

are destabilized, Russia is being swept by anti-American jingoism, and U.S. troops may have to go marching into the big muddy. Such are the fruits of Utopian crusades for global democracy."

Mr. Speaker, several times over the last few days I have heard reports on national networks saying that Members of Congress were getting "antsy" about not committing ground troops to Kosovo. The implication is that all of the Members of Congress want ground troops in there immediately.

I believe it was a terrible mistake to start bombing in the first place, and it certainly would be compounding a huge error to place many thousands of ground troops in there now.

As many columnists have pointed out, the NATO bombings have made this situation much worse than it ever would have been if we had simply stayed out. The very liberal Washington Post Columnist, Richard Cohen, wrote, "I believe, though, that the NATO bombings have escalated and accelerated the process. For some Kosovars, NATO has made things worse."

Pat M. Holt, a foreign affairs expert writing in the Christian Science Monitor, wrote, "The first few days of bombing have led to more atrocities and to more refugees. It will be increasing the instability which the bombing was supposed to prevent."

Philip Kourevitch, writing in the April 12 New Yorker Magazine, said: "Yet so far the air war against Yugoslavia has accomplished exactly what the American-led alliance flew into combat to prevent: Our bombs unified the Serbs in Yugoslavia, as never before, behind the defiance of Milosevic; they spurred to a frenzy the 'cleansing' of Kosovo's ethnic Albanians by Milosevic's forces; they increased the likelihood of the conflict's spilling over into Yugoslavia's south-Balkan neighbors; and they hardened the hearts of much of the non-Western World against us—not least in Russia, where passionate anti-Americanism is increasing the prospects for the right-wing nationalists of the Communist Party to win control of the Kremlin and its nuclear arsenal in coming elections."

Many conservative analysts have been very critical. Thomas Sowell wrote: "Already our military actions are being justified by the argument that we are in there now and cannot pull out without a devastating loss of credibility and influence in NATO and around the world. In other words, we cannot get out because we have gotten in. That kind of argument will be heard more and more if we get in deeper."

"Is the Vietnam War so long ago that no one remembers? We eventually pulled out of Vietnam," Mr. Sowell wrote, "under humiliating conditions with a tarnished reputation around the world and with internal divisiveness and bitterness that took years to heal. Bad as this was, we could have pulled out earlier with no worse consequences and with thousands more Americans coming back alive."

Mr. Sowell asks, "Why are we in the Balkans in the first place? There seems to be no clear-cut answer."

William Hyland, a former editor of Foreign Affairs Magazine, writing in the Washington Post said, "The President has put the country in a virtually impossible position. We cannot escalate without grave risks. If the President and NATO truly want to halt ethnic cleansing,

then the alliance will have to put in a large ground force or, at a minimum, mount a credible threat to do so. A conventional war in the mountains of Albania and Kosovo will quickly degenerate into a quagmire. On the other hand, the United States and NATO cannot retreat without suffering a national and international humiliation. \* \* \* the only alternative is to revive international diplomacy."

Mr. Hyland is correct, but unfortunately I am afraid that ground troops in Kosovo would be much worse than a quagmire. Former Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleberger was quoted on a national network last week as saying that the Bush administration had closely analyzed the situation in the Balkans in the early 1990s and had decided it was a "swamp" into which we should not go.

NATO was established as a purely defensive organization, not an aggressor force. With the decreased threat from the former Soviet Union, was NATO simply searching for a mission? Were some national officials simply trying to prove that they are world statesmen or trying to leave a legacy?

The United States has done 68 percent of the bombing thus far. This whole episode, counting reconstruction and resettlement costs after we bring Milosevic down, will cost us many billions.

If there have to be ground troops, let the Europeans take the lead. Do not commit United States ground troops. Let the Europeans do something. The U.S. has done too much already. Humanitarian aid, yes; bombs and ground troops, no.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 1999]

#### THE MESS THEY'VE MADE

(By Patrick J. Buchanan)

Three weeks into Bill Clinton's Balkan adventure and America risks a debacle. The human rights crisis in Kosovo has exploded into a catastrophe. Slobodan Milosevic is being rallied around like some Serbian Churchill. Montenegro and Macedonia are destabilized; Russia is being swept by anti-American jingoism; and U.S. troops may have to go marching into the Big Muddy.

Such are the fruits of Utopian crusades for global democracy.

The great lesson of Vietnam was: Before you commit the army, commit the nation. Clinton and Madeleine Albright launched a war against Yugoslavia with the support of neither.

Yet this debacle is not their doing alone. It is a product of the hubris of a foreign policy elite that has for too long imbibed of its own moonshine about America being the "world's last superpower" and "indispensable nation." Even as we slashed our defenses to the smallest fraction of GDP since before Pearl Harbor, the rhetoric has remained triumphalist, and the commitments have kept on coming.

Responsibility must be shared by Congress, for Clinton's intent to launch this Balkan war was long apparent. Yet Congress failed either to authorize war or deny the president the right to attack.

With Milosevic still defying NATO, we are admonished that "failure is not an option." The United States must do "whatever is necessary to win." Otherwise, NATO's credibility will be destroyed.

But this is mindlessness. If the war was a folly to begin with, surely, the answer is to cut our losses and let the idiot-adventurers who urged the attack resign to write their memoirs, rather than send 100,000 U.S. troops crashing into the Balkans to save the faces and careers of our blundering strategists.

Only a fanatic redoubles his energy when he has lost sight of his goal.

After the Gallipoli disaster, Churchill went; after Suez, Eden went; after the Bay of Pigs, Allen Dulles departed the CIA. Surely, this is a wiser, more honorable, course than a ground war in Kosovo.

Moreover, Americans will not support "whatever is necessary to win." We are not going to turn Belgrade into Hamburg. As one recalls the horror at Nixon's "Christmas Bombing" that freed our POWs at a cost of 1,400 dead in Hanoi, all but surgical bombing is out.

And if we send in the troops, what do we "win"? The right to say that NATO defeated Serbia? The right to occupy Kosovo?

If, after we take Kosovo, the Serbs conduct a guerrilla war against our troops, and the KLA begins a war of liberation to kick NATO out, annex western Macedonia and unite with Tirana, our "victory" will have produced the very disaster we wish to avoid.

"It is unworthy of a great state to dispute over something that does not concern its own interests," and Bismarck, who called the entire Balkans "not worth the bones of a single Pomeranian grenadier." When did that peninsula become so critical to the United States that we would go to war over whose flag flew over Pristina?

"Arm the Kosovars!" urge other armchair strategists. But do we really want another Afghanistan—in the underbelly of Europe?

What a mess the interventionists have made of it. Because the NATO expansionists could not keep their hands off the alliance, they have shattered the myth of its invincibility and may have called into being a Moscow-Minsk-Beijing-Belgrade-Baghdad axis.

But maybe the foreign policy establishment needed a second Cold War, as anything is preferable to irrelevance.

Out of this disaster, what lessons may be learned?

First, America cannot police the planet on a defense budget of 3 percent of GDP. Our dearth of air-launched cruise missiles, the need to shift carriers from the gulf, the delay in deploying the Apaches, the calling up of the reserves—all point to a military that is dangerously inadequate to the global tasks we have added since the Cold War.

Unless America is prepared to restore Ronald Reagan's Army, Navy and Air Force, we cannot stop a rearmed Russia in East Europe, police the Balkans, roll back a second Iraqi attack on Kuwait, contain North Korea and prevent another of Beijing's bullying assaults on Taipei. Should one or two of these emergencies occur at once, we will be suddenly face to face with foreign policy bankruptcy.

America must retrench and rearm.

What the United States needs today in the Balkans is a least-bad peace, patrolled by Europeans, where Serbs rule Serbs, Croats Croats and Albanians Albanians. And if, in the negotiations to end this tragedy, Belgrade cries, "No American troops in Kosovo!" let us insist upon it, and bring our soldiers home from Europe, as Ike told JFK to do nearly 40 years ago.

□ 1700

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOLT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP ACT OF 1999, LEGISLATION AS SIGNIFICANT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AS THE HOMEOWNER'S MORTGAGE DEDUCTION

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting to Congress what I believe will be an historic piece of legislation. It is entitled The Employee Ownership Act of 1999. This legislation, I predict, will be as significant to the American people as the homeowner's mortgage deduction, which has ensured the widespread ownership of homes throughout the United States of America.

In fact, 60 percent of the American people own their own homes, and this can be traced to the fact that we have written our tax law in a way that encourages widespread ownership of housing and homes in the United States.

The goal of my bill is that after 10 years, 30 percent of all of America's major corporations will be owned and controlled by their own employees. Now, I know that sounds a bit radical. That sounds like a big change, but we have had a great deal of employee ownership expansion over these last 20 years.

This bill, under the guise of ESOPs, Employee Stock Ownership Plans, what I am proposing is an ESOP-plus idea that would increase employee ownership throughout this country.

This bill will bring about a new category of American business, the Employee Owned and Controlled Corporation, EOCC.

These new corporate structures would be modeled somewhat after United Airlines. As we know, the employees at United Airlines bought a controlling interest in their own corporation and now make many of the decisions that affect United Airlines and thus affect the employees.

In fact, the legislation I am proposing would establish an employee trust that when it owns 50 percent of the shares of a company will be entitled to substantial tax incentives that will encourage the growth of employee ownership and ensure the success of this new employee owned and controlled company.

Some of the tax incentives suggested by my legislation: Number one, if someone sells stock in a company to an employee trust or to the employee who is part of the trust, that person shall pay no capital gains on the sale of that stock. Thus, someone is given the incentive to sell the stock to an employee.

Employees who accept stock as part of their pay during the creation of an employee owned trust, that if they accept it in lieu of their pay, they will not have to pay income tax on that stock.

Of course, corporations have a right not to be a part of an employee trust

and there are many corporations who will not participate in this or employees who will not be part of this, but if, for example, an employer or anyone else who owns stock in a company, which is establishing an employee trust, if they sell their stock or, let us say, they give their stock to an employee trust as part of a bequeathal situation, where someone is leaving that in their will to the employee trust, then it decreases the inheritance liability on their estate by a one-to-one ratio.

So if someone left a million dollars in their will to an employee trust of stock in that company, well, then the inheritance liability to their heirs would be reduced by that one million dollars.

The goal of this, of course, is to expand employee ownership. In the end, if we have established these employee owned and controlled companies, they will, by my legislation, not pay corporate income tax. This will provide a major incentive for Wall Street to work with the working people of this country to empower them in a way that they will be able to control their own economic destiny as never before.

This would be the equivalent of the Homestead Act. Many people forget that the Republican Party was the party of the Homestead Act. In 1862 when Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, that same day he signed the Homestead Act, which opened up the idea of ownership of property to millions of people. It was essentially an important part of the American dream.

What we are trying to do now is expand upon that, expand on the home mortgage deduction, expand on the Homestead Act, expand on the idea that people have a right to own their own home but they also should have an incentive in the tax system to own and control their own company. Thus, they will control their own economic destiny. This is the ultimate empowerment. This will increase productivity. It will see that there are no strikes because people would be striking against themselves, their own company or at least they would be more willing to talk out problems within a company.

THE KOSOVO CONFLICT, NO END IN SIGHT

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to give some perspective on an issue that is, I think, very near and dear to every American's heart, as it is in Kosovo today also.

I would like to give the Speaker a little perspective. First of all, according to Henry Kissinger, and I agree, Rambouillet was a very poor foreign policy. It was an agreement only between Albania and the United States in which

the United States knew, in no uncertain terms, that Serbia would never give up Kosovo itself. Any history student would know that.

We have spent \$16 billion in Bosnia to date; Somalia cost us billions of dollars; Haiti cost us billions; \$4 billion times the four strikes in Iraq, the Sudan, Afghanistan. Our troops are deploying 300 percent above the highest level in Vietnam but yet we are doing it with about half the force. Enlisted retention in our own military is below 23 percent; pilots, 30 percent.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff said we are \$150 billion short. We cannot buy spare parts. We do not even have basic bullets. Top gun, 14 of 23 aircraft are down; 18 for engines; 137, parts.

Kosovo, and this is according to General Clark, I was with General Clark just days ago and I said I want to know how many sorties the United States is flying. Mr. Speaker, General Clark said, and this is accurate to the sortie, 75 percent of all strikes in Kosovo are being flown by the United States. That does not include the B-2s, the tankers, the support aircraft like C-17s and C-130s. That brings it up to 82 percent.

We are dropping 90 percent of all the weapons, so we are paying for over 90 percent. That does not even include our ships. That does not include our manpower over there. My point is that it should be the other way around.

The reason given by General Clark is that other nations do not have the stand-off capability that we do so we are having to fly 90 percent of this stuff, 82 percent of it and 90 percent of the ordnance.

My point is that the supplemental that we are going to ask for, if NATO is a fair share organization, then NATO ought to pay the United States between \$10 and \$20 billion for our supplemental and not come out of our taxpayers' dollars.

Let me give you another perspective. Before the bombing in Kosovo, there were only 2,000 deaths. Each death is important, but in perspective there were only 2,000 deaths attributed in Kosovo that whole year. One-third were Serbs and other nationalities besides the Albanians, but after the bombing look at the number of deaths. We have just killed 70 Albanians in a convoy trying to get out of Kosovo. NATO has killed 70 Albanians in an air strike. Look at the million refugees that these air strikes have caused that would not be there unless we had bombed Kosovo.

The Croatians executed 10,000 Serbs in 1995 in Croatia. They deported and fled over 250,000 Serbs as refugees. Indonesia has killed millions; Turkey, thousands; India with the Sikhs; China, thousands with Tibet. Yet, we are in a mass war where there is less than 2,000 deaths, and over a third of those by the people we are claiming to bomb.

The Pentagon, confirmed by Secretary Cohen, that the Pentagon did not want to execute just air strikes. The Pentagon told the President that