugoslavia will surely encourage more ethnic minorities around the world to revolt and demand independence.

Some in Congress are now saying that although they were strongly opposed to the administration's policy of bombing in Yugoslavia prior to its onset, conditions are now different and an all-out effort to win with ground troops, if necessary, must be undertaken. This, it is said, is required to preserve NATO's credibility.

Who cares about NATO's credibility? Are American lives to be lost and a

greater war precipitated to preserve NATO's credibility? Should the rule of law and morality be thrown out in an effort to preserve NATO's credibility? Can something be wrong and misguided before it is started and all of a sudden deserve to be blindly supported?

This reasoning makes no sense.

No one has quite figured out the secret motivation of why this war must be fought, but I found it interesting that evidence of our weapons shortage is broadcast to the world and to the Serbs. Surely one result of the war will be a rapid rush by Congress this year to massively increase the military budget. But a serious discussion of our flawed foreign policy of intervention that has served us so poorly unfortunately will not occur.

Political leaders and pundits are struggling to define an exit strategy for the war. In the old days when wars were properly declared for national security reasons, no one needed to ask such a question. A moral war fought against an aggressor for national security reasons was over when it was won. It has only been since Congress has reneged on its responsibility with regards to war power that it has become necessary to discuss how we exit a war not legitimately entered into and without victory as a goal.

The political wars, fought without declaration, starting with the Korean War to the present, have not enhanced the long-term security and liberty of the American people. Institutionalizing a collective approach to war seems a result of the obsession to save face for NATO. Never before in our history have we Americans accepted so casually the turning over of a military operation to foreign control with non-American spokesmen briefing us each day.

This is a major step in further solidifying the world government approach to all political problems. There is, however, one major contradiction to the internationalist desire to assimilate all countries and ethnic groups and have them governed by a single world government.

Quite ironically, ethnic diversity will surely be the casualty of all of this mischief. NATO and the U.S. are co-conspirators and military allies of a Serbian province that is seeking to become a separate ethnic country. Let there be no doubt, if NATO has its way, Albanian Kosovars will not remain part of Serbia.

The US-NATO War against Serbia is illegal by all standards. Congress has not declared war; therefore the President has no authority to wage war. Attacking a sovereign nation violates longstanding international law, as well as the NATO and UN Charters.

NATO's aggression is immoral as well. It forces US citizens and others in Europe, opposed to the war, to pay for it and some are even forced to fight in it against their will. If the war expands we can expect the return of

the draft to make sure there are enough soldiers to participate.

As ugly as the Yugoslavian civil war may be in Kosovo and as heart wrenching as the pictures of mass refugees fleeing their homeland is, one evil can never justify another.

If one is disinclined to be persuaded by law and morality and responds only to emotions, propaganda, and half-truths, then one must consider the practical failure of compulsive intervention in the affairs of other nations.

Prior to NATO's expanding the war in Yugoslavia approximately 2,000 deaths in the past year were recorded in Kosovo. As a consequence of NATO's actions the killing has now escalated and no one can hardly be pleased just because now Serbs, our once valiant allies against the Nazi's, are dying. Those who are motivated by good intentions while ignoring facts cannot be excused for the escalating and dangerous crisis in Yugoslavia.

The humanitarian concerns for Albanian refugees is justified, but going to war because of emotional concerns, while ignoring other millions of refugees around the world, only stirs the passions of the oppressed, whether they are Kurds, Palestinians, Tibetans, East Timorans, or Rwandans. When NATO talks of returning Albanians to their homes in Kosovo, I wonder why there's no reference or concern for the more than 500,000 Serbs thrown out of their homes in Bosnia, Slovenia, and Croatia. Current NATO policy in Yugoslavia will surely encourage more ethnic minorities around the world to revolt and demand independence.

Some in Congress are now saying that although they were strongly opposed to the administration's policy of bombing in Yugoslavia prior to its onset, conditions are now different and an all-out effort to win with ground troops if necessary, must be undertaken. This, it is said, is required to preserve NATO's credibility. Who cares about NATO's credibility? Are American lives to be lost and a greater war precipitated to preserve NATO's credibility? Should the rule of law and morality be thrown out in an effort to preserve NATO's credibility? Can something be wrong and misguided before it's started and all of a sudden deserve to be blindly supported? This reasoning makes no sense.

No one has quite figured out the secret motivation of why this war must be fought. But I found it interesting that evidence of our weapons shortage is broadcast to the world and to the Serbs. Surely, one result of the war will be a rapid rush by Congress this year to massively increase the military budget. But, a serious discussion of our flawed foreign policy of intervention that has served us so poorly, unfortunately, will not occur.

Political leaders and pundits are struggling to define an "exit strategy" for the war. In the old days when wars were properly declared for national security reasons, no one needed to ask such a question. A moral war, fought against an aggressor, for national security reasons, was over when it was won. It's only been since Congress has reneged on its responsibility with regards to war power, has it become necessary to discuss how we "exit" a war not legitimately entered into, and without victory as the goal. The political wars fought without declaration, starting with the Korean War to the present, have not enhanced the

long-term security and liberty of the American people.

Institutionalizing a collective approach to war seems to be a result of the obsession to "save face" for NATO. Never before in our history have we Americans accepted so casually the turning over a military operation to foreign control with non-American spokesmen briefing us each day. This is a major step in further solidifying the world-government approach to all political problems.

There is, however, one major contradiction to the internationalist's desire to assimilate all countries and ethnic groups and have them governed by a single world government. Quite ironically, ethnic diversity will surely be the casualty of all this mischief.

NATO and the US are co-conspirators and military allies of a Serbian Province that is seeking to become a separate ethnic country. The full force of our efforts, no matter what humanitarian picture is painted to justify our actions, is to make Kosovo an Albanian Muslim state separate from Serbia.

Current NATO and US policy completely contradict the professed goal of multi-ethnicity and assimilation of all people. NATO's operation, by its very nature, is bureaucratically burdened by the effort to appease the political concerns of 19 different countries. This inefficiency and the contradiction of supporting the establishment of an ethnic state will guarantee NATO's deserved demise. The sooner we get out of Yugoslavia the better off everyone will be.

LET US MEASURE UP JUST AT LEAST THIS ONE TIME TO THE GREATNESS OF THE PEOPLE WE REPRESENT

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

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Speaker, today in Kosovo, a baby will die. Three weeks ago, this same little one was healthy and happy. She will not, however, be strong enough to cope with the cold, the hunger, the exposure and the inevitable disease, and today she will die in the arms of a desperate mother who is powerless to keep her daughter safe and well.

Madam Speaker, today in Kosovo, a young woman will be raped. Three weeks ago she was thinking of her studies and her friends, reveling in the beauty and innocence of one who has only celebrated her 16th birthday.

Madam Speaker, today in Kosovo, a loving husband, an adoring father, an affectionate son and a beloved brother will be shot to death as he stands unarmed and unable to comprehend why he is about to die.

Three weeks ago he provided for his family, pattered about his house, attended to those he loved and participated in his community. He lived the life and held the dreams of ordinary folks the world over.

These unspeakable tragedies, Madam Speaker, will repeat themselves hun-

dreds, thousands or very possibly tens of thousands of times as the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo continues to unfold.

As we wrestle with the complexities of the United States's response to this horror, I hope this great House, the people's house, will rise above the partisanship that has all too often characterized debate in this Chamber. For the sake of those whose lives have been abruptly ended, for the sake of those whose families have been destroyed, for the sake of those who have endured life-scarring assaults, let us measure up just at least this one time to the greatness of the people we represent.

□ 2015

Let us, Madam Speaker, deliberate with wisdom and seriousness of purpose the grave question of how our country should respond to the horrific situation in Kosovo.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR THE 106TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. NORTHUP). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Madam Speaker, in accordance with clause 2(a) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Rules of the Committee on the Budget for the 106th Congress.

These rules were adopted by the Committee on the Budget by voice vote at an organizational meeting held by the committee on January 20, 1999.

If there are any questions on the Committee Rules, please contact Jim Bates, Chief Counsel of the Budget Committee.

GENERAL APPLICABILITY

Rule 1—Applicability of House Rules

Except as otherwise specified herein, the Rules of the House are the rules of the committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege.

MEETINGS

Rule 2—Regular Meetings

(a) The regular meeting day of the committee shall be the second Wednesday of each month at 11 a.m., while the House is in session.

(b) The chairman is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting when the chairman determines there is no business to be considered by the committee. The chairman shall give notice in writing or by facsimile to that effect to each member of the committee as far in advance of the regular meeting day as the circumstances permit.

(c) Regular meetings shall be canceled when they conflict with meetings of either party's caucus or conference.

Rule 3—Additional and Special Meetings

(a) The chairman may call and convene additional meetings of the committee as the chairman considers necessary, or special meetings at the request of a majority of the