

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### HONORING THE SPORLEDER FAMILY

#### HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 14, 2000*

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 13, the Colorado Association of Soil Conservation Districts held its 56th annual meeting in Grand Junction, Colorado. This association gathers every year to recognize two land owners who have demonstrated leadership in conservation and stewardship. The work of this body and its members is truly a standard of exemplary commendation.

This year, Sig Sporleder, a member of the Upper Huerfano Soil Conservation District since 1951, was recognized for the outstanding ranching techniques he has implemented on his 2,367-acre ranch near Walsenberg, Colorado and named Conservationist of the Year for Ranching. He has controlled ranch erosion by installing dams and diversion ditches, and increased plant diversity and rangeland productivity by cross-fencing for rotational grazing systems. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sporleder is not only a great conservationist but an upstanding member of our community. He is a member of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association, Farm Bureau and the Huerfano Stock-Growers Association. His contribution to cultivation and conservation practices is an encouragement to all of us who seek to preserve the integrity of the land.

IN HONOR OF RAY BRADBURY

#### HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 14, 2000*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate author Ray Bradbury, as he receives a lifetime achievement award to be presented by the National Book Foundation. A novelist, lecturer, social critic, screenwriter, playwright, poet and visionary, Ray Bradbury is a national treasure.

Born in 1920, the young Bradbury was an imaginative child prone to nightmares and frightening fantasies. He began writing at the age of twelve, and has not looked back. Operas, poetry, essays, plays, more than 500 short stories and 30 books later, Ray Bradbury has left a vast collection of thoughts and ideas which will assuredly withstand the test of time.

A man well grounded in reality, he has an amazingly distinct hold on the creative process that alludes most. He has said, "We are cups, constantly and quietly being filled. The trick is knowing how to tip ourselves over and let the beautiful stuff out." Indeed, Ray Bradbury has found the path to letting the "beautiful stuff out," for nearly 65 years. His works are well known by most, including his more popular *The Martian Chronicles*, *Something Wicked*

*This Way Comes*, and *Fahrenheit 451*. Ray Bradbury's ideas are intertwined with our shared American culture, as nearly every high school student has at some point read one of his novels for a high school literature class. *Fahrenheit 451*, in which an autocratic society's government denies its people access to books, and thus creative thought and actions, is a classic example of Ray Bradbury's unique incorporation of fantasy, reality, and forewarning vision. It serves not only as a warning against censorship, but was firmly rooted in the American culture of the time, as it was written and published during the reign of Senator Joseph McCarthy.

Truly a modern creative genius, Ray Bradbury has won numerous awards for his writing, and was inducted into the Science Fiction Hall of Fame in 1970. After what has indeed been a lifetime of achievement, Mr. Bradbury is showing no signs of slowing down, as even now, at 80, he continues to write and lecture.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring Ray Bradbury, a man whose vision and artistic creativity has challenged our collective memories, ideals and beliefs; and who has served as an inspiration to each of us and our future.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 14, 2000*

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the following votes: Rollcall No. 593, No. 594, No. 595, No. 596.

Had I been here I would have voted: "Yea" on No. 593, No. 594; and "Nay" on No. 595, No. 596.

### GOVERNMENT SPENDING

#### HON. MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 14, 2000*

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to leave in the record a few thoughts about where we are, and where we are going, with regard to government spending. Milton Friedman once said that the only real measure of government's size is what it spends. I had a hunch that he was right when I came to Washington, having been here for six years I am now certain he is correct.

It's not collusion, or a conspiracy, but unfortunately political forces regularly come together to mask the real size of government. Taxes may sit below the real cost of sustaining a program. That's happening now with Social Security where the \$9 trillion liability, if annualized, would mean payroll taxes closer

to 17% than 12%. Money can also be borrowed—we have \$5 trillion in government debt, a great part of this went to consumption rather than investment—and as such basically means that the current generation handed the bill to the next for government services they enjoyed.

Friedman's historical argument is reinforced by the federal government's growth over the last 5 years. When I arrived in Washington in 1995 the federal government spent about \$1.5 trillion per year. It now spends almost \$1.9 trillion per year. Washington looks, feels, and acts like a great spending machine, and I have seen first hand the tremendous bias toward spending inherent in our system of government. Few people take a trip to Washington because they want nothing from it, and you see this in several ways.

First, regular folks from back home come up—they admire what I have done and said on government spending and even say keep it up—but there is always this "one" program they want to tell you about. If you add up all the "one" programs—railroad retirement funding, money to fix the Pinckney historic site in Mount Pleasant, a new line item for firefighters, the local disabilities or humanities board's push for un-offset additional funding, etc, you get to a lot of money. These are your friends, the last thing in the world you want to do is say no.

Second, formal lobbies say basically the same things, but you didn't grow up across the street from the man or woman making their case. They sweeten their argument with a big PAC check or 1,000 letters of support from everyone on their mailing list. They are extremely effective. An example of this would be the sugar lobby. With the exception of maybe ten Congressional districts where sugar is the dominant crop, no one in the Congress could make the case for our sugar price support system without being laughed or booed out of the room. This system costs American consumers \$1 billion a year in the form of higher sugar prices, and all this benefit gets handed down to truly a few—roughly 60 domestic sugar producers. The largest of these is the Fanjul family, who get \$60 million a year of personal benefit as a result of the program. They are not even American citizens, but do reside in Palm Beach and are on the Forbes 400 list with yachts, helicopters, planes—even their own resort. Unjust—yes, but there are 270 million people in America, so that means this program costs each of us about \$4 each per year. Who is going to take a trip to Washington to save \$4 per year? No one—it's not a rational decision. For the Fanjuls it is the reverse, they have \$60 million riding on the visit and are in town in a big way.

Finally, government watches out for its own. The military very effectively uses government dollars to turn around and lobby Congress for more. I don't mind because I see the military as a core function of the federal government, but when our office went after the East West Center, I was disturbed to see public monies

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.