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.