

from local papers in south Florida to record the incident?

There is a real question as well in terms of the process of determining political asylum of those 123 people while they were on the vessel. The administration has given myself as well as other Members of Congress who have inquired totally conflicting reports in terms of the status hearings of those people.

This administration and, in fact, this Congress is faced with a choice. We cannot have it both ways. We all profess that our desire is to bring down the Castro dictatorship, which we must bring down, a relic of decades past, an evil empire 90 miles from our shore. And yet in order to do that, we have the resources at our disposal to do it. Yet we have chosen not to.

□ 1900

HAVE WE LEARNED NOTHING FROM OKLAHOMA CITY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in outrage to take exception to words attributed to a constituent of a Member of this House, as reported in the April 26, 1995 edition of The South Whidbey Record published in 2nd District of the State of Washington, that a revered, senior Member of the U.S. Senate should be killed, and that the person killing him should be given a medal during a Town hall meeting which I assume was called at taxpayers' expense.

I take even greater exception to the fact that a Member of this body did not disavow or dissociate himself from, his constituent for calling for the murder of a sitting Member of the U.S. Senate, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia.

I take great exception to a Member of this House, who not only did not censure or otherwise refute his constituent's call for murder, but allegedly went on to state, and I quote:

"He should be tarred and feathered and run out of the country."

Peter Coogan, staff reporter for the aforementioned newspaper in south Whidbey Island, WA, who opens his article with the words: "To Kill a U.S. Senator or merely to tar and feather him," reports that a Member of this body, whom he claims was elected based on a campaign that attacked the Federal Government, allegedly made the statement at a town meeting in response to his constituent's call for the "killing" of Senator ROBERT BYRD.

Mr. Speaker, these are dangerous times for unguarded, irresponsible speech, and we have every reason and every right to expect a Member of this body to strongly disavow such speech and to advise any constituent that murder is not an option in this country.

Am I in a total state of stunned disbelief that a Member of the House of Representatives let this kind of statement about killing a U.S. Senator go unchallenged when such rhetoric may have led to the killing of more than 160 innocent people in Oklahoma City's Federal building? Yes, I am.

Have we learned nothing from that evil act that shook a nation to its core?

Should I be surprised at such rhetoric being used in just days after Oklahoma City, when the GOP's national committee planned to have as its honored guest a convicted felon-turned-radio-talk-show-host at a gala party fundraiser only days before the last body was brought out of that bombed out Federal building? A talk-show host who advised his listeners to shoot for the head of Federal agents, as the best way of killing them, and who bragged about using profiles of our President for target practice? Why be surprised?

Mr. Speaker, I request that the newspaper article to which I have reference be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the newspaper article to which I referred is as follows:

[From the South Whidbey Record, Apr. 26, 1995]

METCALF SAYS BYRD SHOULD BE TARRED,
FEATHERED

(By Peter Coogan)

To kill a U.S. Senator, or merely to tar and feather him.

The question sparked some light-hearted banter between U.S. Rep. Jack Metcalf and one of his constituents at a Congressional Town Hall Meeting in Oak Harbor Saturday.

It came up when Metcalf tried to explain why, as a rule, he votes against large, heavily amended "omnibus" spending bills, even if they contain some good ideas.

As an example of past abuse, he said a senator had hidden the cost of a Coast Guard facility for an East Coast state in the emergency relief spending for victims of the California earthquake. He asked the crowd to guess which eastern state.

"West Virginia," said Angelo Kolvas of Oak Harbor.

Yes, Metcalf said. The culprit was former Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman Robert Byrd, D-West Virginia, who "steals money all over America."

Metcalf started to suggest some punishment for Byrd, saying "he should be——"

Kolvas interrupted with "somebody should kill him and give them a medal."

Metcalf said: "He should be actually tar and feathered and run out of the country. I mean, I'm serious. He steals money because he's chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, or one of the committees, and he's always the one on the conference committee, in the middle of the night. He's stuffing pork in there for West Virginia, brutally."

Kolvas suggested that other congress-people are guilty of the same thing.

"This gentleman is right," Metcalf said. "It is the fault of Congress, but Senator Byrd still should be tarred and feathered."

Telephoned later, Kolvas said, "I am not a vindictive person but if that guy would die today, that wouldn't bother me a damn bit."

He added, "I really don't think anybody should kill Byrd. That was a little strong."

RETURNING FISCAL SANITY TO OUR BUDGET PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. EHRLICH. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to engage my colleague from California in the 5th installment of our series of colloquys. The gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH] and I have in the past now 120 days, I believe approximately, talked about the Contract With America, and the themes behind the Contract With America, and the regulatory reform, and legal reform, welfare reform, and a lot of the initiatives that we campaigned on that formed the Contract With America, and, Mr. Speaker, I have been thinking about that a lot these last days as now this great House turns its attention to Medicare, and the Federal budget, and doing what a lot of us were sent here to do, which is to return a sense of fiscal sanity to this country and to the budget process of this House. And, Mr. Speaker, as I thought about all this, and I thought about a lot of the rhetoric being heard around this town these days, I again thought about the common themes that seem to occur or recur every time we discuss an important issue in this House, and the premise, whenever comes to an economic issue, Mr. Speaker, seems to be all tax cuts cost the United States Treasury in direct proportion to the tax cuts. Tax cuts are mutually exclusive of the budget cuts. There is no multiplier effect when tax cuts put more money into the pockets of individuals and business.

Premise number two seems to be that we ignore the accepted economic realities and real life experiences of tax increases on the one hand and tax decreases on the other, and, Mr. Speaker, I thought of all this in the context of Medicare and what this majority is now planning to do with respect to Medicare, because there is certainly a lot of talk these days, a lot of heat, and smoke and mirrors on this floor and around this town, and Mr. Speaker, in order to create a context for this debate I thought to myself what example could I think of in the recent past where good politics and bad economics came together.

And Mr. Speaker before I get to that, I would like just to tell the House an example of what I am talking about. Today's message from the House Democrat leadership:

GOP makes its choice. Seniors cough up \$900 a year to pay for the wealthy's tax cut. House Republicans returned from the party conference last week united by a plan to cut Medicare to pay for the \$345 billion tax cut for the wealthy. Under the pretense they will be, quote unquote, fixing Medicare. Republicans have identified Medicare cuts as the cash cow for their tax give away to the wealthy.

As I was thinking about this, Mr. Speaker, I thought about the debate we had in this House before the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH] and I came here. I know I was in the State legislature. That was the great debate concerning the luxury tax, and Mr. RADANOVICH will talk about the luxury tax in its place in the middle of this debate in a minute, but I see the gentleman brought some famous tax quotes with him today, and I ask why you brought those quotes.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I say to the gentleman, "Thank you, Mr. EHRLICH. A couple of past quotes from two different periods, one in 1990, then one in 1995, one representing the majority held by the other party, this 1995 representing the majority that now currently exists, the Republican majority in the House.

It is the same old game. Republicans are out to cut taxes, and strictly for the rich, for their sole benefit, and I think that nothing seems to change.

The gentleman may have a quote here.

Mr. EHRLICH. This bill is fair, it raises more money, again on a progressive basis, from those who can afford to pay and who have paid least during the decade of the 1980s. That is the quote from a Member of this House, the context of the debate during the luxury tax; correct?

Mr. RADANOVICH. Right, and the same quote being is this sacrifice balanced and fair. And indeed it is. Fifty percent of the revenue burden falls on the wealthiest income earners in this country, and that is the way it should be.

Mr. EHRLICH. Now the people of this country will remember the great luxury tax. It placed a 10-percent surcharge on a portion of a purchase price over \$100,000 on private boats and yachts. Congress established similar taxes on furs, jewelry, cars and airplanes.

Now, this in my view, Mr. RADANOVICH, is the best example I can think of where good class warfare politics meets economics 101, and you know what? Politics always loses because combined with the recession, Mr. Speaker, the tax nearly killed an entire industry in this country. The tax adversely effected every segment of the industry, manufacturers, retailers, and blue collar workers, and is that not the ultimate irony, Mr. RADANOVICH, that tax warfare ends up hurting blue collar workers because blue collar workers have the jobs that build the items that are now overtaxed that put them out of business?

Mr. RADANOVICH. And history provided that example as a result of the yacht tax in the last 2 years; is that not right?

Mr. EHRLICH. We have seen that every year. In fact it is very interesting for me to go back, check, have my staff to go back and check the revenue projections from the luxury tax, because obviously it is a static score;

right? You tax something, you get more of it.

Wrong. The new 10 percent luxury tax on boats, cars, furs, et cetera, was to raise \$25 million, Mr. Speaker, in its first year, 1991, and almost \$1.5 billion over 5 years, from 1991 to 1996. And you know what it did? Sales of boats under \$100,000 purchase price dropped 12.2 percent. Sales of boats over \$100,000 dropped 52.7 percent. The sales of volume of boats under \$100,000 of value dropped 28 percent, to \$129 million. Sales of boats over \$100,000 dropped 71 percent, to \$73 million. According to the National Marine Manufacturers Association at the time of repeal, big boat sales were down 70 percent from peak levels in 1988.

And here is the ultimate irony as we have discussed. At the time of the repeal, Mr. Speaker, the National Marine Manufacturers Association estimated that the luxury tax created a net loss of 30,000 American jobs and destroyed dozens of companies in the process. Other estimates were higher, up to \$45,000. And I would direct a question to my colleague from California: What does this teach us?

Mr. RADANOVICH. The big lesson is that, if you want to raise revenue, you have to get to cut taxes. You cannot raise revenue by raising taxes, and I think that is the big lesson we have learned over the last 4 years, and I think that is what this new majority is trying to implement in their tax cuts.

Now there is two arguments when the Democrats accuse the Republicans of gutting Medicare to benefit the wealthiest Americans. There is two arguments here. One is that the basic argument is that, if you cut taxes, if you regulate people less, and you tax them less, they are going to be more productive, and I think that is one basic question. The other basic question on Medicare is the fact that on its own Medicare will go bankrupt in 5 to 7 years.

Mr. EHRLICH. And who says that? Who makes that statement?

Mr. RADANOVICH. All you have to do is look at the books, and you will know that is what is going to happen with Medicare, so regardless of—balancing the budget is not an issue with Medicare. It is fixing the system and doing what is necessary in order to make that system not only work for the people that are currently drawing benefits, but it also worked for people, you and I, and those that are 18 and 20 years old, when they come into the time of their life when they need that service as well.

So there are two basic issues there that are not commingled, and the fact if we wanted to, if the Republicans wanted to benefit the rich, what they do is cut taxes and cut regulations. Then that would not only benefit the rich, but the middle class and the poor. Because the Democratic assumption that cutting taxes, for example, capital gains, would be a benefit to the rich is an insult to the poor because, not only would it make more capital available

for venture capital and expansion to the rich, but also the middle class and the poor, and it is almost an insult to the poor to say they could not take advantage of that.

Mr. EHRLICH. Does anyone doubt that the capital gains tax cut will increase revenue flowing into the Treasury? Tax cuts work. The Reagan tax cuts of the 80's, the greedy 80's we hear about so much, increased revenue into the Federal Treasury. The problem during that decade was, as we know, spending went out of control, and I see the 1995 quote from a Member of this, of this body, and this is my favorite I have to say. It combines a lot of different themes that we have talked about. The hard fact is that voodoo economics, trickle down economics too, which this package happens to be, referring to the tax package and the Contract With America, is nothing more or less than a raid on the poor, a slap to the rich and a benefit to those who have no need of tax expense, sweat it out the hides of those who have the least.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Not so.

Mr. EHRLICH. Why?

Mr. RADANOVICH. It just is not true, and I think, if you pose the argument that if a person is taxed less and regulated less, then they will be more productive, is an argument that both sides of this aisle will buy.

□ 1915

But if you go to the next stage of the argument and say OK, how do they begin to regulate and tax less to the benefit of the American people, this side of the aisle says all right, let's go. Let's work this plan out.

That side of the aisle says no. But there is no logic behind why they are saying no, because that side of the aisle will also agree to the fact that if we are taxed less and regulated less, we will be more productive. But their logic starts there. God knows why.

Mr. EHRLICH. Maybe the answer is in the 1996 elections. I simply do not know. But is it not interesting how these quotes are so similar? A proposal that obviously failed miserably in 1990, they used the same rhetoric against the tax cuts contained in the Contract With America, and now, most disturbing to me and I think to you, is now the offshoot of class warfare. You see class warfare here, and the American people recognize class warfare when they see it. That is all they see.

I know the gentleman wants to discuss it. I know the gentleman wants to comment on my point, which is now that with Medicare in the budget, we not only have class warfare, we have the offshoot, generational warfare. "Let's turn the generations and not just the classes against each other." That is the most unfortunate aspect of this national debate occurring today.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I would say the bottom line motive behind that approach from the other side of the aisle

is to retain more control in Washington, because the big debate in Washington is not necessarily balancing the budget, although that is very important; it is who is going to have control. Is it going to remain here in Washington, DC, or is it going to get down to the most local level possible, via the States down to local governments and closest to the American people in their own homes? That is really the threat.

That is why you see baseless arguments like this. You see people on the other side of the aisle class warfare baiting, only for one reason, and that is to keep control in this House, in the other body, in this town, in Washington, DC. It is called centralized government. It is where you have a lot of control over a lot of people.

Some people like that. Those of us newly elected to Washington do not want that. We want the American people to have the control, and that is what we are trying to do here in Washington.

Mr. EHRLICH. Is it not refreshing with our class, the new leadership, the Speaker, we have people here who are willing to challenge assumptions that really have been accepted by many Americans, many well-meaning Americans, for the last 40 years. We are willing to challenge those exceptions. And we have one person in Washington right now, the Speaker of the House and the leadership, willing to go to the American people and say, look, we have got a problem. And the Speaker has gone out of his way to ask the President to help in a nonpartisan way.

We have people who are willing to challenge assumptions and make a political gut check, cast tough votes, because we both know, we just got back from break in our districts, if we do not cast tough votes, if we do not follow through on our promises, honeymoons are short in American politics today. We will not be here for long.

We are both freshman. This is not a bad job. We kind of like it. I like representing the people of the second district of Maryland, I have to tell you.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I will say, us being new Members, we could remain here a long time, if it were not for two things, and not do the business of our district. In the past I think it used to be elected representatives would come to Washington. They would say one thing in their district, they would do the other thing here in Washington. For a long time the tolerant American people gave their elected representatives the benefit of the doubt that they were doing the right thing in Washington.

Well, two things changed that. One is C-SPAN and the other is talk radio. I do not think anybody can afford to come to this body anymore and say one thing in their district and not do the same thing here, because there will be a lot to pay on election day. So that motivation and that way of operating is now unmasked.

If this gentleman and this gentleman want to stay in this House for very long at all and serve the needs of their district, they better do what they say in their district here on the floor of the House. I think C-SPAN and talk radio are the big changes that made that possible.

Mr. EHRLICH. I agree. When we have a tough vote, the phones and faxes go off immediately. The American people are tuned into what is happening on this floor and they know facts.

I think the best news I brought back from our 3-week break in my district was the fact that this kind of stuff no longer goes over with the American people. They see it for what it is. It can work at times. It certainly worked a few years ago in the course of the Presidential race. But dividing people, labor-management, poor-rich-middle class-lower middle class, young and old, is no longer the answer, not politically, and it has never been the answer economically, at least in my district.

I would direct a question to the gentleman. In my district the people said look, BOB, we know we are not going to agree with you on every vote. But we like the fact you had an agenda, you ran on that agenda, you passed that agenda, and now you are willing to do the tough things that we sent you to Washington to do.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I think that people in my district sent me to Washington to make the tough decisions. If I listen and do what I think is right according to the philosophy that they knew what I believed in when they elected me, then I have their support. If I betray any of that, I do not have their support. That is the way this game works. That is just the way it is.

I would like to comment on a couple of things, one being Medicare, and the other one also being the tax cuts. If the Democrats, people on the other side of the aisle, are willing to sit down and have a debate, rather than resorting to what we call class warfare baiting, which it is nothing more than class warfare baiting to keep a strong centralized government in Washington, then let's agree on two things. Let's agree that the Medicare system, number one, is going bankrupt, and let's work together to solve that, be it cuts, additional money, anything else, let's solve that problem.

The second problem that needs to be solved is let's together realize if people are taxed less and regulated less, they are going to be more productive, and let's build a tax cut structure that will allow that to happen in this country. If you really want a cooperative effort in this House, you will agree on those two things and proceed from there.

We do not need this stuff. The American people do not buy it, we do not buy it, it is not true. There is no class warfare baiting here. The Republicans are not here for the rich. I do not know how many Republicans are rich anyway. I am not a rich Republican. But it just does not work.

This was an article, editorial, in the Washington Times today, "Not Rising to Class Warfare Battle." And that is exactly what Republicans are doing. They are not rising to the class warfare battle.

Mr. EHRLICH. I am not going to embarrass the gentleman. We have a famous quiz at the bottom. I will not embarrass the gentleman by asking which year and which bill these quotes were directed toward. The fact is you see the quotes. "Cheesy tax cut promises only make Americans cynical about government."

Can you imagine that, putting more money back in your pocket so you can grow, so you can take a risk, begin a business and hire people? That makes you cynical about government?

I think tax fairness is an idea that all Americans understand and endorse irrespective of income level and party affiliation.

Fairness. That is an interesting concept. Fairness and equity. My idea of fairness and equity and who is rich and who is not may not comport with yours. Is not that correct?

Mr. RADANOVICH. I believe so, yes. I think that this is a smack in the face of every individual American in this country that wants to do good and be prosperous, and be personally responsible for their own actions. I think that first quote is right there. And you know, it does boil down to different viewpoints of how we treat individuals in this country and how this side of the aisle looks at the individual and says you have that responsibility, go for it, and the other side of the aisle looks and says you cannot do these things, we need to do it for you. There is a big difference between those two outlooks.

Mr. EHRLICH. Absolutely. I agree. There is my final observation here. I hope that what we saw in 1990 with respect to the luxury tax, what we saw 2 months ago with respect to welfare and tax reform, are theories and strategies of the past, because one of the more frustrating parts of our job is when we go back home and meet with groups and they repeat rhetoric they hear on C-SPAN and talk radio, and read in the newspapers, and that rhetoric conflicts with facts.

I know in the course of the welfare debate, in the course of school lunches, for instance, in the course of now the Medicare and the budget debate, we all want to debate ideas and numbers. We have legitimate differences with the other side. Reasonable people can disagree about our budget proposal and Medicare. And I know I join with the gentleman asking just one simple thing, that when the debate begins tomorrow, or tonight actually, that the other side uses real numbers, facts. I am glad to debate facts. I do not like debating rhetoric.

Mr. RADANOVICH. And do not use class warfare baiting. It is not fair to say someone is for the poor any more than anyone else is. We are all here

to do good for everybody. Nor generational warfare.

Mr. EHRLICH. I thank the gentleman from California. It is good to see him. I am sure we will revisit this issue, and maybe when we come back to this floor in a week or two or three, we will be able to report to the American people that we had a real good debate about the budget and about Medicare, and it never broke out into generational warfare. And the President actually was relevant, became part of the process as well. I would love to report that to the people of the Second District, and I would look forward to joining the gentleman again at that time.

Mr. RADANOVICH. You bet.

KEEP EDUCATION IN THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we are about to move into the most important phase of the legislative process, and that is the budget. The Committee on the Budget I understand will be deliberating this week and by this time next week we will have on the floor of the House the budget for fiscal year 1996, the proposed budget of the House committee.

The announcement is that one of the proposals in that budget coming to the floor will be a recommendation, a proposal to eliminate the Department of Education.

The attack on education is one of the most baffling elements of the approach by the present majority of the House of Representatives to the Federal Government and its priorities. The attack on education comes at a time when we are in a global competition with other industrialized nations for the markets of the world, and that competition is likely to get worse. Everybody has conceded that education is a vital component of whatever effort this Nation puts forward in order to be economically competitive, now and in the future.

We have had a continuum of concern expressed about education since President Reagan appointed a commission, and that commission came back with a report entitled "A Nation at Risk." "A Nation at Risk" was a report that alarmed many leaders in America. President Reagan never appropriated any money of any kind to follow through on the recommendations of the report, but he did endorse the findings of the report and called to the attention of the American people the fact that it was a very serious problem, we had a very serious problem.

President Bush came along and began to try to take steps to implement some Federal policies with respect to education which would provide greater guidance to the localities and the

States. Education is primarily a state function. The Federal Government provides leadership and guidance that is very vital and important, but when it comes to expenditures for education, it is the States and the localities that provide most of the funds for education.

I think about 7 to 8 percent of the total education budget may be federally financed. Out of more than \$360 billion spent on education from kindergarten to postgraduate, only about 7 or 8 percent of that was Federal funding. It went down during the Reagan administration to as low as 6 percent, and began to come back up under the Clinton administration, moving toward 8 percent. So although we provide only a small amount of the funding, the Federal guidance, the Federal sense of direction, has been considered very important, since the report "A Nation at Risk" was released.

"A Nation at Risk" showed the industrialized nations have some kind of centralized guidance with respect to their education systems. Many of the industrialized nations, of course, go much further than we would ever want to go in terms of they not only guide education, they administer it and set the policies and dominate education.

In France, Great Britain, you have most of Europe with centralized education policymaking. Traditionally, in this country it has always been education is a state and local matter, and the freedom of local school boards to operate has always been a cherished one. Nobody wants to change that.

□ 1930

But there are extremes. I think the European model of centralized, highly centralized education or the Japanese model of highly centralized ministers of education dictating to all parts of the country what happens in schools is one extreme. The other extreme is for the Federal Government to take no meaningful role at all. At one time our Government had no meaningful role. There was a long, long debate as to how much our Government should become involved in education. We became involved in high education, universities and college education long before the Federal Government ever became involved in public education, elementary and secondary education. There was a long, long debate.

It was during the Great Society years that President Lyndon Johnson moved us into support for elementary and secondary education, and that came in the form of attempting to come to the aid of the poorest school districts in America. The poorest districts needed help. And the original elementary and secondary education legislation was targeted to the poorest districts, and to a great degree that is still the case. Most of our aid is theoretically targeted to the poorest school districts and the poorest children in America.

There was a long debate before the Federal Government took this step. The creation of the Department of Edu-

cation took a long, long time also, a great deal of discussion and debate. And finally, the Department of Education was created by President Jimmy Carter. After the Department of Education was created by Jimmy Carter, of course, he lost the election and Ronald Reagan became the President. And he was ambivalent about the Department of Education. Some days he wanted to eliminate it; some days he was willing to support it.

There were always these forces at work which because they were schizophrenic did nothing to enhance the work of the Department of Education. The Department fell into some extremist patterns on the one hand and was not very useful during those years when it existed under a cloud.

It survived, however. And it existed for the 4 years of the Bush administration and it still exists. Now we are told that for budgetary reasons, in order to streamline the Government, downsize the Government, save money, meet the requirements of this artificially created emergency, the emergency is the need to have a balanced budget by the year 2002, that emergency is an artificial one created primarily to have an excuse, rationale, rationalization for eliminating social programs.

The safety net programs are going to be eliminated and we are going to do that under the rubric of having to do it in order to balance the budget. And the Department of Education now falls into that category. It is one of those programs that has been labeled expendable. We have labeled the whole Department, the whole function as being expendable. We can eliminate it.

I think this is another example of what I have called before a barbaric act. It is a barbaric act. It is like sacking a segment of our civilization. It is like Attila the Hun with torches going through a civilized city and destroying everything that he does not understand or does not want to exist because he has the power to do it. Because the majority of Republicans have the power to do it, they are going to move through the budget to wipe out a department which exists as a result of a long series of discussions and debates.

In 2 years, we are going to wipe out what took 20 years; it took 20 years to finally get to this point. In a 2-year period, while they are in the majority, the Republicans in the House are proposing to just wipe out this Department of Education in an era and a time when education is recognized as being critical to our competitiveness in the global marketplace. No other nation in the world would dare contemplate eliminating its Department of Education or its governmental, Federal Government function of education.

Japan would never contemplate that. Germany would never contemplate that. Great Britain, France, they would consider us to be quite foolish indeed, and they would consider it quite a serious matter to watch the