Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for

yielding me this time.

First of all, let me just say to my colleague from Florida (Mr.

Hastings) if we were in recess, the President could call us back for an

emergency session within 24 hours to get an authorization for the

money, so I think that it really is a red herring, although I have

respect for my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, is this war in our national interests? Does it involve

the security of the United States? I think anybody who is familiar with

this operation realizes that it is not. The Persian Gulf, on the other

hand, did involve our national security, because 50 percent of our oil

reserves came from that part of the world, and it also involved one

country invading another.

Should we be involved for humanitarian reasons? Look at the Sudan.

Two million people, 2 million people, died in the Sudan. We did not do

a darn thing about it. In Ethiopia, there have been 10,000 deaths in

just the last couple of months. In Tibet, nearly 1.2 million people

have died, and we have not done anything. In Sri Lanka, 56,000 people

have lost their lives; 200,000 in Indonesia, and I could go on and on.

In Croatia, in the former Yugoslavia, 10,000 Serbs were killed and

200,000 were driven out in ethnic cleansing in 1995, and we did not do

a darn thing about it. That was a humanitarian crisis right next door.

Why did we not do something about that?

Should we be involved? At the NATO Summit here in Washington just

last

week, a resolution was passed to involve NATO in peacekeeping and

humanitarian missions, like this one, anywhere in Europe. Are we going

to be the world's policeman? We are already paying two-thirds of the

costs and flying 90% of the missions. Can we afford it? My colleague

from Cleveland just noted that we are going to have to take money out

of the Social Security trust fund and other areas in order to pay for

this war, if it is prolonged.

Was this war properly planned like the Persian Gulf War? No. We all

know that. It is piecemeal, and this President does not know where we

are going. We have a man who knows nothing about the military directing

this, even though the people at the Pentagon have told him that the

bombing is only going to exacerbate the situation.

Is this a prelude to more? I think it is. Putting in ground troops

over there is going to bring back what to us? A lot of body bags, a lot

of problems, a lot of costs that we simply do not need. We do not need

to be there. We should support H.R. 1569, bring our troops home, and

let the people in Europe deal with a European problem.