But U.S. military spending did not change accordingly. Outlays have fallen, but only from the 1985 peak caused by the Reagan defense buildup. Adjusted for inflation, expenditures today remain above those of 1980. President Clinton is spending more now than Richard Nixon did in 1975 and almost as much as Lyndon Johnson did in 1965. The U.S. spends more than three times as much as Moscow, and nearly twice as much as Britain, France, Germany, and Japan combined.

Although the world remains a dangerous place, it is not particularly dangerous for the U.S. observed Colin Powell when he was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. ''I'm running out of demons . . . I'm down to Castro and Kim Il Sung.''

The bulk of the Pentagon budget continues to fund Washington's Cold War alliances. For example, through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), 100,000 U.S. soldiers stand guard lest phantom Soviet Divisions invade Europe. It's not as if the Western Europeans, with a combined population of 414 million GDP of $7.4 trillion, couldn't defend themselves against Russia, with 149 million people and a $1.1 trillion GDP, Britain, France, and Germany together spend 25% more on the military than Russia, which just announced a further cut in defense outlays. It is time for the Europeans to take over NATO. There is *certainly* no need to expand NATO into Central and Eastern Europe. The old Eastern Bloc needs access to Western markets, not Western soldiers. And America has no vital interest that warrants guaranteeing the borders of Poland, say, or Hungary.

The case for maintaining 100,000 soldiers in East Asia is equally dubious. South Korea has 20 times the GDP and twice the population of North Korea, U.S. citizens spend more than the South Koreans to defend South Korea.

No new threats loom on the horizon. Germany and Japan remain feared by some alleged friends, but neither is likely to declare war on one of its powerful neighbors—many of whom now possess nuclear weapons. China is growing but seems assertive rather than aggressive. Its military expansion has been measured. Brazil, India, and other nations may eventually evolve into regional military powers, but the U.S. has no quarrels with them and can adjust its policies over time if necessary. Outlaw states like Iraq and North Korea pose diminishing conventional threats that should be contained by their neighbors, not by America.

The final refuge of those who support big military budgets is ''leadership.'' As Newt Gingrich puts it, ''You do not need today's defense budget to defend the United States. You need today's defense budget to lead the world.''

But do you, really? The U.S., after all, has the largest and most productive economy. It is the leading trading nation. Its constitutional system has proved to be one of the world's most durable. Its culture permeates the globe. Perhaps an outsized military isn't required for ''leadership.'' Indeed, even significant budget cuts would still leave Washington with the world's biggest and best military.

No one wants America to be weak, which is why spending on training and technology should remain priorities. But we're ready for a radical restructuring—from, for instance, 1.5 million to 900,000 servicemen, 12 to six aircraft-carrier battle groups, and 20 to ten tactical Air Force wings. The military budget could be cut to some $170 billion from today's nearly $270 billion.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT DOYLE

HON. ALLEN BOYD

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1997

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 28th birthday of Robert Doyle, a loyal member of my staff. As a lifelong, faithful Democrat, Bob has served the party with tireless dedication.

Bob's interest in politics began at a young age. His 3-year service as his high school's class president began a noteworthy career in politics. Bob has also worked on several political campaigns including Leader GEPHARDT's Presidential campaign and the Maryland gubernatorial election. In his most recent venture, Bob managed my own successful congressional campaign this past November. He has worked for the office of the majority leader in the Florida State House of Representatives, and as vice president of the Windsor Group, a political consulting firm in Tallahassee.

Bob and I quickly became friends during my time in the Florida Legislature and while working together on the campaign trail. He is like family to me and I am proud to rise today to wish him all the best on his 28th birthday.

STATEMENTS BY JULIE LUDLUM, EMMA STANLEY, JAMIN WHITEHEAD, AND RACHEL REPSTEAD, ENOSBURG HIGH SCHOOL, REGARDING SCHOOL CHOICE

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1997

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I would like to have printed in the RECORD this statement by high school students from Enosburg High School in Vermont, who were speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people.

Ms. LUDLUM: Good afternoon, Congressman Sanders. It is generally acknowledge that an educated citizenry is a desired thing for the United States. It is needless to say that it is imperative in this age of globalization. Through it the skills, knowledge and value of our democratic capitalistic system are imparted to the next generation, thus enabling us to better compete globally. However, many American public schools are not adequately preparing their students. Too many graduates of American high schools are ill prepared to compete in the global marketplace. The question is how best to fix this?

Ms. STANLEY: There are many educational models, theories and philosophies to make public schools more effective. While educational theorists, politicians and practitioners are locked into a constant tug of war over the most effective practices to follow. Students needs and wants are not being met. Without a school choice most students are simply along for the ride. Those who wish to get a education which meets their needs and wants must wait until they graduate from high school. At that point they can, within the limits of their financial needs, attend the school of their choice. But why wait until then? why not extend school choice to all high school students or for that matter to all students?

Mr. WHITEHEAD: To an extent we in Vermont are afforded school choice. The current practice of some communities of paying tuition for their students to attend middle and high schools elsewhere is defacto school choice. Unfortunately, that is only available for students who do not have a middle or high school in their own communities.

We know that for many of these communities it was originally a decision driven by economics. However, some of these communities have since grown, yet have chosen not to build their own middle and high schools. Why not? To do so would mean giving up school choice. So now the question is how could making school choice available to all students help public schools better accomplish their missions? What else would be needed to make it work?

Ms. REPSTEAD: Enosburg Junior and Senior High School benefits from this kind of school choice. Our high school is a small, rural middle and high school which serves 475 students from six nearby communities. Approximately one-fourth of the student body is in the middle school and the remainder of the student body is almost evenly split between resident and tuition students.

We recently conducted a random study on the question of school choice. We asked 64 students in grade 6 through 12 to rank how they felt about school choice and in what grade or grades that should be an option and what form it should take. The results were overwhelmingly in favor of school choice by a margin of 95 percent to 5 percent. When we exclude the middle grades from the survey the approval rate was even higher, 98 percent to two percent. The few students who did not favor school choice were from the community of Enosburg. The most obvious explanation is loyalty. Tuitioned students unanimously supported school choice. When considering responses concerning the grade level in which school choice would be an option we noted that most students felt it should be available beginning the year they were in.

Ms. LUDLUM: We feel that a voucher program is the only choice to makes school possible, affordable and effective. We should extend to all Vermont the option of school choice. Families can make the types of educational choices they need and want. It would force public schools to be more competitive as well as stimulate the development of magnet and charter schools. Each of the latter two makes it possible through a variety of educational models to be tested in the marketplace. They would essentially function as working models that public schools could emulate.

The people that are supporting it would have to say that the public schools would have to get better, individual public schools would have to get better because if they didn't nobody would attend the schools that weren't up to the higher standards. Some people say that if public money is going to private schools then the private schools would lose control and the government would be able to issue mandates on them.

In support of school choice people say the competition will make public schools improve because if they do not improve they wouldn't get any money from those students who attend, but in opposition, some people say that private schools receiving governmental funds would not be a good thing because the government might then issue mandates and then would lose what makes them private schools.

Mr. WHITEHEAD. A student who chooses not to go to Enosburg whether they are from Enosburg or not, if they are from a different town from Enosburg their town would pay for it and they would pay as much or roughly as much as they would pay for a public education to Enosburg.