

not designed to. There is no incentive for people to work hard so many do not. There is no incentive for people to save money so much of it is squandered."

How true this statement was and is. This is why it has been proven over and over and over again all over this world that the more money that can be left in the private sector, the better off everyone is; the lower prices are, the more jobs that are created, the better the economy is.

Competitive pressures force the private sector to spend money wisely, to spend it in economical, efficient, conservative, productive ways. Private companies do not have the luxury the government has of being able to waste billions with almost no meaningful repercussions.

The Air Force should publicly apologize for dropping this \$3 billion down this Titan IV rat hole. The Congress should be assured that nothing like this will ever happen again.

It is really sad, Mr. Speaker, to take \$3 billion from the families and children of this country, many of whom are barely getting by, to give to highly paid bureaucrats and Air Force officers to just blow in this way. What would be even sadder would be if the Air Force and everyone associated with these failures is not deeply embarrassed and ashamed.

CRISIS IN KOSOVO

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, last week we had a historic symbolic vote on the war. This House voted against ground troops. We also voted against, in a tie vote, a resolution to support the air war. This week we have the real vote. Are we going to fund the war? Are we just talk or are we going to actually cut off the funds for the war?

There are three goals that have consistently been stated by NATO and by our government. One is to degrade the military forces or sufficiently degrade the military forces of the Yugoslav government so that we can move hundreds of thousands of refugees back, and then manage it with a peacekeeping force. I would put forth that anybody who has listened to any of the military briefings we have had, who have listened to the public reports, understand fundamentally that this is an unachievable goal. Milosevic understands that. When are the American people going to be told the truth, that our fundamental goals are unachievable?

First off, the military has been saying all the way along, this cannot be accomplished just by an air war. They are hopeful that they can bring him to the table, but what do they mean when

they say this cannot be accomplished just by an air war?

He has dug in, he is fighting in mountainous terrain, he has supplies that are going to last him an extended period of time, and we read just last week that our military says that after 30 days of bombing, we have a net degradation of his military forces of zero. That does not mean that we have not impacted his long-term ability to wage war, we have blown up a lot of factories so he cannot reproduce, we have reduced some of the supply of gasoline into the country but he only needs 10 percent and they are saying currently that 75 percent of their oil supplies are still there, we have only degraded 25. Three weeks ago they told us we had degraded 35, 2 weeks ago 30, now it is 25. We are headed the wrong direction.

They say, well, that is because of bad weather. The Balkans, when you read history books, always has bad weather. Furthermore, mountains in this time of year always have bad weather. This was no surprise. The Apache helicopters were not designed to go in to take out tanks. They were designed to go in with American forces on the ground as support. We are going to lose a lot of pilots and not accomplish our goal if we are not careful with how we use Apache helicopters.

The American people need to understand the air war cannot solve the problem of getting the refugees back. The ground war cannot, either. A fundamental map, and you cannot see a lot of the details with this map but fundamentally you can tell one thing right away, there is lot of brown and yellow down here. This is Albania, this is Macedonia, and here is Kosovo.

Now, to force your way in there, you have to go through mountains of 8,000 feet. That is why the Ottoman Empire stopped when it came in here. That is why Hitler could not make it through this part. There is no way we can put ground troops in through Albania or Macedonia or come in through Thessaloniki because, A, they do not want us to go through there but, B, even if they wanted to and even if we rebuilt airports and even if we built more roads through the mountains, we are not going to dislodge him through the mountains. It does not work.

Our military understands. Any general who has ever looked at this understands that if you have a ground war, you are coming through the top where all this green area is. That is where invasions of the Balkans have always occurred. But now we are not just talking a few thousand troops, we are talking potentially 400,000 troops, potentially all or mostly American troops, a minimum, according to estimates, of 20,000 dead up to 50,000 dead, and having to fight our way through Belgrade and Yugoslavia.

The people need to understand this is not just a magic little war where we

are going to drop a few bombs and he is going to surrender. The truth needs to be told. Those who advocate a ground war and those who advocate an air war need to explain, it is not going to deliver. The only hope is to get him to the table. We have to have the courage. Before we pass a bill this week, if we do, we should first try to take the funds out. I will have a series of amendments and other Members will, too, to take the funds out to continue this war.

I know some people are concerned that the President is then going to blame Congress for having lost the war. I tried to explain, we did not lose the war. It was an ill-conceived war. We bluffed something that we cannot deliver. We saw this in Vietnam. We saw it with the Russians in Afghanistan. We cannot win this on the ground or in the air alone without multiple years and destruction beyond imagination, and then we are still just bogged down.

The bottom line is this. If we give him \$12.9 billion, this current President, then he could potentially, without a lot of protection for this bill, divert it to the ground war without ever coming to Congress. This is not just the \$3.3 billion to continue the war. While our intent is to rebuild a military that he has devastated, our good intent could be used to fund a war, an expanded war where thousands of lives are lost, where the negotiated settlement in the end is just like the negotiated settlement we would have roughly had in the beginning.

If we get blamed this week because we stopped the funding and the President of the United States says the Republicans stopped the war, which would be untrue because it was an ill-conceived war in the first place, so what? If we saved American lives, that is what we are here to do, not to play politics.

At this point it is the job of this Congress to stand up and say, we know, both from the public statements and our private briefings that this cannot be accomplished. It is time to get to the table, because at most what we are arguing about is how to divide Kosovo at this point. It is not even clear in the end that we are going to have a better arrangement than we had in the beginning because now after all this bombing, after the Kosovars are legitimately upset about the slit throats, the massacres and so on, they want to be independent.

What are we going to tell the Palestinians when they want to be independent? And what are we going to tell the Kurds when they want to be independent? And what about the subsections of India? And what about the Chechnya area of Russia?

□ 2000

Are we going to intervene all over and, all of a sudden, have a new international policy because we got in a bad

war with an ill-conceived strategy? And if we continue this, and we continue to fight this and we continue to put the money in, we only dig ourselves deeper in more graves.

It is time for this Congress to stand up and say:

“Get to the table now. We’re not going to fund this war. It’s unwinnable. The settlement you are going to get now is probably as good a settlement as we’re going to get later, only with fewer Americans’ lives lost, with fewer dollars spent and with less international problems than if we settle it right now.”

WE ARE SPREADING OUR MILITARY TOO THIN

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, later this week we are going to be asked to take a very, very difficult vote, and it will involve how much should the Congress authorize to spend for this war in the Balkans, and as a previous speaker, my colleague from Indiana, just said, there are many of us, not only here in Congress but around the country, that have serious concerns about this war. What my colleague from Indiana did not mention is history, and there is an old expression, and I think it is from Montezuma, who said that those who refuse to learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

Mr. Speaker, let me give the Members a very important history lesson that the Germans learned in the 1940s, in World War II. In World War II the Germans sent 400,000 troops into the Balkans, they suffered 70,000 casualties, and at the end of the war they controlled less ground than the day that they marched in.

Mr. Speaker, this is a war that I think we need to think long and hard before we get even more deeply involved, but we had the debate last week on that, and we had our votes, we had a chance to vote. This week, though, we are going to get a chance to vote on whether or not we should fund the war; and then secondly, if the Republican leadership is successful in the Committee on Rules, whether or not we should vote for even more funding than the President requested.

I want to talk a little bit about history as well because we are continually told that we have spread our military too thin, and I agree with that. The truth of the matter is we have spread our military too thin, but I think the best analogy is an analogy of peanut butter and jelly. We have spread our peanut butter and jelly entirely too thin, but it is not because we are not giving our military enough money.

I want to talk a little bit about what is happening. We have been told, for ex-

ample, in the last several weeks that we are about 14,000 sailors short in terms of our Navy, but do my colleagues know what? We are not short a single admiral, we are not short any generals. In fact, as this chart indicates, in 1945 when we had 12.1 million Americans in uniform, we had 31 generals above the rank of four star. Today we have 1.3 million Americans in uniform, and we have 33 generals. So, we may be short on Army personnel, we may be short on people in the Navy, but we are certainly not short on generals.

Let me point out another chart, and this is really for the benefit of my Republican colleagues.

As my colleagues know, just 4 years ago we passed a 7-year balanced budget plan, and in that balanced budget plan we said that in Fiscal Year 1999, the year that we are in right now, we said that we would spend \$267 billion on defense. That is what we said we would spend this year. Well, according to the Congressional Budget Office, we actually will spend this year \$273 billion. So, in other words, we are already spending \$6 billion more on defense than we said we were going to be spending.

Now despite that we are being asked this week to fund an additional \$13 billion. Now I go back to my analogy of the peanut butter and jelly. It is not that we are not giving the military enough money or enough peanut butter and jelly, the problem is that we are spreading it far too thin. We currently have troops in 135 different countries. We are prepared to fight a war in Korea, we are prepared to fight a war in the desert, and now we are apparently going to have to fight a war in Kosovo. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, we are spreading ourselves too thin, and at some point we in the Congress have to say the problem is not that we do not give enough money to the Pentagon, the problem is that the administration wants to spread that money too thinly.

I simply want to ask my colleagues and the Members of the House a couple of very simple and straightforward questions, and frankly as it relates to defense policy, as it relates to foreign policy and ultimately as it relates to budget policy. We ought to get clear and simple answers to tough questions, and I would like to propose two questions to my colleagues in the House:

First of all, should we borrow from Social Security to pay for a war in Kosovo? My answer is no.

The second question is: Should defense spending get preferential treatment in the appropriations process, or should we give them a special appropriation now? And again my answer is no, and I think the numbers speak for themselves.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, we are going to be asked, Republicans and

Democrats alike: Is this such an important policy, is this such an important war, that we are going to take money out of the Social Security Trust Fund? I hope we will say no.

Now my proposal will be that we give the President exactly what he asked for. He is asking for \$6.05 billion in emergency supplemental appropriations, but I believe we ought to offset that with spending cuts in other parts of the government, and that can be done. In fact, if we do that, it means that every other department will have to cut its appropriations in the next several months by about 1 percent.

Now that is a big cut, but we are talking about a \$6 billion cut out of a \$1,700 billion budget. I think we can tighten those belts, and that will mean that we will not be stealing money from Social Security.

It was only a couple of weeks ago that we here on the House floor said we are going to pass a budget for the first time in American history or for the first time in recent history that actually balances the budget, and for the first time saying that every penny of Social Security taxes will go only for Social Security. That was just a few weeks ago. Well, I meant it when I said it then, and I think most of my colleagues meant it, and I think we ought to make the tough choice when we have to vote on this emergency supplemental where we will already be spending more money than we said we were going to spend just a few years ago in defense. I am willing to give defense the extra money the President has requested, but I think it ought to come out of other parts of the budget.

CENSUS 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to point out that the experts support the use of scientific methods to correct the census for undercounts and overcounts. Yesterday the National Academy of Sciences released the first report from the fourth panel to review the Census Bureau’s plans for the 2000 census. Yet again, the experts convened by the Academy endorsed the Census Bureau’s plan to use science to evaluate and correct the census counts.

At the end of 1998 the Census Bureau asked the National Academy of Sciences to convene a fourth panel to evaluate the Census Bureau’s design for Census 2000. This independent panel, like the three that preceded it, has unequivocally stated that statistical methods work. The Academy panel stated yesterday that the design of the quality control survey represents, and I quote from the panel, “good, current practice.” In fact, the panel explained, and I quote: