

LESSONS FROM THE HISTORY OF
AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, you know, we are a young Nation, and our focus is forward with only an occasional glance back at the lessons of Athens or Rome or even the lessons of the dust bowl in this country.

But this House is soon going to consider an important issue that requires a deeper look back so we can better plan ahead.

We will soon consider a farm bill that warrants an examination of the history of agriculture and a study of the lessons learned. There is a lineage between the modern American farmer and the ancient Sumerian who worked the land between the Tigris and the Euphrates. It is an equality of importance. Both were responsible, indeed farmers throughout history have been responsible for their countries' civilizations.

It has been said that in the last reckoning, all things are purchased with food. This was true with the cradle of civilization, and it holds true now. Today, American agriculture is this country's largest industry. Agriculture accounts for a full 16 percent of our current gross domestic product, \$355 billion worth of food and fiber were produced this past year. That is more than any other industry.

And so it is especially critical that we learn the lessons taught by the successes and failures of the past. History is awash with the remains of societies that failed their farmers and ultimately failed to maintain their soil and who let it succumb to erosion and certainly that resulted in a fall of their civilization.

Cities like ancient Babylon, 2,600 years ago, developed a productive agriculture. It allowed their civilization to grow to 17 million people and a remarkably diversified society. King Nebuchadnezzar boasted, "That which no king has done before, I did. Great canals I dug and brought abundant waters to all the people." But agriculture and farmers became a lesser priority in that country, and ultimately failed.

Today, the site of Babylon is desolation, a dry land, and the promised land 3,000 years after Moses, he called it the land of milk and honey, now barren and rugged, the victim of soil erosion. Only dregs of fertile soil remain at the bottoms of narrow valleys.

But there are also successes. Societies with plans maintaining farmers and maintaining agriculture survived and flourished. For the last 1,000 years, farmers in the French Alps have terraced hillsides dramatically in an effort to prevent soil loss, resulting in continuously fertile soil, fertile agriculture and abundant production.

Essentially, countries that practice a careful stewardship of the Earth's resources through terracing, crop rota-

tion and other sound conservation measures have flourished for centuries, Dr. W.C. Lowdermilk, of the Soil Conservation Service, reported in 1953. Forty-two years have not changed that.

In the U.S. Congress we are now engaged in a great agricultural debate. We are deciding what proper role the Federal Government has in Federal agricultural policy.

It is important that the American people understand that agricultural programs have been designed to encourage a continuous, but slight, overproduction. Farm prices have been kept low.

Most farmers over the past 50 years have experienced subsistence standards of living, mostly because of the agricultural farm programs.

A goal of those programs has been to keep enough farmers and ranchers producing so that an abundant supply would result in not only lower food and fiber prices in this country, but huge exports of commodities that has eventually assisted in our balance of trade.

For 60 years, we have enticed farmers to become more and more dependent on Government subsidy programs. As we move to a more market-oriented farm policy, it is important that we do it gradually and we do it smartly to make sure we do not endanger this productive and efficient industry of American agriculture.

American consumers now spend 9.5 percent of their take-home dollars for food. With that 9.5 percent they are able to buy the best-quality, lowest-priced food anywhere in the world.

In our haste, we cannot jeopardize the survival of American agriculture or the economic strength of our country.

HONORING ST. LOUIS CITY HALL
EMPLOYEES FOR THEIR EFFORTS
ON BEHALF OF VICTIMS'
FAMILIES OF OKLAHOMA CITY
TRAGEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor St. Louis City Hall employees for their efforts on behalf of the victims and families of the Oklahoma City tragedy. The Recorder of Deeds, Sharon Quigley Carpenter, and her staff organized a fund-raiser in conjunction with other departments in City Hall and raised a total of \$3,415.50. In addition, city hall employees sent a sympathy card to Oklahoma City signed by hundreds of people who either worked or came into City Hall on business.

The initiative taken by the employees at St. Louis City Hall demonstrates their caring spirit. It is a model of action stimulated by compassion and empathy. I want to salute these employees for their selfless and generous contributions to the victims of Oklahoma City.

STATE OF EMERGENCY IN
GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

12, 1996, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 1 hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, there is a state of emergency with respect to decisionmaking right here in this capital right now, and there are large numbers who do not recognize the fact that there is a state of emergency.

We are faced with an unprecedented situation. Government is about to make a dramatic change, and most people, most groups who are going to be victimized by this dramatic change, do not quite seem to understand that there is no miracle in the offing, nothing will save us from the kind of decisionmaking that is taking place now which will result in some devastating cuts in program that benefit large numbers of the American people.

There is a state of emergency, and we should understand that there is a state of emergency. Those who do not understand that we are caught up in extremism, driven by the radical right, public policy is being driven toward a dangerous cliff. We are going to go over that cliff if we do not summon our forces and begin to fight back and understand the kind of problem we face.

To approach extremism and to try to combat extremism with moderation is to guarantee defeat. We must summon up the same kind of intensity that is being summoned against us. We must defend ourselves with the same kind of intensity.

Let us take a look at the budget making process that is now begun. We have already passed the House of Representatives budget. The ruling majority, the Republicans, have passed a budget already. The Senate has passed a budget, and the Senate and House budgets do not differ dramatically. There are draconian cuts in both budgets.

Granted, the Senate's wisdom seems to be to move much slower than the House budget, and that is under negotiation now, the House budget versus the Senate budget, two Republican majorities negotiating with each other.

But there is extremism in both. Never before in the history of the country, this Nation has never seen before such drastic changes being pushed over such a short period of time.

There is a document that was issued by the Republican majority in the House called "Cutting Government," and I have it in my hand. Cutting Government was issued, and it is an indication of what was passed in the Republican majority's budget in the House of Representatives. Cutting Government summarizes extreme changes that are being proposed, extreme, and the sooner we all understand it, the better we will be able to marshal some kind of appropriate defense.

Let me just read the first paragraph of the Cutting Government document. It reads as follows: "The House committee on the budget proposes to terminate, block grant or privatize three Cabinet departments, 284 programs, 69

commissions, 13 agencies, and privatize three commercial activities in our 1996 budget resolution."

That is the opening statement of the document, *Cutting Government*, from the Republican majority in the House of Representatives.

□ 1915

Unprecedented. Where else in the history of the Nation have we seen a Congress propose such drastic, reckless changes in such a short period of time, to cut 284 programs, to eliminate three Cabinet departments? Sixty-nine commissions are to be eliminated, 13 agencies to be eliminated, all in a 2-year period—really it is 1 year because a budget is a 1-year document. It is hoped that once they accomplish this, you know, that this is the worst possible scenario, that next year there would not be another budget which will make additional draconian cuts. I do not know what else there will be left to cut in such an extreme matter. They have set out a pattern which I assume will be followed next year, and I assume the pattern will be followed for the next 7 years because there is a 7-year budget that has been proposed. These are extreme measures, you know.

They do not like to hear the word "extreme" around here. They do not like to have recognized exactly what is happening. These extreme measures are camouflaged under talk that makes it appear that this is all a matter of fiscal responsibility, that we are going to save the Government from bankruptcy. These extreme measures will hurt a great deal. They will hurt people in my district; they will hurt people right across the country.

These are extreme measures and represent war being declared on certain categories of people in our society. They do not like to hear class warfare. The Republicans are quick to respond to any notion of an attack on the working class. This is an attack on the working poor, it is an attack on the working middle class, it is an attack on people who are not working and poor. That is class warfare; it is clearly an attack.

You know, it is a blitzkrieg; that is a German word related to World War II that nobody wants to hear either. I am not implying that the Republicans are Fascists or Nazis. It is a figure of speech that I use when I say that they have launched a blitzkrieg because of the rapidity with which they are moving, and the destructive nature, the all-encompassing destructive nature, of the budget process that has been launched by the Republicans: 284 programs to be eliminated, 3 Cabinet departments to be eliminated, 69 commissions to be eliminated, 13 agencies to be eliminated; if this is not a blitzkrieg, then what is a blitzkrieg? You know, if this is not devastation that goes deep and is quite thorough, and to do it all within one budget over a 2-year period, 7 year period, to move that rapidly; if that is not a blitzkrieg, if

that figure of speech is not appropriate, I do not know what figure of speech would be appropriate.

On the other hand there are people who say we should not use such harsh language, that we are overdoing it when we talk about the fact that we are faced with an unprecedented situation in our history. We should respond in a more genteel terms. We should be civil in the face of uncivil actions that are uncivilly perpetrated against us. We should ignore the Speaker of the House when the Speaker of the House states that politics is war without blood.

The Speaker of the House says politics is war without blood. He has proceeded to set a tone in the House which runs parallel to that statement. It has been pretty clear that we have been pursuing business here in a manner which very much resembles war. War requires enemies. War requires losers. I do not think that we define what happens here in the Congress, or here in Washington in the past, as being war without blood. We have defined it as being a contest between two responsible parties. Whether they agree or not, at least we did not consider that there must be ultimate losers, casualties. We did not put it in terms that made it appear that, you know, the Nation is going to suffer, a large segment is going to suffer, as a result of one group trampling over another.

I said before we have been engaged in what I would consider to be a noble contest between two political parties. The contest is to determine who can provide the best possible government or what compromise will result—will result because you have two competing parties who both have the goal of improving the Government, of promoting the general welfare, of establishing an environment where people can pursue happiness in the easiest possible way with the least amount of impediments.

I assume that a noble contest is what we were talking about, and the tone of our deliberations in the House and the tone of the deliberation of the Government in Washington are affected by the fact that many of the leaders in the past have considered us to be engaged in a noble contest to determine how best we can improve our Government to keep the great American experiment going forward and getting better all the time. But Speaker GINGRICH has defined what is happening here as war without blood, and the attack launched by the budget process is a blitzkrieg, it is a war, it is scorched-earth warfare when you eliminate three Cabinet departments, you eliminate 284 programs, you eliminate 69 commissions, 13 agencies, and you privatize three major commercial activities all in a very short period of time. That is war, and, if we do not recognize, if the opposition, the Democrats, loyal opposition, does not recognize it, then they are doomed to failure.

The great majority of the American people are going to be impacted, and

the majority will be hurt, an elite group in the minority will benefit greatly from this blitzkrieg. They will be the winners. The majority of Americans will be hurt. They are going to be hurt, and we are going to have to hide our heads in shame if we do not offer a better defense.

We may lose; after all, the Republicans have the numbers in the Senate, they have the numbers they need in the House of Representatives. We may lose, but at least we ought to rally ourselves and not fool ourselves about what we are confronted with and make an appropriate response.

You know, to take another analogy from World War II, my father, who gave me the name "Major," so you know he must have been interested in war and soldiering a great deal; he followed events in World War II very closely in the newspaper and magazines. He only had an eighth-grade education, so he did not read scholarly journals, but I think he was as smart as anybody I ever met. He followed it very closely, and he explained to me at one point the tragedy of the blitzkrieg launched by Hitler against Poland and how they had these Panzer tanks. Hitler and his army mechanized, modernized, moving toward Warsaw, and the Polish sent the cavalry out to meet him. Poland sent men on horses, beautifully trained horses, beautifully trained riders, the old glory of the aristocracy riding with him. They sent horses out to meet tanks, and that is the danger that I see developing here, is that we are allowing ourselves to be lulled to sleep by some kind of gas or some kind of noxious fumes. Something is affecting us in ways which are inexplicable. We do not understand what we are up against. We are ready to send beautiful horses out to meet tanks, murderous tanks.

On the one hand we say, well, you have the Republicans propose this reckless budget, extreme budget. They cannot get away with that. But the Republicans in the House control the votes, have enough votes to do it. The Republicans in the Senate have enough votes to do it. That is on the one hand.

On the other hand you say, well, you got a Democratic President. A Democratic President will not let him get away with that, but recently the Democratic President says that he is in favor of moving in the same direction, not just moving toward a balanced budget, and wisely so. He makes a difference, that we will do it in 10 years, but the only difference that he proposes, that the cuts be a little less drastic, that the blitzkrieg be joined, not opposed, you know.

That is on the one hand, the other hand, and you know there is just no other hand if the President, the Democrat who has the power to veto—all expecting the veto of the President to put a check on extremism; the veto of the President will slow down this blitzkrieg. The veto of the President will

force a halt to the rapid movement toward the cliff, the dangerous cliff that our public policy is moving toward. The veto of the President would make it necessary to negotiate. There will be no unconditional surrender, but a negotiation which would at least preserve some of what is under attack here.

But the President has said that he will join the rapid movement, and the only difference is he wants to slow it down or he wants to spread it out. That is the only difference. The President wants to balance the budget, and he refuses to talk about the one item that we know one could use to balance the budget in 7 years or in 10 years. You could balance the budget; we have proven that. The Congressional Black Caucus budget, which was introduced here on the floor here, said, if you insist on balancing the budget, we think it is very unwise to try and do it in 7 years, but whether you do it in 7 or 10 years, the way to balance the budget without forcing the draconian cuts in Medicare, the draconian cuts in Medicaid, the terrible cuts in education, without cutting the throat of the effort to improve education, which is so vital to our society, without those drastic moves you could still balance the budget if you would raise the percentage of the tax burden which is borne by the corporations. You could raise the percentage of the tax burden borne by the corporations, and there would be very little pain out there because the corporations are making tremendous amounts of money in our society at this point. Our economy is booming. Part of our economy is booming. The Wall Street economy where investments are made and the profits of corporations are up; that side of the economy is booming.

There is another side of the economy, or another economy totally at this point which I call the job economy which has no relationship between the—there is no relationship between the booming Wall Street economy and the job economy. The job economy is suffering from less and less unemployment in certain places is quite high. Underemployment is rampant all over the country. People are working for less. When they have the good fortune to find a job and have a job, they are working for less, even in the ranks of middle management. They are working for much less. The downsizing, the streamlining, has driven down the quality of life and the standard of living of large numbers of middle-class people who seemed quite safe before in our economy. The very industries which would drive the need for people in an information economy, an information-driven economy, that industry is automating so fast, streamlining its communications technologies and its computerization that large numbers of employees who were needed before are not needed now, or they can take portions of their operations overseas for cheaper and cheaper labor, and the cheap labor is not necessarily only the

children in Bangladesh who make sneakers and who are forced to work long hours. Cheap labor sometimes are computer specialists, people who are programming computers in India and who are college graduates or from Eastern Europe who are college graduates, and they work for half of what the computer specialists or the computer programmers would make here in this country.

So there are many ways in which our industries, American industries, can earn huge profits without improving the job situation. So we need a program to correct that. We need to deal with how Americans are going to protect their standard of living the way the Japanese protect their standard of living, the way the Germans protect their standard of living. We need a program.

□ 1930

Before we get to a comprehensive program to do that, one obvious step we should take is to take advantage of the fact that our corporations are making a lot of money. The profits are up very high, and yet they are paying less of a tax burden than families and individuals.

In 1943, and I have a chart here which shows this, the Congressional Budget Office uses the same statistics. I think this chart came out of one of their documents, the Office of Management and Budget, nobody disputes the fact that these are facts. In 1943, 39.8 percent, of the tax burden, the revenue that runs our Government, came from corporations, corporate income taxes. In 1943, 39.8 percent almost 40 percent. At the same time, in 1943, 27 percent of the tax burden, the revenues that run the country, came from individuals and families.

I have repeated these facts several times here in this Chamber. You cannot repeat it too much, because at some time the American people have to wake up; at some time they have to realize they have a good reason to be angry. At some point they have to know where to direct their anger appropriately. The anger should be directed at the sellout that has taken place in this Congress, in this city, Washington, since 1943. The tax burden that is borne by the corporations dropped all the way from 39.8 percent, almost 40 percent, to 8 percent in 1982, 8 percent. It went all the way down from 40 percent to 8 percent in 1982.

Now, how did that happen, while at the same time the individual share of the tax burden went from 27 percent in 1943 to 48 percent in 1982? And in 1995 we are looking at a situation where the individual taxes, individual and family income taxes, are still at 43.7 percent in terms of the total amount of revenue raised to run the country, while the corporate share is down still, not quite as low as it was under Ronald Reagan in 1982, not at 8 percent, but it is at 11 percent. Eleven percent.

Now, if you want to balance the budget, then I was waiting for the

President to say, "Let's balance the budget by closing the corporate loopholes, by getting rid of the corporate welfare, by restoring a balance in the tax burden. Let's do it over 8 years." You could balance the budget and meet that need, if we consider that to be such a great need, without cutting Medicare 1 cent, without cutting Medicaid.

Medicare and Medicaid should go back to where Hillary Clinton placed them. In her health plan we were going to make cuts in health care, but we were going to make them in the context of a plan which would provide better health care for all Americans, and, most of all, would cover all Americans. Within the context of that kind of plan, we were also going to be able to slow the rate of the rise in the cost of health care, which is what is being talked about now. The cuts being proposed now are being proposed without any discussion of providing health care to all Americans who are uncovered, or without any discussion of how health care can be improved.

What am I talking about? I am saying that on the one hand, the Republicans in the House and the Senate propose to recklessly balance the budget by making cuts that are going to make large numbers of Americans suffer, by making cuts that are going to leave a mark on our infrastructure, our social infrastructure as well as our physical infrastructure, that will make it very difficult to overcome in future years. All of this is being done very rapidly, and nothing seems to be in place to stop it. The Republicans are moving rapidly, and the President now has joined the flow in the same direction, instead of being the opposition force, the one remaining opposition force we could rely on, the veto of the President.

I projected on the floor of the House a few weeks ago that we would have a situation where the President would stand between the American majority, the caring majority of Americans who are going to be hurt by these cuts, he would stand between them and the Republican blitzkrieg, and force the issue by vetoing the appropriations bill. He cannot veto the budget. That will be decided in the next few days probably by the House and Senate, and the budget will be there. But the budget only sets the upper limits as to how each Committee on Appropriations can operate.

The appropriations bills, one by one, go to the President. The President can veto them. The power to override the vetoes does not reside in either House, I do not believe. The Senate could override the vetoes and the House could not. The Democrats have enough coherence, unity, enough strength left to be able to assist the President in the veto process.

Then negotiations would be forced. You have to have negotiations. We all remember the famous negotiations at the White House when we had gridlock

with George Bush. George Bush, facing a democratically controlled House of Representatives and Senate, they had to negotiate a settlement. Each side had to give and take, and you had a balance coming out that nobody was really that happy with, but at least it did not wreck the country overnight. It was not extremism of the kind we are faced with here.

So if we do not have the hope that the President will stand against the blitzkrieg of the Republicans, then what do we have? All we have left is a possibility that the American people can be mobilized and public opinion can be so focused and so determined and communicated in such a forceful way that the President will wake up and change his course.

Our hope is we can have the executive branch of Government stand firm against these draconian, disastrous cuts that will drive our Nation over the cliff into an abyss that will be very difficult to get out of.

Let me just go into a little more detail, because people still do not believe that we are in a crisis. Nobody seems to understand what is in plain English. This is not so subtle. There is nothing hidden. It is all quite out in the open. There is no conspiracy. Republicans cannot be accused of a conspiracy. It is right out there in the open. Everybody has a copy of this list, "Cutting Government."

Departments to be eliminated: The Department of Commerce, the Department of Education, the Department of Energy. They are to be eliminated. That is the Republican proposal. I understand the Senate only proposes to eliminate the Department of Commerce. We can be hopeful in the negotiations between the Senate and the House that we are going to save, if not all three of these departments, at least two of them.

But that is a fact now. It is a very hard fact. One-half of the legislative process, one-half of the legislative branch of Government, is on record already to want to eliminate the Department of Commerce, the Department of Education, and the Department of Energy.

They want to eliminate 13 agencies. I invite anybody who wants to go along with me to take out a pencil and write it down. If you do not have the list, I will give it all to you in detail. Details sometimes are very important. Maybe the details will awaken the American people to the fact we have a crisis. We have a state of emergency in decision making.

The decisions that are going to be made in the next few months in Washington are going to leave us in a situation that will create massive amounts of pain and suffering. The decisions that are made are going to be very difficult to undo in the next few years. Something must be done to rally the American people, the public opinion, and communicate that to the executive branch, that they have to stand against

this blitzkrieg that is going to make for so much pain and suffering.

Agencies eliminated, 13. The Economic Development Administration, the Travel and Tourism Administration, International Trade Administration, Minority Business Development Administration, Maritime Administration, Federal Transit Administration, Agency for Health Care Policy Research, Corporation for National and Community Service, which was created by the National Community Service Act just 2 years ago, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting will be phased out over 3 years, Administrative Conference of United States, Legal Services Corporation, which has provided legal services for poor people since Lyndon Johnson created the Legal Services Program during the Great Society years in the 1960's. That is going to be wiped out completely, eliminated like all the other agencies that I have just named. The State Justice Institute, the Office of Technology Assessment. All eliminated.

Maybe this is too high up for most of you who are listening. You cannot comprehend what it means, because these are big agencies still. They are pretty big. Maybe you want to go to another level and let's talk about the 284 programs to be eliminated. The Housing Investment Guarantee Program, USDA's Strategic Space Plan, FMF, loans to Greece and Turkey, assistance to Eastern Europe and Russia, East-West Center, North-South Center, Office of the American Workplace, the SBA Tree Planting Program, DOT's Minority Resource Development Program, highway demonstration projects, mass transit operating assistance, Air Traffic Control Revitalization Act.

There is an article today on the front page of one of the magazines that asks is the Government doing all they can to protect us in the sky when we are flying? Their answer is no, the Government is not. We are going to eliminate a portion of the effort to make it safer for us to travel by air.

The National Highway Institute, the Office of Physical Fitness and Sports. Under Ronald Reagan I think we had a fitness program that was launched that has been quoted over and over again as having reaped great gains in terms of improvements in health and the movement in the direction which would lessen the cost of health care by having a more fit population.

There is an assumption that any small program, because it is small, is undesirable. Some of the programs I am reading here are small, and they are deemed to be automatically undesirable and unproductive because they are small. There is nothing rational about that. That is totally irrational.

I do not say that some of this reasoning does not come from the administration. The White House, the executive branch, started looking at everything small and deciding that we would consolidate. But every time they consolidate by bringing them together, one of

fice under one umbrella, they would eliminate some of the funding, which means that consolidation was really a way to cut out some of the programs.

It is like saying that fingers on your hand are undesirable and no good, unproductive, because they are smaller than the hand. We would be better off if we had just one lump here, consolidation. Let's consolidate all this stuff, and you have it all in one lump, and that is a great improvement automatically.

Well, the animals on the earth that do not have the kind of finger separation and these smaller items here are not able to compete at all with the manual dexterity of the species homo sapiens. God knew what he was doing, and can we not follow the example? We make the assumption because the fingers are smaller than the hand, we would rather consolidate it in order to improve it. Many of these small programs are far more effective and far more beneficial than large programs. The cost benefits ratio for what we pay for these small programs as taxpayers, we get a far greater benefit out of them than you get from some of the better known, larger programs that are being protected, of course.

The VISTA Program, volunteers in this country, originally created to sort of parallel the Peace Corps, where you would have volunteers in this country. Senior Volunteer Corps, Retired Senior Volunteer Corps, the Foster Grandparent Program, Senior Companion Program, Senior Demonstration Program, these programs are being eliminated because they are very small. They are very tiny, but they are very beneficial and nobody ever argues at any hearing or markup that the programs do not work.

□ 1945

They just are small, and they are going to be eliminated because they happen to be too small.

Goals 2000, State and local education programs. Goals 2000 national programs, Goals 2000, parental assistance, small efforts in the Department of Education that represent a great deal of time, energy, brainpower, devotion, patience, Goals 2000 resulted from a long effort that began under Ronald Reagan when he commissioned a group to study the state of American education, public education. They came back with a report entitled "A Nation at Risk." "A Nation at Risk" said that we are at risk in the modern world of not being able to compete globally with our competitors in trade, not being able to in technology or the use of technology match our competitors and produce the kind of products, the quality of products at the cost level necessary to be able to maintain our leadership in the world.

Goals 2000 is a result of a long process begun then. First, "A Nation at Risk" report was issued by Ronald Reagan, and then George Bush came along and issued a position statement

called American 2000. President Bush called a summit of Governors in Virginia, and the Governors decided to establish a six-point program, six goals for education. These are very, very energetic, knowledgeable people who participated in this process. More important than anything else, they were elected by the American people. They participated in the process together.

It was not to the credit of President Bush, it was not the White House handing down something from Olympia and expecting all the States to comply. There was instead a participation of all existing Governors, including Governor Bill Clinton. So when Governor Bill Clinton became President, he was in a position to follow through. There was continuity from a Republican President to a Democratic President on the all-important matter of education.

Yes, the emphasis was different in terms of the great emphasis on vouchers and privatization of education that was written into the American 2000 program by President Bush and Secretary Alexander. That emphasis was not there in Goals 2000. But much of what was in America 2000 under George Bush was retained in Goals 2000, especially the standard setting.

There was agreement, Republican and Democrats all Governors, that you need to have some standards set. You need to have standards set with respect to the kind of curriculum, the quality of curriculum, the purpose and goals of curriculum. You need to have standards set in terms of how you were going to assess the performance of students, and they did not decide this among the Governors but in the Education and Labor Committee. We introduced a third set of standards called opportunity to learn standards that in addition to standards for curriculum and standards for the assessment of the performance of students, tests, there also should be standards for opportunity to learn, all the young people in the States given an opportunity to learn.

All of these standards were set and would be voluntary. No State would have to do anything. The State has an option. The State would not have to accept the standards. The State would not have to accept standards for curriculum, standards for opportunity to learn. It is all voluntary, but even that, by the way, has been quite successful.

There has been a national math curriculum issue, a national arts curriculum issue. The curriculum standards have moved forward. There is a national history curriculum in the works now, a lot of controversy about it, but it is moving forward. And for the first time the effort to improve American schools is on a systematic upward, forward, progressive path. But now we are going to eliminate that effort. The heart of the effort will be eliminated in this budget that eliminates 284 programs.

Education is a particular target. If you recall, when I read the names of the departments to be eliminated, education was one of the departments, one of the three departments proposed by the Republicans in the House to be eliminated. That alone, when a civilized nation in 1995, given where the world is, how complicated it is, how competitive it is, when a civilized nation decides it wants to eliminate its Department of Education, then you have a state of emergency right there, even if it did no further damage.

If no other reckless proposals were made, that alone is enough for the American people to understand that something is seriously wrong here in Washington. How can any civilized nation say it does not want to provide some kind of direction and some kind of effort to influence the way education is undertaken in the whole nation.

We have a situation where local and state governments are primarily responsible for education. They always have been. There was an editorial in *The Hill* last week where one of the Members of the Education and Labor Committee argued that we have spent more and more on education, and education has gotten worse; and the Federal Government, therefore, should get out of the business of education. We spend more on education, but the money has come from the States and the local levels, and the States and the local governments have been in charge.

Local school boards and the States have been in charge of education. They have the power, \$360 to \$380 billion. That is a lot of money spent on education last year. But only about 7 percent of that was Federal money. The rest of it came from the States and the localities.

So 93 percent of the dollars, the cost is covered by State and local government. They have 93 percent of the power. The Federal Government is a small bit player in education. The largest program, the chapter 1 program, is a \$7 billion program out of that total of \$360 to \$380 billion. So the Federal Government cannot be blamed if we have spent more money on education and got poor results because it has been a bit player, a tiny player. Its influence is at this point quite minimal. I think it would be very appropriate, highly desirable if the Federal Government's role in education increased to about 25 percent and the federal funding for education moved in the same way.

If we were funding 25 percent of the total education budget of the country and we had 25 percent of the decision-making power, education would still be very much under the control of local governments, local school boards and the states. It would still be 75 percent. Anybody who has 75 percent of the power is in control.

The Federal Government would have some influence and that is all it has ever had, a tiny amount of influence. So if education is in trouble, things have gone wrong, it is not because the

Federal Government has had a major role and it is the cause. The Federal Government has come to this situation very late in the history of this nation. State governments have always been in control.

Even this tiny effort now would be wiped out in the pending budget. Education for disadvantaged concentration grants, wiped out; education for disadvantaged targeted grants wiped out; impact aid, wiped out; education infrastructure, small program which was to begin the process of providing some help to have poor local school boards to remove asbestos or lead where it is a problem and make schools more healthy in areas where they do not have the money and will never be able to raise the money to do it so that kids would go to safe schools or schools that are not so life threatening as lead poisoning and asbestos are to young children, that is eliminated.

Magnet schools assistance, eliminated; drop out prevention demonstrations, eliminated; bilingual education instruction services, eliminated; Galaudet University will not be eliminated but they must combine four programs into one. National Institutes for the Deaf combined three programs into one. This is small efforts for people with disabilities, and they are squeezed also.

The Eisenhower Leadership Program, the minority teacher recruitment, minority science improvement, innovative projects for community service, these are all tiny programs, but they have gone and assumed that because they are so tiny they are undesirable, unproductive and must be eliminated.

Federal TRIO programs are tampered with, five programs are eliminated: National Science Scholars, National Academy of Science, Space and Technology, Teacher Corps. I am not reading them all. I am just reading a few of those on the list. Harris fellowships, Javits fellowships, graduate assistance in areas of national need. These are all graduate programs that will be fashioned by members of the Education and Labor Committee in response to long-standing needs. They are tiny programs, but they meet specific kinds of needs that have been identified for more aid in certain areas.

Science is one of those areas. We need more aid for students who are studying, minority students studying science. Javits fellowships were a different kind of effort to aid minority students, not minority students, but students in general. Graduate assistance in areas of national need says it exactly as it is, areas of national need identified, public health people, people who could work with children with disabilities, various areas where you identify national need, there was an effort to target the funding. All of that eliminated. Too small.

Nobody has ever said it does not work, they just said, it must go.

Howard University academic program, Howard University endowment

program, elimination. We are talking about wiping out the Howard University academic program, Howard University research, Howard University Hospital, Howard University Clinical Center, Howard University construction, all that wiped out, about \$110 million wiped out of Howard University's budget, which wipes out Howard University, because Howard University is the only federally funded university for primarily, it was created primarily, after the Civil War, for the newly freed slaves. But it serves students of all colors, races and creeds now, but it is federally funded primarily.

It does receive funds from some other sources, but only tiny amounts. So when you take away federal funds from Howard University, you are saying we are wiping out Howard University. That is a serious action. That is certainly a state of emergency for Howard University, a state of emergency for education.

Star Schools, eliminated; Ready to Learn Television, the whole area of technology, the use of mass media to improve education, to lower the cost of education, all of that discussed for many years in the Education and Labor Committee, the old Education and Labor Committee, which is now called the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the representatives that you elect, the representatives that you send here who are placed on authorizing committees labor to get the best wisdom in the country through hearings, through reading papers. Staff organizes legislation, and we created these programs in response to real needs.

But now the power is in the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations to wipe all this out, and it proceeded to destroy it. When I use the word blitzkrieg or scorched earth, it is quite appropriate. This is very thorough. This is very devastating, very destructive. It is public policy decisionmaking, but it is as deadly as knives and guns are on a smaller level.

What is being done to our society, the torture and the maiming of our society is incomprehensible to most people. We do not think in those terms. One of the problems with the species *Homo sapiens* is that they are very physical. Species *Homo sapiens* only reacts to what it can see and feel, what our senses can identify.

The cognitive process is more difficult to comprehend than we allow, and we allow it to be fooled and manipulated and misused by people who understand the cognitive processes better, who understand futurism and how to project and create new systems. And they understand the result of the systems that they create.

They talk about a balanced budget amendment, but what they are doing is presenting a situation or creating a situation and an environment which will be hostile to social programs and sets up a situation which allows them to

squeeze the social programs that they do not want out of existence.

□ 2000

Granted, another group could do that, and squeeze the defense programs and some of the undesirable programs that are being funded out of existence also, but the process is in the control of those who want to go after the programs that benefit the great majority of the American people.

These people who are doing the squeezing, this list of programs to be eliminated and destroyed, which I will discontinue reading at this point, this list is promulgated by people who know very well what they are doing, and have targeted people programs, programs that do benefit the working poor, the working middle class, the poor who have no jobs, and large numbers of the upper middle class will also be hit.

The professional classes will also be hit. The government workers, they are going after their pensions, and going to squeeze those. They know what they are doing. It is not by accident. Nothing has happened by accident. It is clearly understood what the process is.

When they decide to do something in the opposite direction, which is clearly going to cost a lot of money, but they want to do it, they can be very reckless about doing it, very open.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the discussion on the budget and the discussion on appropriations and the discussion about where the country is going with respect to fiscal responsibility, what the danger of bankruptcy might be, that discussion ought to be divided into two parts: before the B-2 bomber vote that took place last week, and after the B-2 bomber vote. The B-2 bomber is a defining point in this whole discussion. The funding for the B-2 bomber, the authorizing of the funding for the B-2 bomber, was on the floor. There was an amendment to eliminate the funding for the B-2 bomber.

What is the B-2 bomber? It is a dream machine for people who want to sneak into areas through a stealth process with a bomber and drop bombs. It was originally conceived to go into the Soviet Union during a nuclear war and drop bombs on selected targets, and it would do this during a nuclear war by using the state-of-the-art stealth technology. It would not be observed. It could sneak in there and do it. With the whole world exploding around us, we would send this bomber in there and it would finish off targets in the Soviet Union.

We say we still need it. It is under production already. The item on the floor was whether or not they should add additional B-2 bombers. The cost was about \$30 billion, when we add the production costs and operations costs. The figure of \$30 billion sticks out. We are talking about \$30 billion in the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying the discussion before and after the B-2 bomber

tells us a great deal, because there were large numbers of people who insisted that they came here to cut government, to get government off the backs of people, to make government more effective and more efficient.

There was a discussion on the floor of the B-2 bomber costing \$30 billion. Thirty billion dollars can buy a lot of hospital beds, it can buy a lot of school lunches. Thirty billion dollars can build beautiful new schools where there are unsafe schools with asbestos and lead poisoning. Thirty billion dollars can accomplish a great deal in our society in any of the areas of need.

However, \$30 billion was on the floor, and the deliberation was shall we go ahead with this madness and keep this \$30 billion in the budget, or shall we be reasonable and sincere and show that we are honest about wanting to improve the efficiency of government, about wanting to save the Nation from bankruptcy, about wanting to keep our children from having to bear the burden of paying the debt we build up. All the rhetoric that has come around the balanced budget and the need to move forward to make these draconian cuts was on the table.

The B-2 bomber, the Pentagon says they do not need it. The Secretary of Defense said "We do not need the B-2 bomber." Nobody in the military wants the B-2 bomber. The President does not want the B-2 bomber. The people who are the experts, people who have to fight the wars, say "We do not need a B-2 bomber." Yet, \$30 billion is on the table that we can realize and regain to do other things with, to go toward helping the deficit, to keep our children from having to pay these gigantic debts in the future.

All of the rhetoric could be realized. All of the things promised in the rhetoric could be realized to a great degree with \$30 billion on the floor. The military does not want it, the Air Force does not want it, the Secretary of Defense does not want it; yet, the majority of the people on the floor of the House of Representatives voted to keep the \$30 billion in the budget for the B-2 bomber.

Before the B-2 you might have said "Some of these people are really sincere, especially the freshmen." The freshmen came with their eyes popping with sincerity, bright with sincerity. They said "We do not care what it is, if it is wasteful, we will eliminate it."

Here is an example on the floor, a concrete physical example, a \$30 billion example of what you can do to help eliminate waste, make government more effective and efficient, and reduce the deficit. All the objectives can be met to the tune of \$30 billion on the floor. Yet, the vote was that the majority says "No, we will keep the B-2 bomber," for whatever reasons.

I do not stand here to impugn the motives of my colleagues, and Congressmen are not in the business of explaining the votes of other Congress persons. They can explain their own

vote, but I think you ought to call up each one who voted to keep the B-2 bomber to explain "What is the magic, what is it that we cannot see through simple, ordinary logic?"

There may be some special kind of reasoning and logic, or some deep-seated wisdom that the people who voted to keep this \$30 billion monster in the budget have that the rest of us do not have. Let them explain. I see no rush to explain by many who voted.

Of course, there were people who argued on the floor that we need to give our troops the very best, and the stealth bomber would help make it safer for our fliers, et cetera, et cetera. The fliers do not say that. The experts in the military do not say that. The generals do not say that. The Secretary of Defense does not say that. They all gave these arguments, running counter to the people we trust and pay to run our defense.

Therefore, let the B-2 bomber be the deciding point in terms of determining the integrity and the consistency, the truthfulness of anybody who stands on this floor and calls for budget cuts. Let that be the determining, defining moment. It is worthy of saying "Before the B-2 I saw you this way. After the B-2 you are exposed."

Across the B-2, across the spectrum, there are some other B-2 bomber types of votes. We are voting to keep in the F-22, a fighter plane that is the most sophisticated fighter plane ever conceived. It is not needed, also. There are many others. Then we are going to be considering very soon a reorganization of the agricultural bill, continuation of agricultural welfare. Here you have very dishonest discussions about to shape up, similar to the B-2 in terms of the rhetoric is in one place and the action is in another.

If we want to eliminate welfare as we have known it, if we want to change welfare and eliminate welfare as we know it, then let us eliminate agricultural welfare as we know it. From New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, there are thousands, millions of people who would love to go to Kansas and be able to enjoy the benefits that Kansas farmers enjoy from the taxpayers. They get \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000 checks each year of doing nothing. They get checks for not plowing the soil, for not growing grain. The checks are without question. They do not have to prove that they are poor.

If you go in any city and say that you are desperately poor, you have no other means to feed your children, then you have to fill out forms. You have to have an audit of your expenses. Somebody has to investigate you before you get a penny. The average welfare check for Aid to Dependent Children recipients, for a family of three, is about \$300 a month across the Nation, it being much lower in certain places, like Mississippi, and higher in places like New York. However, the average check is \$300 a month for a family of three. Yet, you have to fill out numerous forms, be

investigated, and establish the fact that you really need it. There is a means test.

There is no means testing for farmers. There is no means testing. The rich farmers will get the same check that the poor farmers get. There is no means testing. Yes, true, when Franklin Roosevelt first established the program there were poor farmers in the Nation, and it served the purpose. That is no longer the case. We have rich farmers as well as poor farmers getting this welfare.

My time is up, Mr. Speaker, but my point is we are on the verge of a major catastrophe here in Washington. A state of emergency exists. All of America should wake up, particularly the caring majority, the large majority of people who are going to have a great deal of pain and suffering generated for them as a result of these terrible decisions that are being made here.

I hope people understand that in the final analysis, the war that is raging is for us to win. We are still a majority. We are not beggars. We are not in a situation where we have no arms to fight back with. We are still a majority. The caring majority can rally its forces and still prevail. We have to understand first that we are in a state of emergency, that we are threatened, before we rally, but we can and we shall overcome.

CONGRESS MUST LEAD BY EXAMPLE IN DEFICIT REDUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we address the House tonight on some important issues, many of which are coming up tomorrow. The fact is, in the legislative branch of the Government, if we are going to lead by example, we need to reduce our own expenditures.

We have already seen in this 104th Congress, Mr. Speaker, there have been tax reductions. We have had spending reductions of \$190 billion. We have had a deficit reduction of \$90 billion. We have had regulatory relief to try to eliminate the unnecessary regulations on businesses and individuals, so they have a chance to succeed in life and be able to create jobs. Now we are talking about downsizing Government.

We talked about eliminating some Federal agencies and reducing others, privatizing still others and consolidating their functions, making sure that we have more direct services for people but less bureaucrats we are supporting. That is what the people of the United States want.

We see historically tomorrow a very important day in the life of this 104th Congress in the House, because House Republicans will continue to keep their promise to the American people by

making Congress smaller, more efficient, more accountable, and less costly.

In H.R. 1854, the legislative branch appropriations bill will bring to an end 40 years of largesse in the bloated congressional bureaucracy. By ending business as usual, the GOP bill slashes wasteful congressional spending and ensures that Congress will show its fair share of deficit reduction on the road to a balanced budget.

With me tonight is the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. GIL GUTKNECHT. He will be working with me in discussing with the American people a number of issues where we can see the downsizing. For instance, Congress must lead by example in its quest to balance the budget by the year 2002. H.R. 1854 will cut congressional spending by \$155 million below the fiscal 1995 levels, and we think that is a step in the right direction.

Once the Senate considers its changes, Mr. Speaker, the total savings just within the Congress could be \$200 million. I would like the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] to in fact outline for those Members of the House who are present and listening tonight and others who are joining with us the kinds of changes we are fundamentally making in the way the House runs itself.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] to outline for us some of those points which are radically different than any prior Congress.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, my grandmother used to say it was wrong to tell our children that they should do as I say, not as I do. I think it is important, as the gentleman has indicated, that we lead by example.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased and terrified on my very first day in this body to stand in this very place and be the freshman lead sponsor on the adoption of the rules for the Congressional Accountability Act, which essentially said that Congress is going to have to start to play by the same rules as everybody else. That, I think, was the first step in saying that we are going to lead by example in the 104th Congress.

The bill that probably has more to do with actual Members of Congress than any other bill we will deal with this year, the legislative appropriations bill that will be on the floor tomorrow, really begins to make a very important start, and more importantly, an important statement about what we are going to do.

Let me quote one other person who it may seem unusual for someone on our side of the aisle to quote, but one of my favorite quotations is from a gentleman by the name of Jesse Jackson. Several years ago Jesse Jackson said "If you want to change the world, you have got to first change your neighborhood."