

Armenian Assembly of America has received from Israeli Education Minister Yossi Sarid, and I quote, "I fully intend to allow Israeli pupils to learn the lessons of your tragedy, which is ours and the world's, as well. Israelis are the last people who can afford to forget the tragedies of this magnitude."

#### THE MILLION MOM MARCH AND SETTING AGENDAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating the Million Mom March. The Million Mom March took place on May 14. I think the moms marching had a lot to do with our agenda here in Congress today and tomorrow and our agenda for the rest of the year. I just hope that the moms realize that their power, the power of mothers marching, is great enough to have an impact and an influence on what we do here, in many ways.

Their immediate objective was gun control, but there are many other items that I would like to see placed on their agenda. I would like to see the mothers set the agenda for what is going to happen here in Washington in the next few months.

Mr. Speaker, there is a secret, almost a secret, that nobody wants to talk about that I think the million moms and the fathers too ought to be concerned with and should be discussing. Fathers as well as mothers, and all of us, are concerned about the future and concerned about the Nation's future as it impacts upon our immediate children and our grandchildren. We want to see a greater America, we want to see a better world, and we have a golden opportunity here in this United States of America right now with the surplus of \$2 trillion over the next 10 years as a possibility. It is possible that we may have a surplus of \$2 trillion.

This year's surplus is definitely, by the most conservative estimate, going to be about \$200 billion, \$200 billion this year, and it will probably be no less than \$200 billion for the next 10 years. I think the million moms marching ought to know about that. I think they ought to be involved in a discussion of what happens with that \$2 trillion over the next 10 years to impact upon their lives and their children's lives.

I think the most comprehensive, the longest and the loudest discussion ever held in the history of our democracy should focus on this window of opportunity that we have at this point. We started the debate today on permanent trade with China. The relationship with China is relevant here in terms of the fact that some of us believe that the trade with China agreement will have a great impact on the working

families of America because it is going to take away many of the jobs that people at the lower levels have.

Trade with China is definitely going to be as bad or far worse than the trade agreement with Mexico, which immediately began to drain away certain manufacturing jobs. China is so much bigger. China's economy is controlled and manipulated, and the likely danger that our economy will be greatly impacted by China is even greater than anything that happened in the case of Mexican cheap labor destroying jobs in America.

The question is, what does all this have to do with the million moms marching? What does it have to do with the setting of the agenda here in this Capitol for the next few months? What does it have to do with the \$2 trillion surplus we expect over the next 10 years? It all comes together because, as we lose those jobs that are going to fly away to China, inevitably corporations will pick up and they will go locate plants where the cheapest labor market is, where there are 25-cent-an-hour workers in China, where in some cases they use prison labor.

Already our economy and our stores are flooded with goods from China because everybody can make a killing. Companies can go and manufacture goods at dirt cheap prices and then come back into our advanced economy and sell them at very high prices, relatively speaking, and make a big profit. So no industry, no corporation is going to back away from the opportunity to make these big profits. They will be chasing dollars at the expense of the loss of many jobs.

So, what is one of the possible answers to the problem that will be created if the people who want to pass the trade bill prevail, and the rumor is that they have enough votes and they will probably prevail tomorrow and there will be a China trade agreement? There will be a huge loss of jobs. A country that has 1.2 billion people has a lot of customers, they say, and they want to get those customers. But before they get to the customers, they have a lot of workers who need jobs and who will work for almost nothing and will undercut the workers here in this country.

So one possible answer immediately is in the same breath that as we create jobs in China, as we lose jobs here and create more jobs in China, let us respond to the argument that so many of the proponents of the China trade bill have made, and that is that, yes, we will lose jobs in manufacturing; yes, we will lose jobs at the lower level of the economy, but we will gain tremendous number of jobs and sales in the high-tech industry. We are going to take off where a new boom, a new surge in the sale of PCs and in the sale of services to established Web sites and all of the telecommunications, high-tech technology that is necessary. We will be the suppliers of that.

It may be true that for a while there will be this great surge of need in the

Chinese economy for American know-how and for American high-tech machinery. If that is the case, then there will be jobs created in America in the high-tech area. At the same time we are making a trade agreement, then let us guarantee that the thousands and thousands of workers who are going to lose jobs are also given an opportunity to get some training in these high-tech areas. Let them learn how to be the people who hook up the technology. Some might even travel to China. Let them learn how to manufacture the gadgets and the gears and the switches and the lines that might require skills that are different from the manufacturing skills that the people who make cars have, or the people who make refrigerators, or the various consumer products that are going to now be made in China. Let the people who lose the jobs making those products begin to make the products for the high-tech revolution. They cannot do it without some more training. They need training immediately.

I do not know of any place where there is any legislation on the drawing board which says we are going to have a massive emergency training program for workers who lose their jobs as a result of the China trade bill passing. In the long run, however, we do talk and have talked a great deal about revamping our school system, improving the way we educate young people, so that in the long run the young people who are in school now will get an education which allows them to fill those high-tech jobs. And at least the China trade bill will not take away jobs in the future because the young people will be able and capable of stepping out of school and commanding the jobs that do exist in the high-tech industry.

They predict that there may be as many as 1.5 million job vacancies in the high-tech industry in the next 5 years because of the fact that we are not training enough people in computer sciences and related sciences in our colleges so that vacancies are going to be there. So our schools, then, must rise to meet the occasion and prepare youngsters for these guaranteed jobs.

In the absence of any special education effort, what we are doing is going abroad. And one item that is going to be on the agenda in this Congress in the next few weeks is the H-1B program. The H-1B section of the immigration law allows us to bring in foreigners to fill the vacancies that are created in the high-tech industry. And primarily that is the target. They are not bringing in these people for anything else. The great need is in the high-tech industry, information technology industry. So what we did not train our youngsters for in the past, will now be taken care of by foreigners. And that will keep going.

How are we going to deal with the vacuum created by the movement of manufacturing jobs to China if the only source of the manpower to fill the

jobs that do exist is going to be the foreign countries, foreign countries who have information technology expertise and will send the personnel here?

Weaving this story together may, at the beginning, sound very complicated, but it really is not. It is quite simple. Mothers should be aware of the fact that the best way they can take care of their children is to have an impact on the policies that are made here in Washington, on the bills and the legislation that come to this floor. Mothers should have an impact.

I congratulate the mothers for understanding the relationship between their marching and the possibility of making their schools safer, of making their neighborhoods safer, of ridding our society slowly of a menace that has grown over the years because mothers have not been active in attempting to end that menace. We have more than 200 million guns in our society. Those guns out there are menacing. Those guns out there represent danger to our children. They recognize that, and their immediate focus in marching here on May 14, Mother's Day, was to deal with the menace of the gun, the immediate threat to the lives of children.

I think that is appropriate, and I congratulate them for focusing on something very concrete. It is possible to get some results if the mothers stay organized. It is possible we will get some basic legislation passed which will make the world of our children safer with respect to guns. We have very limited objectives this year, and we ought to be able to meet those objectives.

But beyond that, mothers need to set a larger agenda. I think that The New York Times certainly had it right when they said that perhaps the best fate for the holiday, Mother's Day, would be to make Mother's Day again a day of open activism as they did on this May 14. Mother's Day has an interesting history, a very interesting history.

People say it is very unusual, very nontraditional, very unorthodox to have mothers marching on Mother's Day, May 14. In my community, there were large numbers of mothers who thought it was an insult. We did have one bus load of mothers who came from my district. They actually left the city from my office, and they were mothers mostly of children who had been injured or killed by guns. There were large numbers of other mothers who were really more traditionalist and said, no, I am not ready yet.

But I think I would urge all mothers to rethink the possibility that Mother's Day should be a day of activism, and maybe fathers should take note too and make Father's Day a day of activism. If we care about the next generation, our children, our grandchildren, one of the ways we should express our concern for their survival is to try harder to have an impact on what happens in our government.

Now, let me just read from The New York Times editorial on May 14, which

I thought was very appropriate, where they applauded the activism on Mother's Day. "No matter how simple it looks, Mother's Day is a complicated holiday. It has its roots in mid-19th century women's activism, championed first in 1858 by Anna Reeves Jarvis and then in 1872 by Julia Ward Howe. Their causes, honored locally on various mother's days in mid-spring, were improved sanitation, first aid, and world peace.

□ 2030

"But activism is about the last thing Mother's Day had begun to call to mind in the 20th century. Woodrow Wilson proclaimed the first official Mother's Day on May 8, 1914, fulfilling a joint resolution of Congress that authorized the President to proclaim the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day and to request a flying of the American flag as a token of that fact. The patriotism has filtered out of Mother's Day over the past 86 years, making it hard to think of this holiday as an acknowledgment, as the joint resolution put it, of the service rendered in the United States by the American mother."

Continuing to read from the New York Times editorial of May 14: "The day has instead been formalized, commercially into a festival of flowers and feminine gifts and perhaps a few minutes of hard-earned leisure. But it has also been informalized, made a more intimate and less civic display of feeling. There is something a little ambivalent, a little archaic, about the formulaic ways we celebrate this day, if only because the status of mothers has never been more complex.

"In 1914, the mother's service outside the home was mainly inferential. The American mother, Congress wrote at that time, is doing so much for the home, for moral uplift and religion, hence so much for good government and good humanity. There is a lot in that word 'hence.' But these days there is no inference about it at all. Mothers are as likely to work in government as they are in the home.

"Perhaps the best fate for this holiday would be to make it again a day of open activism, as it was for the woman marching on behalf of gun control in many cities across this country today. Not everyone believes as Julia Ward Howe did, that if mothers could only come together somehow, world peace would ensue. But the second Sunday of every May could come to symbolize a powerful reality of contemporary American politics. Women united behind a cause can be a powerful force for progressive social policies, better child care, broader health coverage and fully equal opportunity for them and their children." That was the New York Times editorial of May 14, the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to enter the statement in its entirety in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, May 14, 2000]

#### ACTIVISM ON MOTHER'S DAY

No matter how simple it looks, Mother's Day is a complicated holiday. It has its roots in mid-19th-century women's activism, championed first in 1858 by Anna Reeves Jarvis and then in 1872 by Julia Ward Howe. Their causes, honored locally on various mother's days in mid-spring, were improved sanitation, first aid and world peace. But activism is about the last thing Mother's Day called to mind in the 20th century.

Woodrow Wilson proclaimed the first official Mother's Day on May 8, 1914, fulfilling a joint resolution of Congress that authorized the president to proclaim the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day and to request the flying of the American flag as a token of that fact. The patriotism has filtered out of Mother's Day over the past 86 years, making it hard to think of this holiday as an acknowledgment, as the joint resolution put it, of "the service rendered the United States by the American mother."

The day has instead been formalized, commercially, into a festival of flowers and feminine gifts and, perhaps, a few minutes of hard-earned leisure. But it has also been informalized, made a more intimate and less civic display of feeling.

There is something a little ambivalent, a little archaic, about the formulaic ways we celebrate this day, if only because the status of mothers has never been more complex. In 1914, a mother's service outside the home was mainly inferential. "The American mother," Congress wrote, "is doing so much for the home, for moral uplift, and religion, hence so much for good government and humanity." There is a lot in that one word "hence." But these days there is no inference about it at all. Mothers are as likely to work in good government as they are in the home.

Perhaps the best fate for this holiday would be to make it, again, a day of open activism, as it is for the women marching on behalf of gun control in many cities across the country today. Not everyone believes, as Julia Ward Howe did, that if mothers could only come together somehow, world peace would ensue. But the second Sunday of every May could come to symbolize a powerful reality of contemporary American politics. Women united behind a cause can be a powerful force for progressive social policies, better child care, broader health coverage and fully equal opportunity for them and their children.

Mr. Speaker, there is a second editorial that was done the next day by The New York Times, and it reads as follows: "The surge of energy was palpable yesterday as hundreds of thousands of marchers gathered on the Mall in Washington to demand stiffer gun control measures, and additional crowds joined in the demonstration at other sites around the country.

"The event may not have reached the million mom goal set by some alliteration-loving promoters, but the turnout, estimated at more than 750,000, was nonetheless impressive, especially on a day traditionally devoted to family gatherings. There is a real hope that the seed planted by this march could blossom into a movement that could change the dynamics of the national struggle to achieve sensible gun control."

I am quoting from The New York Times editorial. I am not going to read the entire editorial, but another section of it reads as follows: "The marchers offered a sound agenda ranging

from the registration of all handguns and the licensing of all handgun owners to mandatory safety locks and full background checks before all gun sales."

This is a very limited, very practical, very reasonable agenda of the mothers who came here on May 14. They are asking for very little. I think it is possible that if they still organize they could gain this. I will just reread what can be the summary of what they came for: "The marchers offered a sound agenda, ranging from the registration of all handguns and the licensing of all handgun owners to mandatory safety locks and full background checks before all gun sales. That is an agenda that mothers set to make their children safer in a very immediate and practical way."

The editorial of the New York Times on May 15, the day after the march ends as follows: "It is not yet clear how the gun control issue will play out politically. Even as mothers were mobilizing for their march, a new poll showed that the gender gap on guns is growing with men more apt to support the rights of gun owners and women more interested in gun restrictions. The challenge for the marchers will be to turn the event into a sustained political movement."

"Many speakers held this as a historical turning point in the gun control struggle, but it will only become so if the marchers keep up the pressure on Congress to pass the modest but useful gun control measures that remain blocked in a conference committee and on candidates running in the fall elections to support strict gun control laws."

"The hands that rock the Nation's cradles have the potential to rock its political institutions, but only if they keep rocking hard." That is the conclusion of the New York Times May 15 editorial on the day after the Million Moms March. The hands that rock the Nation's cradles have the potential to rock its political institutions, but only if they keep rocking hard.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit the entirety of the New York Times editorial of May 15 into the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, May 15, 2000]

#### THE POWER OF MOTHERS MARCHING

The surge of energy was palpable yesterday as hundreds of thousands of marchers gathered on the Mall in Washington to demand stiffer gun control measures—and additional crowds joined in the demonstration at other sites around the country. The event may not have reached the "million mom" goal set by some alliteration-loving promoters, but the turnout—estimated at more than 750,000 by the organizers—was nonetheless impressive, especially on a day traditionally devoted to family gatherings. There is real hope that the seed planted by this march could blossom into a movement that could change the dynamics of the national struggle to achieve sensible gun control.

That possibility clearly has the National Rifle Association running scared. It tried to neutralize the impact of the march in advance with advertisements in print and

broadcast media denigrating the event and offering its own tepid alternative, a program to teach gun safety in every elementary school classroom in America. A full-page N.R.A. ad in The Times on Friday derided the march as "a political agenda masquerading as motherhood" and called it "shameful to seize a cherished holiday for political advantage." That seemed a disingenuous complaint from an organization that regularly uses its lavish campaign contributions to seize the political process and thwart the will of the American people.

The marchers offered a sound agenda, ranging from the registration of all handguns and the licensing of all handgun owners to mandatory safety locks and full background checks before all gun sales. By contrast, the solutions offered by the N.R.A. were laughably insufficient—safety education in the elementary schools, better parenting and better enforcement of existing laws, riddled as they are with loopholes. Those are all laudable goals but would not come close to stemming the epidemic of gun violence.

Even worse ideas came from some participants in a countermarch staged by gun advocates. They argued for the arming of teachers and other citizens and the right to carry concealed weapons on the theory that if more of the "good" people owned guns for self-protection, the "bad" people would be deterred from attacking them. That sounded more like a recipe for shootouts than for crime control.

It is not yet clear how the gun control issue will play out politically. Even as the mothers were mobilizing for their march, a new poll showed that the gender gap on guns is growing, with men more apt to support the rights of gun owners and women more interested in gun restrictions. The challenge for the marchers will be to turn the event into a sustained political movement. Many speakers hailed this as a historic turning point in the gun control struggle, but it will only become so if the marchers keep up the pressure—on Congress to pass the modest but useful gun control measures that remain blocked in a conference committee, and on candidates running in the fall elections to support strict gun control laws. The hands that rock the nation's cradles have the potential to rock its political institutions—but only if they keep rocking hard.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues can see, I want to go further than gun control. I think that the practical objectives of the Million Moms March on May 14 are realizable. I think they should strive to see those objectives, since they are so limited, realized this year. Why not? They are very modest goals. I would like to appeal, however, to the million moms and all the moms and moms organizations everywhere to go further and set a larger agenda, beyond gun control, to make your children safe in this world, beyond gun control to guarantee that your children have a reasonable opportunity to pursue happiness. It will have the tools and the capability to be employed in the industries that are going to be very complex and demanding in the future with respect to training and intellectual capabilities.

Let us set the agenda so that they have a chance. Let us set the agenda so that at a point in history where there is a \$2 trillion surplus anticipated over a 10-year period that \$2 trillion surplus is not squandered by the traditional

conventional wisdom that prevails here in Washington.

I am not going to set female reasoning up against male reasoning. I know there was a recent article in the New York Times that talked about the fact that women may have a chemical hormone that makes them more nurturing; and they may be more useful to civilization, because their immediate response to danger and response to challenges to the survival of themselves and their children is to close ranks and to organize and to help each other.

I am not going to get into that kind of scientific basis that is being attempted to establish the fact that mothers are more suitable for maintaining our civilization and that women are more suitable for maintaining our civilization. Now men, I would like to appeal to men to march also, since I was very much impressed, I was down here for the Million Moms March, very impressed at the way that they turned this traditional holiday into a temporary movement, and I was very impressed by the editorials in The New York Times that call for the mothers to make the temporary movement a permanent movement.

I only say that the permanent movement should set a larger agenda; let the mothers set the agenda for Washington. Let the mothers set the agenda for the House of Representatives, for the Congress. Let the mothers set the agenda for the end game negotiations that take place every budget year at the White House. There is going to be an end game negotiation where the decisions will be made about how to spend some of that surplus. Nobody wants to talk about it now.

The Committee on Appropriations process is moving forward with no discussion of the surplus. They are acting as if we are still in a period of desperate deficits. The Committee on Appropriations and the authorizing committees act that way in all cases, except one. Mothers need to know that, last week, last week mothers, we passed a defense authorization bill which was \$309.9 billion. The authorization bill already was \$21.1 billion greater than the amount spent for the last year on defense. However, the Republican majority added an additional \$4.5 billion to the bill.

So if you want to know where the surplus is likely to go, if you want to know what the temperament is and what the likely manner in which it will be wasted, you watch the defense budget. There is no great war on right now. There is no evil empire to defend ourselves against, but it is the first place the extra money has been utilized.

H.R. 4205, the defense authorization bill, increases the defense budget to \$309.9 billion. If we do not have the debate, if you are not aware throughout the entire country that there is a window of opportunity that right now we have an opportunity to use revenue that is available in constructive ways,

I do not say that the defense authorizations are not constructive, I just think they have enough money already before the additional amounts were added.

There is plenty of money to meet the agenda that the defense and military establishment have set, the legitimate agenda. I would like to see them expand the agenda and use some of the tremendous resources of the defense and military establishment to do more to help with disaster relief, disaster relief in this country, disaster relief anywhere in the world. We have this huge apparatus of equipment and men and know-how and I think we ought to expand the mission of the defense to be a mission to help with natural disasters throughout the world.

We can spend the money well there, but even then they have too much money. At the same time that they are authorizing an additional amount for defense, the Republican majority and the appropriation committees have led the fight to cut education drastically. Education has been cut, despite the fact that we no longer have a desperate deficit.

They cannot argue, as they argued under the Newt Gingrich Contract with America, that they had to cut school lunches and they had to destroy the Department of Education, they had to cut Head Start, they had to deny increases in higher education grants, because we had a deficit, the country was on the verge of bankruptcy. That was the illusion that they painted. That was the picture that they painted.

The country is not on the verge of bankruptcy now. So why are the Republicans leading these tremendous cuts in education? Why at a time when we are opening trade with China, trade with China, which will draw out our manufacturing jobs, the jobs for entry-level persons who do not have an education? Why at a time like this are we going to cut back on the education budget? Yes, it is true the Federal Government only gives a small portion.

It provides a small portion of the education budget. Most of the education budget is provided by the States and by the localities, but the Federal Government's 7 percent or 8 percent is a key amount, and the fact that it is only 7 percent or 8 percent is unfortunate. There is no reason why it could not be larger.

The dogma has been over the years that the Federal Government should not spend more money for education, because we want to keep our schools under local and State control. But if there is only a 7 percent investment in the schools, there is certainly no way you are going to take over the schools. And if we increase the 7 percent investment from the Federal level to 25 percent, there still is only a 25 percent power, 25 percent of the power, the other 75 percent of the power would still be at the local and State level.

What is this great myth that more State, more Federal money would

mean more Federal control? We need the money from the Federal Government to revamp our schools now. The window of opportunity is now while we have this great Federal surplus. There are some States that have some surplus. There are some cities that have some surplus, but there is no surplus like the tremendous surplus that is being projected over the 10 years for the Federal Government.

There is no place where we are going to find over the next 10 years a projection of sums like \$2 trillion, this year, \$200 billion. So I think the mothers who marched here ought to know and ought to join the debate.

□ 2045

Mothers, keep the pressure on for gun control, but, mothers, if you want to save your children and want to allow them to join the 21st century revolution which moves into a kind of a cyber-civilization, a digital world, where you have to have special skills, if you want all the children to be able to keep up with the rapid changes in our digital society, then we have got to have the education revamping now. We have to have the reform in education now. We need the computers in the schools now. We need the teachers that know how to use computers to teach. We need many of the items that were cut by the Republican majority in the Committee on Appropriations.

At this point, I would like to read portions of a letter that was submitted from the National Education Association. It is headed by Robert Chase, who I heard speak a few months ago, and he talked about the fact that our schools have a great deal of needs operationally, but there are even greater needs in terms of the infrastructure. Our school buildings, our school equipment, our laboratories, there is a great need for an investment there.

I want to congratulate Mr. Chase and the National Education Association, because following their statement of that need, they went out and they did an in-depth study, a thorough study from State to State of what the needs were for our school infrastructure. Infrastructure means buildings, it means gyms, it means laboratories and cafeterias, it means classroom space. That is what infrastructure means. In addition to infrastructure, they also studied our technology needs in the schools, computers and the hookups you need for the computers in terms of wiring, et cetera.

So the National Education Association is certainly qualified and has earned the right to criticize the recent cuts that the Committee on Appropriations has made in the education bill. Let us remember now that the majority party, the Republican majority, is the same party which 6 years ago proposed that we abolish the Department of Education. They proposed that we cut Head Start, they proposed that we cut school lunches. They are not as bold and as open and honest in their as-

sault on education now as they were 6 years ago, but here is an assault.

In this letter from the NEA, it states that the \$1.3 billion in emergency grant and loan programs proposed by the President for school repairs has been cut from the budget, cut from the appropriations. They did not put one penny in to replace that. There is no school modernization and construction money in the bill that is passed out of the Committee on Appropriations, the subcommittee, by the Republican majority.

The possibility of reducing class sizes is cut down drastically when you do not have the classrooms, when you do not have the infrastructure improvements. The NEA study estimates that there are \$268 billion in unmet school infrastructure needs. Now, we are talking about infrastructure, buildings, that are needed to service the enrollment right now. The population of the schools right now is being made to operate in inadequate facilities. We are not talking about projections over the next 10 years of enrollment, we are talking about the needs right now. \$268 billion is needed, according to the National Education Association study, yet, the cuts that were made by the Subcommittee on Appropriations for education have wiped out any possibility of even entering \$1.3 billion for emergency repairs.

They have eliminated the Class Size Reduction Program, which was going forward without the extra classrooms. We started that last year by appropriating money for additional teachers. The assumption is if you have additional teachers, the ratio of pupils to teachers will be smaller in each class.

The problem is that if you do not have the classrooms, you can give money for more teachers, but there is no way to reduce the class size. In the case of New York City and a few other places across the country, they have put an additional teacher in the classroom. When you have young children in the elementary grades, a teacher at one end of the room and a teacher at the other end of the room trying to teach 2 different classes is definitely an adventure slated to not be successful.

Various other adaptations of the teaching takes place when you do not have the classroom space. But, nevertheless, I certainly support the program to have more teachers.

We wanted to put 100,000 new teachers in our classrooms over a 3- or 4-year period. The successful class size reduction program has already helped schools to hire 29,000 highly qualified new teachers. Just last November, Congress agreed on a bipartisan basis to continue and strengthen this critical program as part of the consolidated fiscal year 2000 appropriations bill. Elimination of targeted funds for class size reduction will not only jeopardize the gains already realized, but will prevent the schools from hiring an additional 20,000 qualified teachers to serve another 2.9 million children. We urge the

committee to restore funding for this critical program.

The Teacher Empowerment Act Block Grant, the subcommittee bill provides for \$1.7 billion for a block grant consolidating the Eisenhower Professional Class Reduction Program. Because the bill provides only a minimal increase above the current funding, schools seeking to hire additional teachers to reduce class size will have to do so at the expense of programs to recruit and train teachers. In other words, the Republican majority has folded in other programs into the money and into the program that was designed to get additional teachers.

Insufficient funding for the teacher quality programs, they have cut that also. They have frozen the funds for the critical Title I programs. The subcommittee bill not only eliminates targeted funding to help low-performance schools maximize student achievement, but the subcommittee bill denies additional math and reading services to 260,000 disadvantaged children.

Just last fall, the House passed a bipartisan Student Results Act setting the Title I authorization level at \$9.85 billion, yet the subcommittee bill provides almost \$2 billion below this level, something like \$7.8 billion. So there is another cut in a critical program.

There is no program that has been more critical than Title I, which is a basic thrust of the Federal Government in elementary and secondary education. Title I provides funds to schools where the poorest youngsters are attending, and it is designed to enhance the school program with extra services.

They have eliminated \$20 million for elementary school councils, frozen funds for bilingual school programs, refused to give additional funding for Head Start. All of this adds up to a hostile Republican majority attacking education again through the budget action. All of this is an indication that there is no concern about the fact that we have a surplus, a \$2 trillion surplus over a 10-year period.

We are not going to spend the money on education if we continue to follow the leadership of the Subcommittee on Education which passed out this appropriations bill. They refused to discuss the surplus. But the million moms out there who marched on March 14 ought to wake up and ask the question, what are you going to do with the surplus? And the second question is, what are you going to do about education with the surplus?

There is no reason why we cannot simplify matters. I think we should make it easy on ourselves and dedicate 10 percent of the surplus, no matter what it is. If it goes down, then it is 10 percent of whatever that is; if it goes up, it is 10 percent of that. Ten percent of the surplus over the next 10 years ought to be dedicated to education, to educational improvements. Half of it can go in the form of the improvement of the infrastructure for schools all across America; the other half can go

to other reforms. The debate about what the other reforms should be might continue for some time, but the money would be there when we reach consensus on programs that do work.

We know that there are some programs that do work. Head Start works. We know that. The TRIO programs work; we know that. There are a number of different programs that we agree work. They should be the recipients of the increased funding first. Then additional programs that are designated as programs that work can be funded also out of the second half of the 10 percent of the surplus.

What is 10 percent of the surplus this year? It would mean \$20 billion; \$20 billion into education this year. \$10 billion of that goes toward school construction and infrastructure improvement. Then you would have \$10 billion left for other reforms and education improvements.

I am certain that there are many who dismiss this proposal right away as being too ambitious, out of harmony with what is practical and acceptable, but those of us who are Members of Congress know better. We authorized a \$218 billion program for a 6-year program for highways just a year ago, so \$218 billion for highways over a 6-year period was not unthinkable. We can think big when it is necessary.

We have just increased the defense budget, as I said before, increased it to \$309.9 billion. Just as an afterthought, we added \$4.5 billion to last year's budget. The President had already added \$21 billion to it. So we think big, and we think in the billions. There is no reason why we cannot think about \$20 billion for education improvements in one year, especially if half of that goes toward construction.

School construction and infrastructure expenditures for wiring schools, for technology, et cetera, those are items which do not involve interference by the Federal Government in the operation of a local school. Those are capital budget items. The Federal Government gives the money, let us do the construction, let us revamp the schools, repair those schools, let us wire the schools so they can have Internet access, let us buy computers, let us do the capital improvements necessary, and then the Federal Government can get out. The operation of the school goes on, and you actually free up additional dollars so that the State and the Federal Government dollars, more of them can be spent on operational activities instead of capital budget activities.

That is a simple formula. The amount of money spent for construction is no threat to local control at all. It is an easy way to relieve the burden at the local level.

If these amounts seem too great, let me just go back for a moment to the National Education Association study. The National Education Association study is very revealing because they conclude, as I said before, that we need

\$253.8 billion, about \$254 billion, for infrastructure other than technology. They conclude that just for technology, we need \$53 billion additional. They have mapped it out quite thoroughly. Unmet needs, school modernization funding, totals, when you add technology and infrastructure together, \$307.6 billion. They break it down in two areas, school infrastructure and technology.

School infrastructure means deferred maintenance, take care of that, new construction, renovation, retrofitting, additions to existing facilities, major improvements. The results would be that we would have to bring it up to par, spend that \$254 billion that I spoke about.

Educational technology, they define that. A comprehensive definition of educational technology according to the NEA study is multimedia computers, peripherals, software, connectivity, networks, technology infrastructure, equipment, maintenance and repair, professional development and support.

□ 2100

All of that goes into the physical needs for technology. They do not talk about training teachers. That was a different bill, and we still need that.

What does it all add up to in terms of the States? They break it down according to the needs of each State. One might be interested to know that at the very top of the States in terms of infrastructure needs stands the great Empire State of New York. New York, according to the National Education Association study, New York's infrastructure needs total \$47.6 billion. New York has the greatest infrastructure, they call it unmet needs, greater modernization of unmet needs in New York, the infrastructure is \$47.6 billion, technology is \$3 billion.

According to the survey and the standards supplied by the National Education Association, the total need in New York is \$50.6 billion to bring their schools up to par, to meet the needs of the 21st century in infrastructure and technology combined. New York is so bad off, they are in such terrible shape, that the second State in terms of need is about half that amount.

Now, California is the second State in terms of infrastructure need, technology need. California is number two. Even though California has a much larger population, their infrastructure need is only \$22 billion, not even half of New York State's \$47.6 billion. Their technology needs are greater because New York, according to the survey, has done more in terms of computerization than California, so the technology needs of California are \$10 billion, for a total of \$32,901,000 that California needs versus New York's \$50,675,000. I am talking big figures, these are big numbers. Let us not run away from them.

Do we know the cost of one nuclear aircraft carrier? We do not run away

from the cost of a nuclear aircraft carrier. It is more than \$4 billion. Do we know the cost of a Sea Wolf submarine? It used to be around \$2.1 billion. It has probably gone up by now. In weapons technology, the Star Wars, the new missile defense system that we are going to construct, I think we added almost \$6 billion more to play with that some more. We have spent billions of dollars over the years to get a missile defense against terrorism. We are willing to throw away additional money on that.

Common sense tells us that a terrorist does not need a long-range missile to throw a bomb into a crowded city, or to bring a bomb into a crowded city. There are many, many ways other than the firing of a long-range missile. So a system which is designed to stop long-term missiles where we have already spend hundreds of billions of dollars, we do not need to spend more billions of dollars. But my argument is that this is the way it will be thrown away. It will just be flushed down the drain, all of the surplus money, in one foolish project after another by policymakers who ought to know better, under pressures from lobbyists and from corporations and from hundreds of people who will make millions of dollars as a result of our wasting our money.

The best defense for America is in brain power, developing maximum brain power so that when the China trade agreement begins to siphon off the jobs for our young people, the brain power that has been developed in those young people to step forward and take those high-tech jobs that we still have left. We do not have to bring foreigners in with an H 1 B program to take the jobs that our own youngsters should be trained for. It all comes together.

Let the mothers set the agenda. Let the mothers have the common sense to do what so far the policymakers here are not willing to do. Let the mothers in on the discussion. Let us not keep proceeding toward September when the end game negotiations will take place and decisions will be made about what we should do with the surplus. Yes there have been some proposals by the President, and I support all of his proposals. He proposes to use some of the money to deal with the Medicare problems, the problems of Medicare, the possible deficit in Medicare in 15 or 20 years. Some of the money can be used to deal with that.

The President is proposing we use some of the surplus to deal with a prescription drug benefit. That is one of the possibilities. Another possibility has been, of course, that we pay down the debt, the most popular one; and I am all in favor of paying down the debt. But we are not in a situation where all of the funds have to be used to pay down the debt at once. Why not invest in education, because the investment in education will only increase the surplus and increase the health of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of arguments that make sense, and yes, they have gone forward; but suddenly there is silence about even the President's proposals which he made in the State of the Union address are not getting any great amount of discussion here on Capitol Hill. The Senate and the Congress are moving at this point as if there is no surplus. If there are discussions of a surplus, and there are, I am sure, they are all behind the scenes getting ready for D-Day when the Democratic President and the White House will have to sit down with the Republican-controlled Congress, and they will dole out what happens to portions of the surplus that they are going to spend this year.

Mr. Speaker, it is our duty to send them a message. Public opinion is still vitally important. It is not as important as it used to be because there was a time when public opinion was used as a barometer for a lot of decision-making and people would say well, I have to do it because the public wants it. I cannot do it because the public is against it. Never before has public opinion been as strong as it is now in favor of the Federal Government providing more assistance to education. For the last 5 years, public opinion has told us that education ranks as one of the top five priorities of the public for the use of government money, government funds. For the last 2 years, education has been number one. Indisputably, this year education ranks as the number one priority according to the public. The polls that are taken by the Republicans show the same as the polls that are taken by the Democrats.

Why is our leadership fully aware that education is a number one priority of the public refusing to respond by dedicating more of our resources to education? Our leaders who read these public opinion polls, we pay large amounts of money to pollsters to do the polls. Some of them come free from objective sources that have no stake in politics. Why are they not listened to?

Now, we are like the Roman Empire right now in terms of the rest of the world. We sit on top of the world as the only superpower; and it is to our credit that we are a superpower not only in military terms, but in terms of influence of our popular culture, in terms of our compassion. Probably no nation can match our overall compassion when it comes to international emergencies. The history of defending democracy far from our shores is written in the blood of the young men who died on the beaches at Normandy and on it goes. So we have a lot to celebrate, and if there is any empire that exists now in the modern 21st century, then the empire of America is one that we can be proud of, not an empire built on blood, but the empire can fall.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the same pivotal position as the Roman Empire was. Science and technology, military might has brought us to this point. But let us remember, at the same time

Roman technology and the Roman engineers and the Roman scientists were at their height, they invented concrete. They built magnificent structures. They were way ahead of the rest of the world at that time.

At the same time the Roman engineers and the scientists and the craftsmen were doing such great work, the Roman politicians were so backward that they were feeding the Christians to the lions in the colosseum. The engineers built a magnificent colosseum, but the Roman politicians determined who died, who was fed to the lions. So the savagery and the backwardness of the politicians, of the policymakers, of the people in charge was the beginning of the downfall of Rome.

Mr. Speaker, we have so much going for us economically, scientifically, militarily. Why is it that we cannot make decisions in this case in response to our own electorate, in response to the mothers and fathers out there who answer the polls? The pollsters tell us they want more money spent for education. When they questioned the people more closely within the category of education, they said they want us to fix up the schools. How much more information do we need? How much more instruction from the people do we need?

Mr. Speaker, there is a stubbornness which is dangerous. There is a stubbornness which is deadly. There is a stubbornness which we see in the figures related to gun control. We are a Nation of savages when it comes to the number of people who die from gunshot wounds every year. Compared to the other industrialized nations, Germany, Japan, France, we have 100 times more people dying from guns, being killed by guns. No other nation allows 200 million guns to circulate in their society. The mothers were late, the mothers were late, but at least they are there on gun control.

There are other kinds of savage acts that are taking place that need to be challenged. There was a book written called *Savage Inequity*, which was a book describing the way the school resources are allocated in New York City. They compared the best schools in certain neighborhoods with the worst schools in other neighborhoods. I am sorry, it was not just New York City, it was other cities as well. They called it savage inequities in the way we are educating our children. That was almost 20 years ago. The savage inequities in the way we allocate our resources for education have gotten worse, not better. Now we have the resources. We have a \$200 billion surplus this year, and over a 10-year period, a \$2 trillion surplus. Why not end the savage inequities? Why not end the savage inequities? Do we need the mothers to come here and tell us what to do?

I think in 1990, March 27, 1990, I made a speech on the floor of this House which was called, "Keeping Our Eyes on the Real Prize: The Child Care Bill."

At that time we were considering a bill for child care, and again, we were nickel and diming the situation, looking at ways in which to cut pennies from the program at the same time the savings and loan swindle was raging. Billions of dollars were going down the drain from the taxpayers to take care of the crooked savings and loan swindles and deals, and we were nickel and diming the child care program.

There was a meeting held here, I will not go into the details of that meeting, and Marian Wright Edleman was invited to that meeting. She is the head of the Children's Defense Fund. The discussion that took place at that meeting and the way in which they responded to her, the negative way in which many of the persons at that meeting, Congress persons, responded to her simple plea for more money for child care upset me to the point where I wrote my first rap poem and found that rap poems are a good way to get off your frustration here in this place.

I called that rap poem, "Let the Mothers Lead the Fight." I dedicated it to Marian Wright Edleman and the Children's Defense Fund. It is very appropriate now. The mothers are leading the fight, they came to Washington, and I just want to close out by reading this rap poem that was put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the 27th of March, 1990. It is relevant.

Let the mothers lead the fight; sisters snatch the future from the night. Dangerous dumb males have made a mess on the right, macho mad egos on the left swollen out of sight.

Let the mothers lead the fight. Drop the linen, throw away the lace, stop the murder, sweep out the arms race. Let the mothers lead the fight.

□ 2115

Use your broom. Sweep out the doom. Do not fear the mouse. Break out of the house. Rats are ruining the world. Let the mothers lead the fight.

Fat cats want to buy your soul. Saving the children is the mother's role. Cook up some cool calculations. Look some of new recipes. Lock the generals tight down in the deep freeze. Let the mothers lead the fight.

Human history is a long ugly tale. Tragedy guided by the frail monster male. Babies bashed with blind bayonets. Daughters trapped in slimy lust nets. Across time hear our loud terrified wail. Holocaust happens when the silly males fail. Let the mothers lead the fight.

Snatch the future back from the night. Storm the conference rooms with our rage. Focus x-rays on the Washington stage. The world is being ruined by rats. Rescue is in the hands of the cats. Scratch out their lies. Put pins in smug rat eyes. Hate the fakes. Burn rhetoric at the stakes. Enough of this endless bloody night. Let the mothers lead the fight.

Holocaust happens when the silly males fail. March now to end this long ugly tale. Let the mothers lead the fight.

Stand up now to the frail monster male. Let the mothers lead the fight.

Snatch the future back from the night. Let the mothers lead the fight.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TOOMEY). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, and I plan extensive remarks this evening in regards to Social Security, I think it is a very important subject and I hope that as many as can will stay so that they can hear these comments. I look forward to a debate in the future on these comments in regards to the Social Security system. I think it is awful critical, but before I get there I have a very special announcement this evening.

Thursday of this week, at 9:00 in the morning, in Grand Junction, Colorado, our little baby, Andrea, graduates from high school. I never imagined that I would see my youngest child all of a sudden now a fine, beautiful, intelligent woman. I mean, she grew up overnight. So as soon as the vote on China is finished tomorrow night, I will depart promptly for Colorado.

I do want to say how proud I am. I am sure all of you have experienced this as well, but my wife and I now face the empty nest syndrome. We are not looking forward to that. We have had awful good years with Daxon, Tessa, and Andrea, but we will adjust.

We are pleased to announce that all three of the children will be in college; unfortunately all at once so as one can see, our budget does not have a lot of fluff to it.

Now let us move on to Social Security, the subject of which I really want to focus on this evening. I am going to talk about several things in regards to Social Security, but let me make something very clear at the beginning of this speech, and that is the speech is not intended to be partisan but it is necessary to distinguish between generally what the Republicans feel about Social Security and generally what the Democrats feel about Social Security.

There is a dramatic difference between the policies in regards to Social Security of the Vice President, Mr. GORE, and the policies of the governor of the State of Texas, George W. Bush.

So as I go through my comments this evening, I hope to distinguish for those out there in this audience here, Mr. Speaker, because there are two distinct directions that we can go in hopes of doing something with Social Security. So, again, let me repeat it once more. My comments are not intended to be a partisan attack, but I fully intend to distinguish between the Republican position and the Democratic position in general as it regards Social Security and the future of Social Security.

I think a way to begin a discussion about Social Security is to talk just a little about the history of Social Security. As many people know, Social Security was started in 1935. Now, it was not an idea that just sprung up overnight. It was an idea that was created as a result of many years of the harshest economic times this country has ever faced, the Great Depression, 1929. In the 1930s, things were very,

very difficult in this Nation, but our country came together. The President, at the time, felt that we needed to have some type of system to assist our senior citizens who could no longer work. So in 1935, the President signed in a system called Social Security, which was designed for the individual.

In 1939, the United States Congress broadened the new program from a focus strictly on an individual to a focus on the family. Now, is Social Security in trouble? And why is Social Security in trouble? And to the extent Social Security is in trouble, we should discuss that this evening.

Clearly, Social Security on a cash basis, that means the money in the bank today, the money in the bank today, Social Security has a huge surplus, but it would be like a pilot flying through the clouds coming to the conclusion that because they have not hit a mountain they have clear sailing ahead. Social Security does not have clear sailing ahead. There are mountains in those clouds; and all of us, the people of this country, are in that airplane. And, frankly, we are flying with instruments that are not appropriate to get that airplane through those clouds without hitting those mountains.

Right now the plane is flying fine. On a cash basis Social Security has a huge surplus of money, but on an actuarial basis, meaning we look into the future, we figure out what our liabilities are and we figure out what our assets are, and as we go further and further into the future we find that our assets dwindle and our liabilities increase, and at some point about 2035 as we know it today, about 2035 those two will meet.

In other words, the assets equal the liabilities. Immediately thereafter, the liabilities, in other words the cash going out, exceeds the cash coming in.

Now one good thing about the United States Congress, one good thing about other policymakers in this country, and the various senior citizen organizations, is that, for a change, Congress is looking into the future. Instead of waiting for the crisis to actually beat at our doorsteps, we are looking at a crisis that is 35 years out. Now that does not mean we can wait for a very long period of time, because at some point that actuarial liability is accelerating at such a fast speed that if one does not catch it early on they cannot stop the momentum. But we have some time if we act on a reasonable and prompt basis. That is why the discussion of Social Security should play a very predominate role in the elections this fall.

Now let me visit just for a moment why Social Security is in trouble. It is really pretty simple. It is called demographics. Look at these numbers. In 1935, in 1935 when the Social Security system started, we had 42 workers for every one worker who was retired. So in 1935, 42 workers were in the workplace. One person was retired. Today that ratio is no longer 42. Look how dramatically that number changes.