Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from

Texas (Mr. Reyes) for his comment. I compliment him on his words here

in the well.

If the gentleman swings by my office, he will see hanging in my

office as he leaves, and I look at it almost every day, the father who

lost his son who bled to death in Somalia cut the Ranger patch off his

son's uniform and sent it to me. It is on the wall in my office. It is

a constant reminder about the pain.

If America is going to send our sons and daughters into a theater

war, then they need to thoroughly understand what they are fighting

for, what are the vital national security interests, what is at stake.

I compliment the gentleman's words.

We are hearing some rhetoric on the floor about genocide, ethnic

cleansing. Mr. Speaker, since when has that been a cause for U.S.

intervention throughout the world?

I will not stand for the United States to have a racist foreign

policy. Since when do we have a preference of ethnicity? Are we

Europhiles, that we somehow want to go on the ground in Europe, but

will not do so in Africa or Asia or Indonesia or in other countries?

Let us be very wise, prudent, and cautious about the words we use

here today and about our foreign policies. Let us be the advisers and

counsel to the President to make proper judgments. The reason American

is confused is that the political rhetoric does not match NATO's

political objectives, which does not match the military use of force.

If we say that Milosevic is a Hitler and Stalin and he has no right

to lead that country, it appears as though that is our political

objective, and therefore the use of military force is to overthrow

Milosevic. That is not true. NATO's political objective is Kosovo and

Kosovo only. So we should restrict our rhetoric, be careful for our

words.

Then the ultimate question is, through the use of air power, does

that accomplish the political objectives? That is why, when I returned,

I said we have to return for the ground function. That does not mean I

support troops on the ground.

Mr. Speaker, what I advise my counsel, I will vote this way today. I

do not agree with the War Powers Act. I will vote no on House Joint

Resolution 44, I will vote no on H. Con. Res. 82, I will vote yes for

the Fowler amendment, because I want the President to define the end

state, what does he want it to look like, how does he define success,

before we go on the ground.

With regard to Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, let us be up front,

this is a political vote. This is a cover vote for some Democrats here

who do not have the stomach. We have had over 10,500 sorties that have

already been flown. Now we are going to come in and have a vote to

authorize? The question is moot.