

title I funding for poor children in the No Child Left Behind Act, the budget cuts 82 percent of that proposal. Despite the growth of our immigrant population, the Republican budget cuts 10 percent per child for funding to teach children to be proficient in English. Some may think that is not important. Having been a superintendent, I can tell Members that if we do not help those children, all children suffer.

The Republican budget freezes funding for education for homeless children. When you account for inflation, the budget will mean 8,000 fewer homeless children receive this help next year. They are all Americans, and they deserve our help.

We should not turn our back to fully fund special education and forestall completion of that long-time goal by at least 4 years, but this budget does that. And the Republican budget freezes funding for after-school centers, which will eliminate 50,000 children from participating in after-school programs. And I can tell Members that having been a school chief, that is critical, because so many children go home alone and stay by themselves. Despite the looming teaching shortages across the country, the budget shortchanges teacher training and denies this aid to 92,000 potential teachers who would be eligible under the No Child Left Behind Act.

The budget cuts more than 95 percent of the school library initiatives of the No Child Left Behind Act. And the budget guts school reform grants of 24 percent, or \$75 million, and the list goes on. But let me talk about my home State of North Carolina.

More than \$92 million from title I grants to school districts will be cut, \$1.5 million from language acquisition grants, \$332 million from special education, \$10.2 million for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers, \$462,000 for education for homeless children, \$9.5 million for teacher training, and \$1.7 million for comprehensive school reform.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on. The bottom line is that this Republican budget is wrong for education. It is wrong for our children, and it is wrong for America. I join my fellow Democrats and urge the Republican leadership to restore these educational cuts.

#### CAUTION IS URGED IN STRIKE AGAINST IRAQ

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the very distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) for allowing me the courtesy to speak this evening.

As the daughter of a family of infantrymen and Marines, I was particularly captivated by an article I read just a

few days ago in USA Today's editorial page entitled "Untested Administration Hawks Clamor For War," by James Bamford, who is a member of USA Today's board of contributors. I would like to read a portion of it into the RECORD and insert it in its entirety.

He says, "Beware of war hawks who never served in the military. That, in essence, was the message of retired four star Marine Corps General Anthony Zinni, a highly decorated veteran of the Vietnam War and the White House point man on the Middle East crisis. Zinni is one of the growing number of uniform officers in and out of the Pentagon urging caution on the issue of a preemptive strike against Iraq."

"In an address recently in Florida, he warned his audience to watch out for the administration's civilian superhawks, most of whom avoided military service as best they could. 'If you ask my opinion,' said Zinni, referring to Iraq, 'General Brent Scowcroft, General Colin Powell, General Norman Schwarzkopf and General Zinni may all see this the same way.'"

□ 1915

"It might be interesting to wonder why all of the generals see it the same way, and all those (who) never fired a shot in anger (and) are really hell-bent to go to war see it a different way."

"That's usually the way it is in history," he said.

"Another veteran, Senator CHUCK HAGEL . . . who served in combat in Vietnam and now sits on the Foreign Relations Committee, was even more blunt. 'It is interesting to me that many of those who want to rush this country into war and think it would be so quick and easy don't know anything about war. They come at it from an intellectual perspective versus having sat in jungles or foxholes and watched their friends get their heads blown off.' They have never seen that."

He talks about during the bloodiest years of the Vietnam War, Vice President CHENEY decided against wearing the uniform of his country. Instead, he used multiple deferments to avoid military service altogether. In fact, he quotes the Vice President as saying, "I had other priorities in the '60s than military service."

Mr. CHENEY is far from alone. "Neither Paul Wolfowitz, the Deputy Defense Secretary, nor Richard Perle, the Chairman of the Defense Policy Board, have served in uniform, yet they are now two of the most bellicose champions of launching a bloody war in the Middle East."

"What frightens many is the arrogance, naivete and cavalier attitude toward war. 'The Army guys don't know anything,' Perle told The Nation's David Corn earlier this year," and debated with him whether 40,000 troops would be sufficient, when indeed most of the military say 200,000 to 250,000 would be needed, plus the support of many allies.

"Non-combatants, however, litter the top ranks of the Republican hierarchy. President Bush served peacefully in the Texas National Guard," and indeed was missing for 1 year of that service. "Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld spent his time in a Princeton classroom as others in his age group were fighting and dying on Korean battlefields (he later joined the peacetime Navy). Another major player in the administration's war strategy, Douglas Feith, the Defense Under Secretary for Policy, has no experience in the military. Nor does Mr. CHENEY's influential Chief of Staff, Lewis Libby."

"The top congressional Republican leaders" in both the House and Senate "never saw military service," and in contrast, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) here in the House, "a World War II combat veteran, has expressed skepticism about hasty U.S. action, as have some prominent Democrats" such as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), a distinguished Member who was in the military during the Vietnam War.

"What is remarkable about this administration is that so many of those who are now shouting the loudest and pushing the hardest for this generation's war are the same people who avoided combat" themselves, "or often even a uniform, in Vietnam," just simply were not there.

"Military veterans from any era tend to have more appreciation for the greater difficulty of getting out of a military action than getting in, a topic administration war hawks haven't said much about when it comes to Iraq."

"Indeed," the author closes, "the Bush administration's nonveteran hawks should review the origins of the Vietnam quagmire. Along the way, they might come across a quote from still another general, this one William Westmoreland, who once directed the war in Vietnam," and said, "The military does not start wars. Politicians start wars."

Also, he quotes Civil War General William Tecumseh Sherman, who observed, "It is only those who have neither fired a shot nor heard the shrieks and groans of the wounded who cry aloud for blood, more vengeance, more desolation."

I commend this article to my colleagues. The title of it is "Untested Administration Hawks Clamor for War." I ask Americans to think about it.

I will insert in the RECORD at this point the article that I mentioned previously.

[From USA Today, Sept. 17, 2002]

UNTESTED ADMINISTRATION HAWKS CLAMOR  
FOR WAR

(By James Bamford)

Beware of war hawks who never served in the military.

That, in essence, was the message of retired four-star Marine Corps general Anthony Zinni, a highly decorated veteran of the Vietnam War and the White House point man on the Middle East crisis. Zinni is one of a growing number of uniformed officers, in

and out of the Pentagon, urging caution on the issue of a pre-emptive strike against Iraq.

In an address recently in Florida, he warned his audience to watch out for the administration's civilian superhawks, most of whom avoided military service as best they could. "If you ask me my opinion," said Zinni, referring to Iraq, "Gen. (Brent) Scowcroft, Gen. (Colin) Powell, Gen. (Norman) Schwarzkopf and Gen. Zinni maybe all see this the same way. It might be interesting to wonder why all of the generals see it the same way, and all those (who) never fired a shot in anger (and) are really hellbent to go to war see it a different way.

"That's usually the way it is in history," he said.

Another veteran, Sen. Chuck Hagel, R-Neb., who served in combat in Vietnam and now sits on the Foreign Relations Committee, was even more blunt. "It is interesting to me that many of those who want to rush this country into war and think it would be so quick and easy don't know anything about war," he said. "They come at it from an intellectual perspective vs. having sat in jungles or foxholes and watched their friends get their heads blown off."

The problem is not new. More than 100 years ago, another battle-scarred soldier, Civil War Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman, observed: "It is only those who have neither fired a shot nor heard the shrieks and groans of the wounded who cry aloud for blood, more vengeance, more desolation."

Last month, Vice President Cheney emerged briefly to give several two-gun talks before veterans groups in which he spoke of "regime change" and a "liberated Iraq."

"We must take the battle to the enemy," he said of the war on terrorism. Cheney went on to praise the virtue of military service. "The single most important asset we have," he said, "is the man or woman who steps forward and puts on the uniform of this great nation."

But during the bloodiest years of the Vietnam War, Cheney decided against wearing that uniform. Instead, he used multiple deferments to avoid military service altogether. "I had other priorities in the '60s than military service," he once said.

Cheney is far from alone. For instance, neither Paul Wolfowitz, the deputy Defense secretary, nor Richard Perle, chairman of the Defense Policy Board, has served in uniform, yet they are now two of the most bellicose champions of launching a bloody war in the Middle East.

What frightens many is the arrogance, naiveté and cavalier attitude toward war. "The Army guys don't know anything," Perle told The Nation's David Corn earlier this year. With "40,000 troops," he said, the United States could easily take over Iraq. "We don't need anyone else." But by most other estimates, a minimum of 200,000 to 250,000 troops would be needed, plus the support of many allies.

Even among Republicans, the warfare between the veterans and non-vets can be intense. "Maybe Mr. Perle would like to be in the first wave of those who go into Baghdad," Hagel, who came home from Vietnam with two Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star, told The New York Times.

Secretary of State Colin Powell, a Vietnam combat veteran and former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has often expressed anger about the class gap between those who fought in Vietnam and those who did not.

"I am angry that so many of the sons of the powerful and well-placed managed to wangle slots in Reserve and National Guard units," he wrote in his 1995 autobiography, *My American Journey*. "Of the many trage-

dies of Vietnam, this raw class discrimination strikes me as the most damaging to the ideal that all Americans are created equal and owe equal allegiance to their country."

Non-combatants, however, litter the top ranks of the Republican hierarchy. President Bush served peacefully in the Texas National Guard. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld spent his time in a Princeton classroom as others in his age group were fighting and dying on Korean battlefields (he later joined the peacetime Navy). Another major player in the administrator's war strategy, Douglas Feith, the Defense undersecretary for policy, has no experience in the military. Nor does Cheney's influential chief of staff, Lewis Libby.

The top congressional Republican leaders—Senate Minority Leader Trent Lott, House Speaker Dennis Hastert, House Majority Leader Dick Armey and House Majority Whip Tom Delay—never saw military service, either; only one, Armey, has shown hesitation about invading Iraq. In contrast, House International Relations Committee Chairman Henry Hyde, R-Ill., a World War II combat veteran, has expressed skepticism about hasty U.S. action, as have some prominent Democrats—House Minority Whip David Bonior, Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle and former vice president Al Gore—who were in the military during the Vietnam War.

No administration's senior ranks, of course, have to be packed with military veterans in order to make good military decisions. But what is remarkable about this administration is that so many of those who are now shouting the loudest and pushing the hardest for this generation's war are the same people who avoided combat, or often even a uniform, in Vietnam, their generation's war.

Military veterans from any era tend to have more appreciation for the greater difficulty of getting out of a military action than getting in—a topic administration war hawks haven't said much about when it comes to Iraq.

Indeed, the Bush administration's non-veteran hawks should review the origins of the Vietnam quagmire. Along the way, they might come across a quote from still another general, this one William Westmoreland, who once directed the war in Vietnam.

"The military don't start wars," he said ruefully. "Politicians start wars."

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). The Chair must remind Members to avoid improper references to Senators.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE HON. PATSY MINK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating my colleagues who provided the review of the irresponsibility of the Republican majority toward the economy and my previous speaker, the gentlewoman from Ohio, in terms of her spirit of indignation expressed about cavalier attitudes towards war.

I think the subject that I want to talk about tonight, the lady that I

want to talk about, the Congresswoman I want to talk about tonight, would very much approve of what our previous colleagues have done here already tonight. I want to talk about Congresswoman Patsy Mink, who recently passed away in Hawaii.

Patsy Mink is known for many things, but I know her as a Patsy Mink who was filled with righteous indignation and anger against injustice, and my colleagues have presented tonight very intelligent presentations, well-documented presentations, but that will get all the time. I think I heard in their voices also some outrage. They were upset. They were angry about the irresponsibility of the Republican majority, and that we have all too little of here in this Congress, all too little righteous indignation and anger.

We are going to miss Patsy Mink because she was a lady with great righteous indignation against injustice. She was angry at the kind of callous approach to human welfare that was exhibited too many times on the floor of this Congress.

Yesterday we had a resolution on Patsy Mink, and many people spoke. I was not able to speak, but I did submit for the RECORD a tribute to Congresswoman Patsy Mink, and I would like to start with that tribute and make comments on it. The tribute, of course, is in its entirety in the RECORD, Tuesday, October 1.

In Tuesday's RECORD this appears in its entirety, but I would like to repeat it and comment as I go, because I heard my colleagues yesterday talk about Patsy in many ways. Most of the references were personal. I would like to focus primarily tonight on Patsy Mink as a policy manager, Patsy Mink as a champion of the poor, Patsy Mink as a champion of women, Patsy Mink who could be very intense, although she always was polite and warm, and lots of people talked about that yesterday.

Patsy Mink will be remembered with a broad array of accolades. She was a warm, compassionate colleague. She was civil and generous, even to the opponents who angered her the most. As a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, which when Patsy Mink first came to Congress was called the Committee on Education and Labor, as a member of that committee, in any long markup, and we could have some long markups, we always knew that Patsy would try out macadamia nuts to supply for all of us to refresh myself, and she would share my macadamia with everybody, those who were opponents as well as those who were allies.

I remember her chiding me, joking with me when I talked about how much I loved macadamia nuts. I was a macadamia nut junkie, but I said to her, Do not bring any more because I am on a diet, and these things certainly do not help anybody's diet. The next time she came with macadamia nuts, they were chocolate-covered macadamia nuts, and they are even more delicious than