Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in

opposition to this rule, which will govern our debate over the

situation in Kosovo today.

Under the terms of this rule, we will be debating four measures, each

for only one hour. This means that each side will only receive but 30

minutes to make known their concerns, just slightly more than is

allowed for a bill on the suspension calendar. These measures are of

precious importance to our troops, and to our national security, and we

should have ample time to debate them.

Furthermore, the timing for the debate on these bills is poor. Like

many other conflicts, the factual circumstances are fluid, and require

our flexibility if we are to be effective. We should not be

pigeonholing our position and threatening the safety of our troops.

Neither NATO nor the United States believes that a state of war

exists in the current conflict in the Balkan region. The President has

not requested that Congress issue a declaration of war. I believe that

a declaration of war would be entirely counterproductive as a matter of

policy and is unnecessary as a matter of law. Yet we stand to debate

this measure today.

On only five occasions in the United States history and never since

the end of World War II has the Congress declared war, reflecting the

extraordinary nature of, and implications attendant on, such a

declaration. Yet it seems Congress is willing to do that today. While

we are not at war with either the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or its

people, Slobodan Milosevic should not doubt the determination of NATO

to see the stability of Europe reasserted. Yet, with this debate today,

we show Milosevic weakness. With resolve NATO can attain a durable

peace that prevents further repression and provides for democratic

self-government for the Kosovar people. Yet, with our votes today, we

send mixed signals to our trusted allies.

As it stands, I must question the genuineness of at least three of

the measures we will be debating today. That is especially true because

we will see Committee leadership bringing a resolution to the floor

that they will be voting against. Those at home watching this debate on

television will undoubtedly see through this charade, and know that

what transpires here today will be less about the importance of our

mission in Kosovo, less about ending human suffering, and more about

partisan politics and taking shots at the White House.

What we should be debating here today, and acknowledging, is the

suffering that is taking place in the Balkans. We should be doing

something to help the refugees who have been cast out of their homes,

and their homeland, by a tyrant. We should be debating how we can bring

stability to this region, and appropriating funds to help thousands of

innocent children eat. We should be passing resolutions of support for

our brave troops.

Instead we stand here today, using the floor of the House of

Representatives, to play tired, partisan politics. I urge my colleagues

to vote against this rule, and to bring to the floor meaningful debate

that can help save lives in Kosovo.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this

resolution. This resolution would prohibit funds to deploy ground

elements without prior authorization. Mr. Speaker, this resolution goes

far beyond the concerns of many who believe Congress should express its

will before a ground invasion of Yugoslavia is contemplated.

I do believe that Congress should express the views of our

constituents as we proceed with action in the Balkan region. I however

do not want to limit the flexibility of our military in their efforts

to make Slobodan Milosevic comply with international norms. Mr.

Speaker, I find it ironic that this body is even considering this

resolution in light of past precedent. When President Bush asked this

body to authorize action in Kuwait, this body had sufficient time to

debate the matter. Secondly, this body did not attempt to block our

commanders' flexibility and ability to respond to emergency situations.

I believe that NATO's operations are making a difference in the

region both militarily and in providing comfort to thousands and

thousands of refugees. But it is important for us to remember that when

conducting operations like this one that it is going to take time. I

want to ensure that Milosevic pays a heavy price for his present policy

of repression against the Kosovar Albanians, to alter his calculation

about continuing on this course, and to seriously diminish his military

capacity to exert his will over Kosovo.

In addition, Mr. Speaker there are thousands and thousands of ethnic

Albanians who have received the full brunt of the Yugoslavian army and

police force in Kosovo. These people have lost their homes and

possessions. They have lost countless loved ones to unspeakable

atrocities. We may never know the full extent of the horrors committed

by the Yugoslavian army. We are left with the words of refugees fleeing

this country. Their eyes have witnessed and their words speak of men

and boys who have been led off to die.

The 37,000 refugees in Montenegro, the 262,000 refugees in Albania,

and the 120,000 in Macedonia; place the responsibility for the Kosovo

tragedy squarely on the shoulders of Slobodan Milosevic. Mr. Speaker,

we cannot deny the evidence of mass graves nor the humanitarian crisis

ongoing in Montenegro, Macedonia, and Albania.

Mr. Speaker, we must be patient in this endeavor, for the stability

of Europe is at risk. I believe that we must stay the course, for this

is a battle that Milosevic cannot be allowed to win and that NATO must

not lose.

There is a great deal at stake in this operation including the

stability of Europe. We cannot lose sight of the fact that on two

occasions we have sent young men and women to fight and die in order to

restore the stability of Europe. Mr. Speaker, if Milosevic is allowed

to succeed then we will be establishing a dangerous precedent for the

next century. NATO must succeed in its endeavor to restore order to

Kosovo and to establish a lasting peace based on fairness and justice.

Although I do not support the use of ground forces, I feel that this

resolution goes too far. This sweeping resolution threatens to severely

restrict the ability of our military commanders to conduct operations

in the Balkans. There are situations, which could arise that require

the deployment of ground troops. I cannot support H.R. 1569 because it

imposes a risk to both our forces and those of our allies.

Mr. Speaker, this effort is in our national interest, our current

policy best represents our interests. We must prevail in this struggle

because the interests and the values, which embody our nation and those

of our allies, are at stake.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to

this concurrent resolution. This resolution would direct the President,

pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United

States Armed Forces from their positions in connection with the present

operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Adopting this

resolution, Mr. Speaker, would certainly not be in America's best

interest.

My opposition to this resolution is threefold. First, I understand

that several of my colleagues oppose the use of United States Armed

Forces in the Balkans. My colleagues refer to terms like mission creep

and quagmire when discussing this region and our current involvement. I

understand their reluctance for we all can remember Vietnam and the

pain that our nation endured. In fact it was in part because of Korea

and Vietnam that in 1973 Congress enacted the War Powers Resolution.

The War Powers Resolution is a remnant of the Vietnam War and of the

cold war era. This resolution is not suited for the new-world situation

in which U.S. involvement in hostilities may often be part of a

multilateral effort. As examples of the post cold war era, we saw in

the Persian Gulf War and now in Yugoslavia the need for greater

flexibility. The time in which we now live the President must have the

ability to make rapid decisions that may entail the use of force in new

and varied ways.

Secondly, I object to this resolution because I am wary of beginning

a constitutional struggle between the Office of the President and

Congress when our troops are currently involved in an armed conflict.

With military operations underway we cannot afford to send mixed

signals about our commitment to the region. We cannot afford to risk

that one American soldier, sailor, or airman would doubt that this

nation fully supports their mission nor can we risk that Slobodan

Milosevic or any future adversary doubts our resolve.

I am mindful that the Constitution, the lifeline of our Republic,

grants Congress the power to declare war and to make all laws necessary

for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in

the Government. However, I am also mindful that the War Powers

Resolution as well as H. Con. Res 82 take from the President authority

that the President has exercised for nearly 200 years. This resolution

would remove from the President's arsenal flexibility and decisiveness

in times of crisis.

If this resolution were to pass today, it would certainly begin a

constitutional struggle. The constitutionality of the War Powers Act

has been debated since 1973. As a concurrent resolution does not

require presentation to the President for his signature, then it is

almost certain that this legislative veto will trigger a quagmire of

its own. In INS v. Chadha, the Supreme Court declared legislative

vetoes to be unconstitutional.

American foreign policy cannot be micro-managed by this body nor

dictated by the President, it instead requires a balance based on

consultation and cooperation. If we are to establish NATO's goal for

the Balkans, of a durable peace that prevents further repression and

provides for democratic self-government for the Kosovar people, then

this Body must work with the President.

Finally, I oppose this resolution because in my judgment America has

an important interest in the stability of Europe. I would hope that if

nothing else we would have learned that to

ignore European instability is in fact a mistake. Within this century

we have twice ignored instability in Europe, counting on their

political savvy and experience to restore peace. And twice within this

century we have sent young men and women to restore the peace that

Europeans could not capture.

Kosovo shows us that the Europeans by themselves are incapable of

restoring this peace. However, we are fortunate that NATO provides us

with a vehicle to restore peace to the Balkans. After fifty years of

investment in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization we are finally

enjoying the rewards of our collective investment.

Our commitment to NATO and to Kosovo is the best means to achieve a

lasting peace. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and let us

proceed together with the President and our NATO allies with the

business of providing stability and peace in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New

York for his leadership, and I thank my colleague from California for

giving us the opportunity to discuss a very important issue as to

whether or not we stand for war or peace. I must acknowledge that the

gentleman who proposed this particular resolution himself voted against

it.

I grappled today and struggled with the vote on the Goodling

amendment, because I have concern about whether or not we are forcing

ourselves into war, or looking for ways of peace.

I want peace. I have indicated over and over again that we must have

peace, but we must have peace with justice. We must have peace for the

37,000 refugees in Montenegro, the 260,000 refugees in Albania and the

120,000 in Macedonia. We must have peace for those in the former

Yugoslavia.

So a declaration of war is not, I believe, in the best interests of

the United States of America, the best interests of those refugees who

are looking to go home, and the best interests of us trying to force or

bring about a real peace.

We have only declared war in not more than 5 conflicts in our

history: The War of 1812, the war with Mexico in 1846, the war with

Spain in 1898, the First World War and the Second World War.

I do believe that the President's hands must not be tied. We must

have the ability to send peacekeeping troops in. We must get back our

POWs, two of whom are from the State of Texas, but all of them are

Americans. We must not be weak in the eyes of the former Yugoslavia and

Mr. Milosevic. We must stand united.

And to my friends who have mentioned where were we in Rwanda, and

maybe where were we in Ireland, we must not stand while there is ethnic

cleansing and killing and murdering in any part of the world.

I want to stand with an America that has principles. I want to stand

with an America that believes in human life and human dignity, against

the murder of children and women and raping.

I hope we will never stand by against a Rwanda. I hope no matter what

race of people are in trouble, or being attacked or being murdered, we

will stand up against it. Declaring war, however, is not the way that

we should go.

I want us to have a sustained air strike, but, most of all, I want

Mr. Milosevic to come to the peace table. I want a negotiated

settlement. And for us to declare war today, we will not get that.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, I want to stand on behalf of the

refugees returning to their home, I want peace to come in the Balkans,

and I stand by the vote that I took some years ago for

the Dayton peace treaty. Yes, our troops are still in Bosnia, but there

is peace there, there is a united peace there, the United Nations

peacekeeping troops, and I do not see why America has to step away from

providing for peace around the world.

We are not police officers, no, but we have a conscience and we

believe in humanity and dignity.

So I would offer to my colleagues as they vote against this

declaration to declare war, that we should vote for the sustained air

strikes, we should make sure that we force or encourage or demand that

those who have the power, including our NATO allies, come to the peace

table, and that we remember that the greatest of all those that we can

give to the world is love and charity. I hope that we will stand for

what is right.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to

this joint resolution. This resolution would pursuant to section 5(b)

of the War Powers Resolution, declare a state of war between the United

States and the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Again,

Mr. Speaker this joint resolution is not in the best interest of United

States of America.

Neither NATO nor the United States believes that a state of war

exists in the current conflict in the Balkan region. The President has

not requested that Congress issue a declaration of war. I believe that

a declaration of war would be entirely counterproductive as a matter of

policy and is unnecessary as a matter of law.

On only five occasions in the United States history and never since

the end of World War II has the Congress declared war, reflecting the

extraordinary nature of, and implications attendant on, such a

declaration. While we are not at war with either the Federal Republic

of Yugoslavia or its people, Slobodan Milosevic should not doubt the

determination of NATO to see the stability of Europe reasserted. With

resolve NATO can attain a durable peace that prevents further

repression and provides for democratic self-government for the Kosovar

people.

Mr. Speaker, if this resolution is adopted this body would convey the

wrong message. The adoption of H. J. Res. 44 would indicate the

existence of a bilateral war between the United States and Yugoslavia.

A bilateral war between the United States and Yugoslavia has not been

declared and in my opinion should not be declared; rather our efforts

must remain in concert with the allied effort under the NATO umbrella.

As a matter of law, there is no need for a declaration of war. Mr.

Speaker, every use of U.S. Armed Forces since World War II has been

undertaken pursuant to the President's constitutional authority. In

some cases like the Persian Gulf War, action was taken under

congressional authorization, but not since World War II has Congress

declared war.

Mr. Speaker, in the time in which we live, the President must have

the discretion and authority to use U.S. Armed Forces when there is a

clear and significant risk to our national security interests. I would

hope that if nothing else we would have learned that instability in

Europe does have an immediate impact on our own security interests.

In addition, a declaration of war could have serious

counterproductive effects on NATO cohesion and regional stability.

Russia, already agitated over NATO action, could be further alienated

from joining in diplomatic efforts to achieve a lasting peace.

As NATO reaffirmed at its 50th Anniversary, it remains committed to

the stability of Europe. NATO is acting to deter unlawful violence in

Kosovo that endangers the fragile stability of the Balkans and

threatens a wider conflict in Europe. The NATO alliance is as united as

ever, and there is no sense in giving up now, and there is no better

prospect for getting a fair and lasting settlement.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution and let us proceed

with our NATO allies to bring about a peaceful settlement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. Con.

Res. 21. This resolution authorizes the current military air campaign

that was launched by NATO a little over a month ago. Mr. Speaker it is

important to note the bipartisan support, which this bill received in

the Senate. I believe that this resolution will enable NATO to achieve

its goal of a durable peace that prevents further repression and

provides for democratic self-government for the Kosovar people.

This Body can send an invaluable message to Milosevic, to our troops,

and to the world. If we adopt this resolution authorizing air

operations and missile strikes against Yugoslavia, we will show our

support for the troops carrying out this mission. If we adopt this

resolution we will signal to our NATO partners that our resolve to see

stability and peace prevail in Europe is no less today than it was

during WWI and WWII. When we adopt this resolution we signal to

Milosevic that his campaign against the Albanians of Kosovo is

unacceptable.

Endorsing airstrikes today does not preclude a vote in the future to

authorize ground troops in the future. But we are certainly not at that

point now. Instead this Body should show patience and determination.

The airstrikes are an effective means of delivering our message. We

must make Milosevic feel the pain and pay a heavy price for his policy

of repression and aggression in Kosovo.

If this Body fails to adopt this resolution now it would be

interpreted as a vote of no confidence for our foreign policy in the

Balkans. It would send confusing signals about our national resolve to

persevere to friend and foe alike. The blame for this crisis lies not

with the President, the U.S. Congress, or even the NATO airstrikes;

rather the blame rests with Slobodan Milosevic.

Milosevic shoulders the blame for the current crisis. I stand firm in

my determination to see the killing of innocent Kosovar Albanians

ended. War and conflict is not my first choice, it is not the first

choice of any American, but there are times when force must be

employed. We joined the NATO alliance some fifty years ago to provide

stability and to limit aggression. If we ignore the acts committed by

Milosevic, then our fifty-year commitment to NATO will have been lost.

During WWII this nation turned away a ship full of Jewish immigrants

from our shores. The 907 immigrants on board the S. S. St. Louis sought

to escape the horrors of Nazism but our nation sadly turned them away.

In the aftermath of WWII the American people pledged to never again to

allow ethnic cleansing to occur and to never again to ignore the plight

of those who face genocide. This Body must answer the call of the 1.6

million Kosovars displaced from their homes and of those who can rest

in the unmarked mass graves.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. We should follow the

Senate and send a unified message to our troops, to Milosevic, and to

our allies.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what we wrought

just a few minutes ago. And it is interesting to listen to my

colleagues talk about defending the troops and saving lives. But if

they would have read the resolution that we had before us just a few

minutes ago, although I am not challenging the conscience of those who

express themselves, this is where we should do it. That is why we have

a democracy.

But it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that just a few minutes ago we

voted not to support those troops who have their lives on the line, who

engage in the military air strikes, just as our Senate colleagues voted

a couple of weeks ago to say we support their efforts in bringing about

peace, in bringing about a resolution in fighting for the refuges.

I am not sure what we thought we were doing, but the message that

goes out to those who have to leave right now and engage in war and

conflict on behalf of the freedom of those of us here in the United

States and of those refugees being murdered and raped is that we are

not in support of their efforts.

I hope that we will not say to the POWs we do not want them home. I

hope that we will correct this mistake that we have made. But most of

all, I hope the clear message will be that we, as Americans, stand

united behind freedom, behind justice, and behind the safe return of

the refugees and the POWs.