

who succeeded him, whom, of course, I had known from the beginning back in Texas. And more so with President Johnson, I became a gadfly, as the drum beats rose in noise and the urge to propel our armed services into action became irresistible.

So in this letter I say, as I said in my letter to you last year—and this reflects my consistency “air strikes will not accomplish the goal of peace in the former Yugoslavia.”

Fortunately, of course, we know now that the president has been restrained, and I compliment him. But as I said in this letter, in my last paragraph: “As I have expressed to you with regard to Somalia, Haiti, and before in Bosnia, as I have with previous presidents about other situations, the Constitution and the War Powers Resolutions”—which I had the great honor of first evolving and developing in this House and eventually, unfortunately too late, enacted “the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution clearly afford Congress an important role to play in the use of U.S. military force overseas, and, as you know, I have long struggled to uphold this balance of powers among co-equal branches of government. I was heartened by your comments today that Congress would be consulted in this matter and that you continue to exercise restraint in deploying United States forces on the ground in Bosnia. I fully hope and trust that you will continue to do so.”

□ 1900

I am happy to say that up until now that seems to be the case.

However, I do want to point out that one of the things that in fact has made me an irritant to be even friends, like President Johnson, is the fact that we have become inured more and more to an excessive weight in that coequal branch, which should be a coequal branch, the presidency.

After all, the Constitution itself does not make the office of the presidency Article 1. It is the Congress, and it was deliberately done. There was a reason for it. The men who wrote the Constitution were the first to protest that the king made wars. Now in democracies, we have the equivalent. The only thing is that it is not the king declaring then, but as far as the will of the people expressing itself and the idea of the fundamental nature of a justified war having been lost sight of, makes it impelling that we review this matter.

I want to terminate by saying that I will place a copy of this letter in the RECORD, so that those of my colleagues interested will have a chance to review it.

The material referred to is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 31, 1995.

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
President, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The preparations currently underway for the possible involvement of U.S. military forces on the ground in

Bosnia impel me once again to urge you in the strongest possible terms to seriously consider this matter before committing our troops to any such action and to abide in the closest possible way to the laws of the land with regard to the use of U.S. military force abroad.

As I said in my letter to you last year, airstrikes will not accomplish the goal of peace in the former Yugoslavia. I am truly sad to say that recent events make this all the more clear. The Serbian forces in Bosnia have shown that they will exact as high a toll as possible from their adversaries in their pursuit of their military goals. In this situation where the Serbs are waging a war against the Bosnian government and where they consider the United Nations an enemy in their fight, deploying U.S. forces on the ground, whether it be in support of a reorganization of U.N. forces or in a related effort, will surely put our troops in a hostile situation and in imminent danger of being involved in combat. With the Bosnian Serb's recent demonstration of their grotesque lack of respect for civilian life and for U.N. peace-keeping forces, there can be little doubt that American forces would likewise be a target for attack.

As I have expressed to you with regard to Somalia, Haiti and before on Bosnia, as I have with previous presidents about other situations, the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution clearly afford Congress an important role to play in the use of U.S. military force overseas, and, as you know, I have long struggled to uphold this balance of powers among co-equal branches of government. I was heartened by your comments today that Congress would be consulted in this matter and that you continue to exercise restraint in deploying U.S. forces on the ground in Bosnia. I fully hope and trust that you will continue to do so.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THOSE IN A CREATIVE MEDIUM AND OF AMERICA'S ELECTED OFFICIALS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last week when Senator BOB DOLE made his statements about Hollywood, it was unfortunate that they were made in the context of a presidential campaign, because his remarks were immediately analyzed and seemingly split into two camps, deciding whether or not it was an attack on Hollywood, justified or unjustified, and whether or not Hollywood should defend itself, justified or unjustified, and that seemed to end the debate. You could take sides on whether or not that attack had taken place or not.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a very fundamental mistake for Hollywood or anyone else in this country to believe that because that speech appeared in a political context and was analyzed mainly by political analysis and analysts, pundits who deal with the political people in this country, to believe that his remarks do not represent a concern in this country about the level of violence in the media, in all of its different forms, in music, in

films, TV, and a concern that is one that is shared by millions of American families, and a concern for many of us in public life.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the issue would not get down to the issue of censorship, or picking our favorite stars, or deciding who bankrolled the good movie versus the bad movie, but I would hope that we would have the possibility of having a national conversation in this country about the future of our children, about the impact of the media on our children, on our families, on ourselves, because none of us are immune from this.

It is not just young, impressionable children who absorb the hours and hours of violence that are now portrayed on TV, in the movie theaters, and in our music. It happens to all of us. It makes statements about our society. I think we have to have this discussion. I do not think you can end this discussion by denying the power of this media, all of a sudden saying we have no impact, or suggesting that it is the only reason, or the cause of many things that we do not like in our society, because it is not. These are all multifaceted problems.

I think we should do it with an understanding that this is a country that loves its movies, love its moviemakers, its songwriters and its performers. We recognize the creativity, we recognize the agility, the ability, the fascination that they can create.

We also, in loving them, recognize that they are powerful; that music can pick up our spirits, it can lower our spirits. It can excite us, it can soothe us. A film is designed to invoke emotions, to create a result, to get a response. When you listen to the great filmmakers of our time discuss how they put movies together, what they were thinking about, why they picked to do it this way, why music was added in this fashion, why this scenery, why this color, why black and white, why this, why that, why that lighting, it is all designed to move people in the viewing of that medium, designed to get a reaction, to get a response, to create an atmosphere, and they successfully do it. They have been doing it as long as the movies have been around.

You listen to them discuss that, and you appreciate that they understand the power of their medium, the power to move a Nation, the power to move a Nation's children, to excite us, to fascinate us. They know they can do that if you give them an hour and a half of your time, if you give them 2 hours, if you give them a subject. It does not matter if it is fantasy or animation, it does not matter if it is in a historical context or a completely fictional context, they know they can do that. That is the tribute, the genius.

The same is true with songwriters. They know they can move a Nation to its feet. They know they can move romance, where romance maybe was not. We have to recognize that. However,

they have also got to recognize that when it becomes unpleasant and the outcomes are not what we desire, in some instances, or what some of us do not desire in a pluralistic society, they cannot run away and say "Oh, we could not be responsible for that, because after all, it is just a movie." No, you cannot take that genius and understand and know what you have created, and then deny it the next moment, to suggest it has none of the impacts for which you designed it in this movie, but it could not have any impacts over here.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would just hope that we would not let this get down to who is getting the advantage and not getting the advantage in presidential politics, but we would bring this as a national conversation about the future of our children. I hope to have more to say on this to their body, to my constituents and to others, but I think we need this conversation without jumping to a conclusion, but understanding the responsibilities, the powers, and the obligations that go with this medium and with those of us in public office.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO ON THE RESCISSIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I could not help but notice that the President vetoed the rescissions bill, and our attempts to cut back spending on the Federal level, and to send money back home on education programs and on job training programs. The President vetoed the bill because he thought it cut too much. I have to tell you, I agree with the President that the bill was not perfect, but I do not think it was perfect for another reason. I do not think we went far enough.

Let me explain, Mr. Speaker. When he talks about education dollars, when he talks about job training dollars, what he is actually talking about is spending money on the Department of Education bureaucracy in Washington, DC. We are not talking about spending money on children, we are not talking about spending money on raising teachers' salaries, we are not talking about spending money on hiring more teachers so we can lower the student-teacher ratio, so our students can learn more. We are talking about spending more money in Washington, DC, on an education bureaucracy that has, unfortunately, failed miserably over the past 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, I was named to head the task force to look into education reform. I believe today, more than at any other time in this country's history, we have to be bold and aggressive in reforming the educational system of this

country, because if our children are going to be prepared for the 21st century, and if our children are going to be able to work in the 21st century workplace, they are going to have to do it by having the best education possible. With two young boys in public schools, I have as much at stake in this fight as anybody.

Mr. Speaker, we have to start with basics. The bill that we are introducing is called the back-to-basics education reform bill. The basics that we begin with are these. First of all, parents and teachers and principals know how to teach our students and our children better than a bureaucrat in Washington, DC. That is not a foreign concept in this country's history, or in our educational history.

The fact of the matter is that over 200 years ago we had Founding Fathers, who believed that education belonged in local communities; that we were to be a nation of communities, instead of a nation of bureaucrats and a nation of education bureaucracies.

James Madison wrote, as he was helping to frame the Constitution, "We have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government, but upon the capacity of each of us to govern ourselves, to control ourselves, and sustain ourselves according to the Ten Commandments of God." That was from James Madison, one of the 3 men that was most responsible for framing the Constitution.

Of course, Thomas Jefferson wrote that "The government that governs least governs best." As they were saying that, they were not saying that because they were antigovernment. Far from it. The men and women that helped found this great constitutional republic believed government could serve a useful purpose. In fact, they dedicated their entire lives to this government, put their lives on the line in a brutal war, where they could have been killed or where they could have been hung as traitors. They believed that the Federal Government had a role, but that role was in protecting the God-given rights of the men and women and the children of the country that they were serving.

One of those rights, I have to believe, was the right to teach your children and to educate your children, instead of having bureaucrats in Washington, DC do it. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison believed that this country should be a great experiment; that we should have a country that was a nation of communities, and not a nation of bureaucrats and bureaucracies; that would have parents and individuals and families and communities making decisions on how to teach children, and what type of school programs needed to be implemented.

Unfortunately, somewhere along the line we lost our way, because in the late seventies the great education bureaucracy experiment began. It began in 1980, as Jimmy Carter struck a deal

with the NEA teacher's union to set up a national education bureaucracy. Since that time, we can see what has happened to education.

Back when it started in 1980, we were spending \$14 billion on education in this Federal bureaucracy. Since 1980, spending has gone from \$14 billion in Washington, DC, to \$33 billion. What have we gotten for our education revenue? The fact of the matter is that despite the fact we have gone from spending \$14 billion on an education bureaucracy to \$33 billion in 15 years, we have spent more money on the bureaucracy, but as you might guess, the results have not been positive. Test scores have gone down. Dropout rates have risen.

Of course, as all of you know, violence in schools has risen. You go to inner-city schools, whether it is in the South Bronx or whether it is in South Central Los Angeles, or Gary, IN, or in parts of Miami or Tampa, or even in your hometown, you know and parents know and I know as a parent that our educational system in this country continues to decline.

□ 1730

That is because education dollars are not getting into the classroom. They are coming up to Washington, DC, to our Federal bureaucracy.

Let me give you a perfect example of how this has happened. Do you know this year the Department of Education will be cutting \$100 million from their budget to keep our schools safe? Think about that. They are cutting \$100 million to keep the infrastructure in our schools safe across the country. But at the same time when they are saying we don't have the money to keep our school buildings safe for our children, they are spending \$20 million to upgrade their own bureaucracy right down the street.

Think about that. This is not robbing Peter to pay Paul. This is robbing our schools across the country, I suppose what they consider to be the flyover space between Washington, DC and Los Angeles. They are taking the money out of our schools so they can bring it up to Washington, DC, and upgrade their bureaucracy.

Is that what education should be about? Is that what educational reform should be about? I don't think so, and I know that men and women across the country that have a little bit of common sense don't think so, either. We need to put our education dollars in our school system, but the fact of the matter is that by the time the money goes through the process, the education dollars don't get to the schools.

Think about it. Where I come from—I am from northwest Florida, specifically I live in Pensacola, FL—when I have to pay a dollar for my taxes, that dollar goes from Pensacola, FL, to Atlanta, GA. That is our regional IRS center.

So when it goes up to Atlanta, the IRS center up there, they obviously