

board bringing together experts in the field, and a fundraising foundation—have all been reviewed by the staffs of the Library's Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division and American Folklife Center, as well as our legal staff, and appear to provide the necessary elements of a comprehensive program to ensure the survival, conservation, and increased public availability of America's sound recording heritage.

I am pleased that the legislation includes a directive for a comprehensive national recording preservation study and action plan, such as the one produced in 1993 under Congressional directive, which laid the framework for a national film preservation program. This study would serve as the basis for a national preservation plan, including setting standards for future private and public preservation efforts, and will be conducted in conjunction with the state-of-the-art National Audio-Visual Conservation Center we are developing in Culpeper, Virginia. The Center and the program created by your legislation will each benefit from the existence and work of the other.

I support the bill in both goal and substance. I will need your support, however, in assuring that any funds appropriated for the Board or Foundation are new funds added to the Library's base. We cannot afford to absorb these costs, as happened this year with funds for the National Film Preservation Foundation. Please thank your staff members, Bob Bean and Michael Harrison, for their hard work and extensive consultation with the Library in developing this legislation. Please let me know if Congressional staff would like to visit the Library's sound recording program to see what we do currently and how your legislation might be implemented.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. BILLINGTON,
The Librarian of Congress.

TEAR DOWN THE WALL OF MILK MARKETING NONSENSE

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, every morning back in Minnesota, on about 8,300 farms, the lights go on between 4:30 and 5 o'clock in the morning. On those 8,300 dairy farms, people get up; the farmers get up to go out and milk their cows. Now, if there was a group of people in America that works harder than our dairy farmers, I do not know who they are.

Ever since 1937, the dairy farmers in the Upper Midwest have labored under the yoke of the milk marketing order system. It is a convoluted, complicated, and unfair system whereby the price that the dairy farmers receive for their milk is priced based on how far they are away from Eau Claire, Wisconsin. It makes absolutely no economic sense. Now, it may have made sense back in 1937 before the refrigeration we have today, before the interstate highway system that we have today; but it makes no sense today.

In fact, Justice Scalia described the system as Byzantine. Ever since about 1938, those of us who represented the good dairy farmers in the Upper Midwest have been trying to get this sys-

tem reformed. We have asked for just a modest amount of reform.

Finally, in the last farm bill, we made an agreement that we would request that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Glickman, would come back with a proposal to level the playing field at least a little bit in this milk marketing order system so that dairy farmers in the Upper Midwest would not be punished as much just because their dairy farms are located closer to Eau Claire, Wisconsin, than dairy farms in other parts of the country.

Finally, the Secretary of Agriculture came back with a plan, a modest plan. It was not strong enough for many of us. We wanted more reform than the Secretary brought forward. But in the sense of compromise, we were willing to live with that. But, unfortunately, some of our colleagues from the rest of the parts of the country said no, no, no, we cannot even have that modest amount of reform.

Well, Madam Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues some excerpts of an article that was written back in about 1985 about a U.S. Representative from the State of Texas who was a former economics professor. He is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY). The title of the article is "Moscow on the Mississippi: America's Soviet-style Farm Policy." Let me just read some excerpts from this article.

He starts off by saying, "Even as perestroika comes to the Communist world, our own Federal farm programs remain as American monuments to the folly of central planning. If we have reached the end of history with the vindication of free economy, the USDA has not yet heard the word."

"Fifty years ago, when the Roosevelt administration announced certain 'temporary emergency measures,' farm programs were highly controversial." Even Henry Wallace, the Secretary of Agriculture "who conceived the idea, remarked, 'I hope we shall never have to resort to it again.' The USDA has been resorting to it ever since."

"Under the current farm law passed in 1985," and this was in 1986, I believe, the article was written, passed in 1985, "the Department of Agriculture has paid dairy farmers to kill 1.6 million cows."

I go on. He says, "Under the dairy program, local dairy cooperatives are allowed to form government-protected monopolies. Because there is no competition, people have no choice but to buy the milk at higher prices, which is a good arrangement for the big cooperatives, but a bad arrangement for parents who buy milk for their children. The resulting dairy surpluses have been reduced by government's paying dairy farmers" large amounts "to slaughter or export their cows and leave dairy farming for" at least "5 years."

"Like any central planning effort, whether in the Soviet Union or the American Corn Belt, all supply-control

policies are riddled with irrationalities and unintended consequences. Even though the USDA has one bureaucrat for every six full-time farmers, fine-tuning the farm economy is a difficult task."

I go on and I quote from the end of this column where he says, "Repeal all marketing orders. Current law prohibits the Office of Management and Budget from even studying them. Marketing orders should be repealed."

"Terminate the dairy program."

Well, Madam Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), a wall of protectionism cannot stand against free markets. Milk marketing orders cannot be explained, let alone defended. Compacts are trade barriers. Trade barriers are walls.

I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), if they mean what they say about perestroika and open markets, then come here to the well of this House and stop the milk marketing nonsense. Tear down this wall.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 66TH OBSERVANCE OF UKRAINIAN FAMINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, as a cochair of the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus, I rise to commemorate the 66th observance of the Ukrainian Famine, to help record this century's largely untold story of famine and repression in the former Soviet Union.

During 1932 and 1933, the people of Ukraine were devastated by hunger, though not the kind caused by unfavorable natural conditions. Instead, only certain regions or a part of the country suffered famine while the government of the former Soviet Union turned their backs upon the population.

The famine of 1932 and 1933 stemmed from political rather than natural causes. In 1932, Ukraine had an average grain harvest of 146,600,000 metric tons of wheat, and there was no danger of famine, or at least there should not have been.

But the famine was first and foremost a planned repression of the peasants by the Soviet government for their resistance to collective savings. Second, it was an intentional attack on Ukrainian village life, which was the bulwark of Ukrainian heritage. Third, it was the result of the forced export of grain in exchange for imported machinery which was required for the implementation of the policy of industrialization.

The events of 1932 and 1933 are considered a man-made famine because food was available. But what happened was politically motivated. It characterized the Soviet system and ultimately resulted in the deaths of over 6

million people, including our great grandparents.

□ 2000

People died by the millions, and they were piled at the village edge like cord wood. According to Stalin's commands and the law that was enacted in 1932, Party activists confiscated grain from peasant households. Any man, woman, or child either could be, and often was, executed for taking a handful of grain from a collective farm field or was punished by 10 years of hard labor.

Gangs of Communist Party activists conducted house-to-house searches, tearing up floors and delving into wells in search of grain. Those who were already swollen from malnutrition were not allowed to keep their grain, and those who were not starving were suspected of hoarding food. An average peasant family of five had about five pounds of grain a month to last until the next harvest.

Lacking bread, peasants ate pets, rats, bark, leaves, and garbage from the well-provisioned kitchens of Party members. There were occurrences of cannibalism. People dug in the frozen ground with their raw hands to find even an onion for soup. But many villages died out, in spite of the fact that party activists continued confiscating grain.

The unprecedented calamity came in the winter and spring of 1933, before a new harvest could be gathered, when the world population was left without any means of sustenance and authorities did not organize any supplies for the villages. Some villages in the regions of Poltava, Kharkiv, and Kyiv were completely deserted by the spring of 1933.

When the casualties of collectivization, famine, the purges of the 1930s, and the nearly 6 million who died during World War II are combined, it is estimated that more than half the male and one quarter of the female population of the Ukraine perished. Along with these people, the achievements, lessons, and hopes that one generation communicates to another were destroyed. Under the circumstances, it was all the more remarkable that Ukrainian society had any strength left for self-assertion in the postwar period. In summing up the famine in Ukraine, it is no exaggeration to say that the Ukrainians' greatest achievement during that decade and this century has been to endure and survive.

In this sense, we must recognize the Ukrainian famine on a yearly basis to bring light to the tremendous sacrifices a people had to endure. Last year we commemorated the 65th anniversary of the Ukrainian famine with a commemorative resolution. Later this week, on November 20, the Ukrainian community will have an opportunity to commemorate the fallen victims of the famine with an ecumenical service and program at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City. I join with the Ukrainian-American community in com-

memorating this tragic period in the world's history, certainly in the history of Ukraine. Always remember, never forget.

And here in America we will attempt to tell the history of a people who struggle even today to build a nation where democratic reforms and freedom are possible for millions and millions of those who survived and those who remember the great price that their families paid only because they wanted to be free.

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

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

UNPREPAREDNESS OF U.S. ARMY

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, last week, The Washington Post ran a front-page story that said the U.S. Army has rated 2 of its 10 divisions unprepared for war due to the "strain of open-ended troop commitments in Bosnia, Kosovo and elsewhere."

This unpreparedness is the result of spending so many billions in Kosovo, where we made the situation many times worse by going in than it was before we started bombing. This unpreparedness is the result of spending many billions in Bosnia, where we had U.S. troops giving rabies shots to Bosnian dogs and where the military's greatest problem was boredom of the troops. This unpreparedness is the result of spending billions in Haiti, where, according to The Washington Post, we had our troops picking up garbage and settling domestic disputes. This unpreparedness is the result of spending even now, according to the Associated Press, \$1 million a day on a forgotten war in Iraq that is doing us no good at all.

In fact, almost all of these foreign misadventures, in addition to weakening our military and costing U.S. taxpayers many billions of dollars, all of these misadventures are making new enemies for this Nation all of the time. Haiti, Rwanda, Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, Iraq, and billions and billions and billions of U.S. taxpayers' money, all spent at a time when we are still almost \$6 trillion in debt, and all spent where there was absolutely no threat to U.S. national security.

In addition to these problems is the fact that our constitution is being ignored. Syndicated columnist Doug Bandow wrote "When the U.S. attacked Yugoslavia earlier this year, it inaugurated war against another sovereign state that had not attacked or threatened America or an American

ally. The President, and the President alone, made the decision. The constitutional requirement that only Congress shall declare war is obviously a dead letter. Yet the administration's embarrassing bungling in Kosovo illustrates just why the Framers intended that the decision to go be nested in the legislative.", according to Mr. Bandow.

He also quoted Abraham Lincoln, who said "Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending that the good of the people was the object." Lincoln added that the constitutional requirement that only Congress could declare war came about because war was "the most oppressive of kingly oppressions; and (the Framers) naturally resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this suppression on us."

James Madison wrote that "The Constitution supposes, what the history of all governments demonstrates, that the executive is the branch of power most interested in war and most prone to it. It has accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war in the legislature."

Of course very few people seem to care that we so routinely violate our constitution today.

The Christian Science Monitor had a special section last year showing that there were little wars going on in over 40 places around the world. If we try to stop them all, we can forget about Social Security, Medicare, the national parks, and almost everything else the Federal Government does.

Do we now go into Chechnya and stop the Russians from killing people there? Do we start now attacking the Albanians, who have been killing the Serbs in Kosovo now that the shoe is on the other foot? Of course not. We only go where CNN tells us to by whichever hot spot they are playing up at the moment.

We need to stop turning our military into international social workers. We need to restore our constitutional form of government, and we need to stop sending troops in and bombing people where there is no real threat to our own national security. And we need to stop spending so many billions of hard-earned tax dollars in military misadventures when so many families have to have both mother and father working so that one can pay all the Federal, State and local taxes imposed upon them.

One other unrelated topic, Mr. Speaker, which also shows that the Federal Government is simply too big, is the report just out that the wife of a member of the other body has been paid \$2.5 million by just one company over the last 6 months in lobbying fees. When the Federal Government was much smaller, no one was paid \$2.5 million for 6 months of lobbying, especially by just one company.

It seems to me that it should be wrong for the wife of a Senator or for any one person to be paid \$2.5 million