

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

#### GODSPEED TO OUR TROOPS IN THE BALKANS

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON). Both of us had the privilege of accompanying Secretary of Defense Cohen into the theater. All of us walked away, one, awestruck by the commitment and spirit of the young men and women who represent us there. Their technical ability, their proficiency is something that is awe-inspiring, as well as their commitment.

Additionally, I think for me and others on the trip the commitment of the other NATO parties was something that struck us, and as we all pray and hope for a quick end to this conflict and the safety and security of our men and women that are in the field, I join with my colleague from Missouri and many others wishing them Godspeed.

#### CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I do want to take this first opportunity back from the NCAA for a little bit of bragging rights, and when I was there in Europe I met some other folks from Connecticut, some from my own district, and one of the great things about our State is that our UCONN basketball teams, men and women but this year it is the men's turn, are really the center of attention from an athletic perspective. Our team beat the Duke Blue Devils 77 to 74 for that championship, and with this win UCONN became the first school in New England to win this NCAA since 1947.

It was a great team. They made an incredible effort on that day and through the whole season. What is clear to all of us is that each and every one of the players put their heart and soul and every bit of effort in it, and I congratulate each one of them.

But I want to take a moment in particular for Jim Calhoun and his entire coaching staff. Coach Calhoun, who is a great coach and a great human being, someone that is involved in the community to help good causes, has been at UCONN since 1986 and has built an incredibly impressive record. In 13 seasons his record is 304 wins, 120 losses. Coach Calhoun has taken UCONN basketball from the backwaters to the front edge of competition, and he has succeeded time and time again in the Big East, in the championships, and finally this year in the NCAA.

For all my constituents, those like myself who are graduates of the University of Connecticut and every citizen in our State, this was a truly exciting moment and one that we will revel in for some time.

Congratulations, UCONN, the team, the president and all the folks back at Storrs.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Connecticut men's basketball team for winning the 1999 NCAA Division I National Championship over Duke University. UCONN's 77-74 victory over the Blue Devils culminated years of hard work, dedication and perseverance on the part of the players, coaches and the entire University community. The residents of my state also deserve some of the credit for being among the most loyal, supportive fans in the nation.

The Huskies' "road to the Final Four" has been long, but illustrious. UCONN has been in the NCAA tournament twenty times in school history. Its teams have played in seven "Sweet Sixteen" and four "Elite Eight" games in the 1990s alone. The path to this year's Final Four appearance—the first in school history—included victories over Texas-San Antonio, New Mexico, Iowa and Gonzaga. UCONN bested Ohio State to advance to the championship game. UCONN's win over Duke produced the school's first NCAA Division I men's basketball National Championship and marked the first time since 1947 that a school from New England has won the title.

It goes without saying that basketball is a team sport. This UCONN team is the embodiment of that statement. Game in and game out, this group of extraordinary young men worked together as a unit to achieve their common goal. Every player made a contribution which helped the team win the Big East regular season and tournament championships, advance through the tournament to the Final Four and, ultimately, win the 1999 National Championship.

During the tournament every player made contributions that helped the team to move ever closer to its ultimate goal. Kevin Freeman provided offensive spark throughout the tournament especially in the game against Ohio State and helped to contain national player of the year Elton Brand in the championship game. Ricky Moore, who many people, including this member, believe is the best defensive player in college basketball, demonstrated over and over again why he has earned this title. He played opposite star guards throughout the tournament and made crucial plays against Duke's Trajan Langdon in the final seconds of the championship game which sealed the victory for UCONN. Jake Voskuhl filled the lane throughout the tournament and in the final game played a crucial role in containing Elton Brand. And what more can be said about the contributions of Richard Hamilton and Khalid El-Amin? Hamilton, who was named tournament MVP, scored an average of 24 points in six tournament games capping off the season with a 27 point performance in the final game. El-Amin, the team's floor leader, directed the offense, motivated his teammates and made crucial shots down the stretch in the victories against Ohio State and Duke. Others, including Edmund Saunders, Rashamel Jones and Souleymane Wane, played critical minutes in each game contributing to the team's success.

Coach Jim Calhoun and his assistants—Dave Leitao, Karl Hobbs and Tom Moore—have done a masterful job. Over the past thirteen seasons, Coach Calhoun has built a program that has dominated the Big East, one of the most competitive conferences in NCAA

basketball, winning the regular season championship six times and the tournament championship four times. After only two seasons at UCONN, Coach Calhoun led the Huskies to the 1988 National Invitation Tournament championship. His teams have advanced to at least the round of sixteen in the NCAA tournament seven times this decade. Coach Calhoun can be very intense, but he is committed to his players more than anything else.

In Connecticut, UCONN basketball is the state past-time. Every game is sold out and families across the state gather to watch every game on TV or listen on the radio. The Huskies have such phenomenal support because the team has a special relationship, a dedication to one another which is infectious. This commitment produced an extraordinary season.

Mr. Speaker, as a UCONN graduate and the representative of Storrs, I am especially proud of the team's accomplishment. The team achieved its objective due to the extraordinary chemistry between its members, skilled coaching and incredible support from its fans. Once again, congratulations on a great season and enjoy the title—1999 National Champion.

□ 2000

#### U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN KOSOVO: WHY THIS HUMANITARIAN CRISIS?

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to discuss one of the primary reasons I introduced legislation that will prohibit the use of appropriated funds to the Department of Defense from being used for the deployment of U.S. ground troops in Kosovo unless deployment is specifically approved by Congress and authorized by law.

There are many reasons why Members of Congress should support the bill. Issues that need to be discussed include the authority of Congress to declare war, why this region is or is not vital to our national security interests, and whether the human and monetary cost of American involvement in this fight is worth risking American lives.

The President has argued that for humanitarian reasons American intervention is necessary. Why is it more important for us to be involved militarily in Yugoslavia, a country certainly of no real national security threat to the United States, when there are human rights violations occurring in China, a nation that is perhaps our biggest security threat in the new world order?

While we rightly condemn Yugoslav President Milosevic for driving ethnic Albanians from Kosovo, we continue to maintain a strategic partnership, sell highly sensitive satellite information, provide normal trade relationship status to China, a nation that has suppressed and displaced over 128,000 Tibetans and commits some of the most horrific human rights abuses in the

world, including forced abortion, sterilization, execution, rape against its own people.

Who is our biggest national threat? A nation the size of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, with a population of 11 million and an active military of 114,000 and 400,000 reserves or a country the size of the United States, with a population of 1.2 billion and an active military of 2.8 million with 1.2 million in reserve under communist control with a nuclear and chemical arsenal that sells weapons technology to rogue nations at odds with the United States?

Civil wars and human rights atrocities are occurring all over the world. According to the 1998 world refugee survey, there are over 3.5 million refugees and asylum seekers worldwide, including 2.9 million in Africa, 5.7 million in the Middle East, 2.2 million in South Central and East Asia and the Pacific.

Let us get back to the question of why Kosovo and not elsewhere is important. In Sudan alone there are 4 million internally displaced persons and over 350,000 refugees. In just the last decade over 1.9 million people in Sudan have died due to war-related causes and famine. In 1998, 2.6 million Sudanese were at risk of starvation due to civil war, drought and government restrictions on relief flights. Why are not we bombing the Sudanese Government and sending in ground troops?

Afghanistan has over 2.6 million refugees and between 1 million and 1.5 million internally displaced persons. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. NORTHUP). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### 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